

Narrative of “Civilization” within Frameworks of Contemporary Philosophy of Culture

Çağdaş Kültür Felsefesi Çerçevesinde “Medeniyet” Anlatımı

INNA SAJTARLY  OLENA ISHCENKO 

Sabancı University

Received: 12.03.2021 | Accepted: 10.05.2021

Abstract: This paper examines some philosophical approaches, within frameworks of which have been grounded in the determining influence of characteristics of culture on the whole social field, including the formation of human mental structure. In other words, their authors claim that society and culture are so closely linked, that the process of cultural or civilizational decadence, for example, causes to decline of many key social systems, a separate element of which is the human individual. In the light of the specific dynamic of modern and post-modern cultural reflections, it is worth paying most attention to the encounter of two main approaches in contemporary theory of culture. We are referring to structuralism in its certain variations, including the poststructuralist discourse and, the so-called civilization interpretation. According to representatives of both these directions, it is the culture that is the basis of the social system. The divergence of these approaches consists in their different perspectives on the origins of culture-civilization. The purpose of this paper is to clarify the difference between these two directions.

Keywords: Humanizing, civilization, civilizing process, civilizational approach, psychoanalysis, structuralism.

✉ Inna Saitarly

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Department of Philosophy of Humanities
03022, Kyiv, Ukraine | inna.saitarly@gmail.com

✉ Olena Ishchenko

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Department of Philosophy of Humanities
03022, Kyiv, Ukraine | rebluesun@ukr.net



Introduction

In the contemporary theory of culture have occurred the significant changes, caused by the significant changes of entire contemporary philosophy, which have generated new worldview issues and approaches. We are referring to such trends as psychoanalysis, structuralism and so-called post-structuralism, which essentially transformed the subject field and logic of whole philosophical knowledge, including the philosophy of culture.

That leads us to the question: “What is the connection between the mentioned above approaches? In what way do these two fields relate to each other?” The answer is more than obvious: *their developers tend to treat culture as a highly developed system of ethical standards and a most important component in the actualization of any society.* Furthermore, several poststructuralist theories of culture have an extremely psychoanalytic context.

Indeed, nowadays it’s difficult to find the philosophy of culture that does not refer to psychoanalysis and does not deal with such concepts as «Oedipus complex», libido, unconscious, etc. All these concepts reflect a powerful effect of psychoanalytic trend on the development of the subject field in all modern cultural thought: *henceforth, the classical problem of exploration of consciousness or rationality is replaced by the psychanalytic structuring of the unconscious and by the problem of transgressive experience, primarily, in the form of superfluous violence (super-violence) that found its direct expression in post-structuralist projects.*

Nevertheless, the most complex issue of contemporary philosophy of culture turned out to be the methodological rationale itself. In this case, the issue lies in the methodological demarcation between a very philosophy of culture and other cultural studies. In other words, what exactly is the difference between the philosophy of culture and just cultural studies, and does it indeed exist a certain methodological demarcation between these sciences?

The answer to this question is related to clarifying the very notion of philosophy, which, as we believe, has not essentially changed. From classical schools to contemporary trends, philosophers use a high degree of generalization, which is associated with its metaphysical core, especially with discovering the “prime causes”. What specific “causes” do we have in mind?



At first glance, when reviewing the modern theories of culture there is an impression of their extreme multiplicities. But, some of them are too philosophical ones and can be classified into widespread. For example, the basic structuralists term is the notion of structure. However, this notion is almost a “metaphysical principle” for a number of discourses, namely psychoanalysis and phenomenology. Thus, there is another methodological issue, which is to with a comparative analysis of mentioned above trends, united by the common notion of “structure”.

The concept of structure usually means the presence of some order in the arrangement of parts of something or some construction. Meanwhile, in structuralism and psychoanalysis, this concept has received a certain clarification, primarily, it means the presence of a stable and relatively fixed pattern of relationship between elements of the complex system.

First and foremost, the mentioned above refers to patterns of social relations, which are reflected in the morals, myths, behavior rules, that is, in the elements of culture. However, psychoanalytic, structuralist and post-structuralist scholars are concerned with studying structures that are the basis of both the individual and the collective unconscious. This structure-pattern in psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud, for example, is designated by term of an “*Oedipus complex*”; structuralist Levi-Strauss talks about an “*avunculate*”; in the structural-psychoanalytic exploration of Denis de Rougemont it is associated with the myth of “*fatal love*”, and there are some others examples.

A number of mentioned thinkers recognize these “structures” are caused by certain social circumstances (“institutes”), rather than “some transcendental grounds”. Here is what, for instance, Rougemont writes about the myth, which is the core of any culture: “A myth makes it possible to become aware at a glance of certain types of constant relations ... expresses the rules of conduct of a given social or religious group. A myth stands forth as the entirely anonymous expression of collective or, more exactly, of common – facts” (Rougemont 1983, 18-19).

1. The “Civilizing Process” and Humanizing

The brilliant example of the rationale for close correlation between



the culture (the cultural tradition) and corresponding to it the social structure is the theory, proposed by Norbert Elias, who, in addition, was convinced of the determining influence of some socio-cultural institutes (“figurations”) on the formation of basic mental structures of human being in the process of his direct participation in the complex social process. There is, primarily, talking about the formation or “designing” of such mental phenomena, which are associated with the ability for affective self-control, including the control over the aggressive impulses.

Elias clearly outlined the possibility of *cultural development, including the degree of its civilization*, by describing such “things” as “advancing threshold of shame and repugnance”, “developing of specific sensitivity”, etc.

In contrast to the familial concern of psychoanalysis and structuralism, Elias examined in detail such a social phenomenon as “*the Court Society*” (*Absolutist aristocracy*) in terms of its determining role in the development of whole Western culture. Elias paid extremely attention to questions of social violence, which he considered in the context of clarifying the concepts of “civilization” and “civilizing process”.

From the well-known exploration of Elias, titled “The Civilizing Process”, one can indeed conclude that the civilizing process, primarily, gave “modern men and women the capacity to have a detached attitude towards themselves and their relationships with others”. Due to this long-term cultural development men and women have become capable “to hold back their emotions to an unhealthy degree... Standards become more “delicate”, do’s and don’ts have become more detailed, and behavior has become more tightly regulated” (Smith 2001, 21-23).

These were the meanings, which Elias had in mind when he used the concept of the “civilizing process”. In addition, he believed that the civilizing process has the desirable effect of lowering the level of interpersonal violence in everyday life. Elias argued that the classical Western philosophy of human beings as of so-called “homo clausus” is a false and harmful theory. He very convincingly proved the mental dependence of “human beings” on the social world around them, and therefore, it is more appropriate to use the term “homines aperti” in the scientific context, which, according to Smith, for example, is “open to the influence of others and influencing them in turn”. Moreover, as a result of the *civilizing process*,



Western people "can look at the world in a 'cold' and systematic way, so to speak, keeping their emotions under control" (Ibid, 26).

It is this "cold" and the "systematic way" that are the main characteristics of notorious Western rationality, which will be subjected to detail analysis in the works of Oswald Spengler and Max Weber. But, contrary to them, Elias was not explaining this cultural trait in a "physiognomic way" or "intuitively". He clearly saw its origin in the emergence and fruitful activity of such socio-political institute as "*the Court Society*".

Furthermore, Elias, thanks to his profound research, convincingly proved *that humankind is inherently inclined to destructive behavior. He forecasted that these destructive tendencies would increase, especially under conditions of deep social decline, since it is violence that is the simplest source of libidinal gratification.*

The statement, where is claimed that "Elias's theory of the civilizing process cannot adequately explain the increase in the homicide and other forms of interpersonal violence in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s in the USA and Western Europe" (Sinisˇa Malesˇevic □ 2013, 276) give rises some doubts, because Elias clearly pointed to a certain social mechanism, enabled to constrain the violence. This is the *high level of personal interdependences* and so-called "*interconnectedness*".

In other words, *it is the weakening of social control from surrounding people, their indifferent attitude that is the most likely cause of increasing violent tendencies.* This Elias's viewpoint will be elaborated by Erich Fromm, who, as well-known, will be studying this problem at its core, and emphasized the high level of personal disintegration and social alienation of modern societies.

At the age of Absolutism, social relations differed by the high degree of personal participation. But, we can talk about the essential *softening* of manners only within frameworks of a certain social group. Royal Absolutism, studied by Elias in detail, was generally, distinguished by violent tortures and executions, if we refer, for example, to its "penitentiary" system. Even though the aristocratic ethos was, first of all, the ethos of honor and

¹ Meanwhile, according to a number of thinkers in the 20th century, who studied this problem profoundly, especially in the context of the social radicalism, the reason for the lowering the violence in human relations lies in the well-developed economy, that is, in life satisfaction. We have in mind, primarily, Wilhelm Reich, Hannah Arendt and others.



dignity, the power of the feudal aristocracy over ordinary people was associated with sophisticated and long-legalized violence.

Thus, keeping in mind this contradictory era, we can only talk about the beginning of the humanization of culture, *since humanization is, first of all, a process of softening the morals by “introducing” aesthetic and ethical elements into the human psyche, for example, the specific delicacy of feelings*. That is why, there is many scholars, who emphasize that the above issue is rather complex, and we just have to join their viewpoint.

There are also thinkers who tend to accusation against very culture, especially, representatives of French postmodern philosophy. Then it leads us to the question: “How exactly do they define culture, its “prime-principle” and its main functions?

2. What is the “Civilizational Approach” in the Theory of Culture?

However, despite Elias was engaged in studying such phenomena as “civilization” and “civilizing process”, we can hardly subsume his theory under the example of philosophical thought, equally as well as under manifestation of civilizational approach. Although, here we can find out some elements of philosophical reasoning. For example, examining the logic of the development of Western civilization, Elias manifests himself as a philosopher, rather than as a sociologist. When he formulates the question of the causes of Absolutism, he points primarily to purely economic factors, namely, to “commercialization”, “extension of market networks”, “strengthening of bourgeois groups”, etc. These groups influenced the emergence of such a socio-political phenomenon as “Court Society”, since these groups were concern with the development of stable central state apparatus, with its monopolizing physical force, because only in this way they were able to protect their revenue.

Meanwhile, throughout the 20th we can observe the emergence of some attempts to determine the “civilization”, that is, the culture is the phenomenon, conditioned by nothing more than only by the specific fate (“destiny”) of entire nations, especially with regard to Western civilization: “World-history is the history of the great Cultures, and peoples are but the symbolic forms and vessels in which the men of these Cultures fulfill their Destinies” (Spengler1928, 170).



It is enough to refer to such prominent developers of civilizational approaches as Oswald Spengler and Max Weber. A brilliant example of the above metaphysics thinking, more precisely, a beginning of rationale for the civilizational approach in the theory of culture, we can find in Spengler’s “The Decline of the West”. Spengler was the first who clearly pointed to specific “morphé”, “prime symbol” or “habitus” of Western (“Faustian”) culture, for instance, which he associated with the reason, profound feeling of dynasty or *pureblood*, and with the striving for domination. This aspiration is the basic “cosmic Destiny” and “physiognomy” of peoples who belong to the so-called picture of the world of Western man.

More precisely, according to Spengler the “soul-image” of Western man was born out of “the conflict concerning the primacy of *will* or *reason*”, the basic problem of the Gothic philosophy, which men tried to solve now... It is this myth of the mind – which under ever-changing guises accompanies our philosophy throughout its course – that distinguishes it so sharply from every other. The rationalism of late Baroque, in all the pride of the self-assured city-spirit, decided in favor of the greater power of the Goddess Reason (Kant, the Jacobins); but almost immediately thereafter the 19th century (Nietzsche above all) went back to the stronger formula *Voluntas superior intellectu*, and this indeed is in the blood of all of us. Schopenhauer, the last of the great systematists, has brought it down to the formula “World as Will and Idea” (Spengler 1926, 309).

Faustian peoples are, primarily, the “organisms”, who like other great *races*, related to the embodiment of dynastic idea: “All nations of the West are of dynastic origins. In the Romanesque and even in Early Gothic architecture the soul of the Carolingian primitives still quivers through. There is no French or German Gothic, but Salian, Rhenish, and Suabian, as there is Visigothic (northern Spain, southern France) and Lombard and Saxon Romanesque. But over it all there spreads soon the minority, composed of men of race, that feels membership in a nation as a great historical vocation. From it proceed the Crusades, and in them there truly were French and German chivalries” (ibid, 180).

In contrary to Spengler, another no less outstanding representative of the civilizational paradigm, namely, German scientist Max Weber more emphases the *rationality of Western culture as its distinct feature*, rather than



its dynasticity, or desire for world power. According to Weber, Western rationality manifests itself in quite certain practices, especially, in terms of permanent striving for cognition that affected the continuous development of scientific-technical progress and industrial economy.

The Western cult of “*pure Reason*”, that is, primarily, *Reason* that is “*detached*” and “*alienated from nature*” found its direct expression in philosophical rationalism as a leading trend of the entire history of Western philosophy, starting with Plato and his belief in the divine origin of thinking, and ending with Rene Descartes and Edmund Husserl with their belief in the perfection of mathematics. One should not forget the rationalizing in terms of specific Western behavioral traditions in the form of constraining the passionate feelings till mentioned above “unhealthy degree”.

The Western cult of “*pure Reason*” in both the theoretical-scientific and practical-ethical terms has continued in economic activity of modern peoples, namely, in their “*rational conduct of the household*”, with regard to that it gained another meaning. It is this meaning that was the subject of detailed analysis by outstanding sociologist and philosopher Max Weber.

When describing Western rationality, Weber completes it by “*rational organization of the capitalistic enterprise*”, which “*would not have been possible without two other important factors in its development: the separation of business from the household, which completely dominates modern economic life, and closely connected with it, rational book-keeping*” (Weber 1930, 21-22).

This developed “*rational book-keeping*”, that is, this considerable rationalization of capitalistic calculation” has provided the rising of modern capitalistic enterprises. Henceforth, “*everything is done in terms of balances: at the beginning of the enterprise an initial balance, before every individual decision a calculation to ascertain its probable profitableness, and at the end a final balance to ascertain how much profit has been made*” (Ibid, 18). Weber associates all this movement directly with the spirit of modern industrial capitalism.

According to him, this “*spirit*” corresponds to quite ascetic imperatives of Protestantism, more precisely, to Franklin’s labor ethics, based on



the imperatives of “*industriousness*” and “the saving” that laid the basis of the Western successes in the field of economic and technical achievements.

For example, regarding to Christian origin of the value of “*industriousness*”, Weber notes: “the concept of *industria*, on the other hand, is differently colored on account of Christian influence. And there is just the difference. In the conception of *industria*, which comes from monastic asceticism and which was developed by monastic writers, lies the seed of an ethos which was fully developed later in the Protestant worldly asceticism...” (Ibid, 196). It is noteworthy, that the idea of economic ethos with its certain religious orientation was proposed long before books by Weber, namely, by Spengler in his prominent “The Decline of West”.

Another brilliant representative of the civilizational paradigm, namely Samuel Huntington, who is close to our postmodernity, focuses even more on the religious basis of currently established civilizations, rather than particularities of their “world-images”, “ethos”, “gestalt”, etc. Though, apparently, his famous geopolitical treatise, entitled “The Clash of Civilizations” can be subsumed to some synthesis of Spengler’s and Weber’s ideas, since similar to Spengler, for example, Huntington forecasts of possible “decline” of the West, in relation to that he emphasizes: “the central issue for the West is whether, quite apart from any external challenges, it is capable of stopping and reversing the internal processes of decay. Can the West renew itself or will sustain *internal rot* simply accelerate its end and/or subordination to other economically and demographically more dynamic civilizations?” (Huntington 1997, 303). He is also solidarity with Weber in relation to his perspective on religious faith as the determining origin of civilizational development, as its “central component”.

Indeed, despite some archetypal similarities between religions (as Carl Gustav Jung argued), every religious worldview has its specificity that it is not easy to explain, rather it is impossible, which can give us the impression about its complete unconditionality. All Huntington’s reasoning around the “fate” of contemporary cultures-civilizations testifies only that he deals with the civilizational paradigm, and even with regard to the civilizational approach he fully supports such concept as a paradigm, being convinced that it is this notion is the “simple map” for understanding what is going on in the contemporary world.



Furthermore, similar to all representatives of civilizational interpretation, he points to the greatest impact of culture on the entire social field, especially before the era of industrial capitalism. Indeed, it seems to be very difficult to contest the thesis that exactly the culture, more precisely, particularity of human faith, which has laid the basis of culture, determines of the direction of civilizational development.

Meanwhile, as we believe, Huntington tends to obvious exaggeration in relation to the influence of culture in the current time, namely, when he determines postmodern peoples as the people of culture. According to him “in the late 1980s, the communist world collapsed, and the Cold War international system became history. In the post-Cold War world, the most important distinctions among peoples are not ideological, political, or economic. They are cultural. People and nations are attempting to answer the most basic question humans can face: Who are we? And they are answering that question in the traditional way human beings have answered it, by reference to the things that mean most to them. People define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs, and institutions. They identify with cultural groups: tribes, ethnic groups, religious communities, nations, and, at the broadest level, civilization” (Ibid, 21).

It is very doubtful that peoples of the postmodern period are increasingly “cultural”, or that cultural identity means more to them. In this regard, there is another point of view, which is no less convincing. There is talking about the critical trend in contemporary philosophy of culture, where present peoples are considered, primarily, as the “consumers”, and their destructive impulses are regarded as the effect of dissatisfaction with life, rather than of religious or cultural distinctions.

As we believe, a man of culture is, primarily, a moral person who thinks and acts in accordance with moral restrictions and norms, which demand respect for another tradition, especially in a so-called “good society”.

Huntington draws attention precisely to the ethical “component” of culture, resorting to moral argumentations, when summarizing the “modernization”, which, according to him, “has generally enhanced the material level of Civilization throughout the world. But has it also enhanced the



moral and cultural dimensions of Civilization? In some respects, this appears to be the case. Slavery, torture, vicious abuse of individuals, have become less and less acceptable in the contemporary world. Is this, however, simply the result of the impact of Western civilization on other cultures and hence will a moral reversion occur as Western power declines? Much evidence exists in the 1990s for the relevance of the "sheer chaos" paradigm of world affairs: a global breakdown of law and order, failed states and increasing anarchy in many parts of the world, a global crime wave, transnational mafias and drug cartels, increasing drug addiction in many societies, a general weakening of the family, a decline in trust and social solidarity in many countries, ethnic, religious, and civilizational violence and rule by the gun prevalent in much of the world" (Huntington 1997, 321).

In other words, despite of individual "habitus" of cultures, nowadays, they are experiencing a serious ethical crisis that has heavily civilizational and social effects, including the notorious Western "rationality. This fact is obvious, and it is also recognized by most of the scholars that developed of civilizational approach. Thus, perhaps, Sigmund Freud, who was the first to clearly see the ethical core in culture, had a grain of salt.

3. The Critical Bias of Poststructuralist Philosophy of Culture

When reweaving some postmodern treatises, one can conclude that most poststructuralists are more concerned with the fundamental function of culture, namely, the function of enforcing social order. One gets the impression that, in their opinion, culture, is, in fact, associated with suppression or a system of repression, rather than with the very process of humanization or the so-called "civilized" face of culture. Furthermore, contrary, for instance, to Freud and Levi-Strauss, who were more interested in the contents of cultural prohibitions, poststructuralists did not deal with all of these. Indeed, according to most postmodern philosophers, the culture is deeply functional. *Unlike the followers of the civilizational approach, they are not concerned with the supersensible "causes" at all; more precisely, their metaphysics vision of culture is more related to the question of "causes" of cultural "decline", rather than to the issue of "emergence".*

As an effect, they manifest a skeptical attitude in relation to very humanism, considering it as a fully artificial or fictional notion, although, they



had to admit the obvious historical fact of humanizing the punishment system. Apparently, the poststructuralist conception of humanism is based on its reduction to economical effect or “prime-principle”, rather than just cultural field. According to many of them, the particularity of culture depends on the particularity of production basis. Hence, despite that cultural (civilizing) process is starting with *taboo*-prohibition (as Freud argued) and, in general, have a repressive character, the “peaceful”, that is, the humanized meaning of culture provides not only the high level of personal interdependence (as N. Elias believed), but also the development of the industrial-commodity production, that enables to “conserving” (J. Baudrillard) people for involving them in work.

First and foremost, the poststructuralist vision is based on deep skepticism in relation to the psychoanalytic hypothesis about feelings cultural evolution, in any case, concerning postmodern man. This hypothesis is reflected in the theory of so-called *sublimation*, which Freud considered, first of all, from the point of view of the development of the ethical and esthetic structure of the personality, that is, from the point of view of “designing a civilized Subject”. Freud proposed a dialectic vision of culture, based on the proof of its contradictory nature and its functionality in the sense of regulating relationships. One might get the impression that poststructuralists do not see effective evolution at all. According to their conviction, human “desire knows only gift and theft” (J. Deles, F. Guattari), that is, only desire for primitive pleasure, and nothing more, therefore postmodernists do not want to notice of the constructive function of culture. Despite this claim, their study of culture is, in fact, an extension of psychoanalytic philosophy. Apparently, in the postmodern theory of culture, we have only an increase in Freud’s “discontent” about any culture, especially to the cultural tradition with its ascetical imperatives.

They tend to view the “civilization process”, primarily, as a process of development of various “disciplines and punishments”, aimed at creating fully-controlled Subjects. According to many postmodernists, the institutes of culture are cruel, because humanity itself is cruel, and *the history of the development of human civilization clearly shows that this cruelty could and can acquire most “sophisticated” forms.*



A considerable amount of scientific literature is devoted to human affection or so-called love feelings, including postmodern publications, where the relativity of all of the above is proven. The most provocative philosophical work of the 20th century, namely in "Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia" by J. Deles, F. Guattari can serve as direct evidence that the thinking of poststructuralists is the revolt against both effective culture and familial values as a part of this culture.

As mentioned earlier, in this "treatise" philosophers try to assure us that in so-called "male solidarity group" there is no love for either a woman or a child, that all of this is a "social myth", which "is aimed at to impose a family, as a unite of reproduction and consumption, consequently, to involve him more in the established re-production and manufacturing order" (Sajtarly & Utiuzh 2020, 80).

Due to the fact that the majority of modern societies are experiencing a deep socio-cultural crisis, which does not even allow "sublimation in labor" (G. Marcuse), "organized violence" is widespread. In other words, postmodern society is a society that is "on the other side" of culture, and the possibility of any sublimated aggression has long been replaced by well-organized aggression. That is why the contemporary scientific works of literature are devoted primarily to the issue of violence. According to several authors, in the postmodern "consumer society" there is a complete substitution of culture with political discourse.

Moreover, this society is obsessed with politics and power, and in the conditions of total poverty of the masses, transgressive behavior can become the only source of gratification. Therefore, the psychoanalytic theory of "destructive aggression" (E. Fromm) is replaced by more contemporary concepts, for instance, with the concept of "organized violence" with its obvious political context.

In other words, at present we are forced to talk more and more about the real violence, "organized violence" in the sense of the existence of "bureaucratic", "utilitarian, rationalist logic of mass murder" (Sinis̃a Males̃evic □ 2013, 286), as well as about "virtual violence", to which we are accustomed in our everyday life, and not about forms of its sublimation.

Indeed, it is difficult to contest the fact that "violence is embedded in



complex ways in multiple social and cultural processes”, and that it “is complexly related to social divisions, social distance, hierarchy and ritual aspects of life” (Ray 2013, 293).

As a result of all the above, as some modern authors rightly emphasize: although severe pain has been replaced by a largely invisible and detached callousness, “the inter-group level, macro, inter-polity, level have witnessed profound transformations in both violent actions and the popular attitudes towards violence. However, rather than taming violence, the modern age is a witness to the escalation of bloodshed and the extraordinary expansion of coercive reach and capacity of social organizations. In addition, more than any other historical epoch, the modern era provides the most sophisticated social mechanisms for the justification of violent actions: secular and secularized ideologies” (Sinis`a Males`evic □ 2013, 274).

That is why, in addressing these issues, some contemporary discussions focus exclusively on the *transgressive experience*, although, this is a traditional psychoanalytic narrative if we express ourselves in the language of postmodern philosophy.

Moreover, the existing practice of multiculturalism, is inherently opposed to the idea of culture itself, since any culture implies a well-defined system of values, while multiculturalism implies the coexistence of different systems, that is, cultural pluralisms. This logic leads to the fact that national culture inevitably loses its imperative (obligatory) character and became “empty place”, or “nothingness”, as G. Ritzer wrote.

Postmodernists have gone further. They simply stated that culture is always explicit or implicit violence, “decoding” it to such an extent that the question then becomes, what purpose are they pursuing? What kind of alternative to culture? Is this “Schizoid Subject of Deleuze and Guattari? Or they just declare that culture is “dead”, and immediately argue that the existence of society is impossible without culture, therefore, one can conclude the representatives of poststructuralism were quite clearly aware of the entire functional value of culture in social being.

Discussion

The formation called postmodernism is based on the full variety of



affective gratifications or “freedoms”, that lose their moral component, including humanism, or as Nietzsche wrote, “Beyond Good and Evil”. The postmodern stage of Western civilization turned out to be “on the other side” not only of spiritual virtues but also of virtues as such. Direct proof of this is that the word “virtue” has completely disappeared from everyday language. However, contrary to the beliefs of Freud and Reich, the arbitrariness of desire in the postmodern era did not make humanity kinder or less aggressive. It was in our postmodern times that it became obvious, that the problem of *the “lack” of culture* is acquiring a fatal sense for the entire global community, and it is at this time for each of us must realize the true core of civilizational development.

Conclusion

Thus, summarizing the above, it is not difficult to see there is an obvious connection between structuralism, which has been above considered, and the civilizational approach. This connection is in the substantiation of the main role of cultural tradition in social beings.

Apparently, from the view of most followers of the Civilization approach (if we do not take into account the German tradition, for example, the vision Spengler), the notion of civilization does not significantly differ from the notion of culture and, generally, is identical to some kind of culture with its religious and language particularities, which are, supposedly, founded on some intuition, “gestalt”, “world-image”, etc.

Nevertheless, the idea of Civilization should be distinguished from the idea of Civilizing process in the term of process humanizing of culture, that is, in the term of strengthening the affective control and self-constraint, as well as cultivating an aversion to the pain in both its physiological and moral meanings.

The psychoanalytic statement about the sociocultural genesis of the individual or the so-called “genealogy of Subjectivity” formed the basis of many philosophical theories, especially, postmodern philosophy. As its core, this statement is absolute relativism, denied the idea of the human soul as such. But, it does not mean that the culture has not valued, as some poststructuralists try to assure us, imposing their “genital” discourse on us.



In connection with the crisis of traditional cultures under the influence of contemporary economic factors, the structuralism and civilizational paradigm cause quite reasonable questions. We are, primarily, referring to clarify the true meaning of the term “culture”. In other words, it is becoming more obvious that the true culture always functions based on constraining the desires, that is, based on prohibition.

Even if culture performs a repressive function (as poststructuralists believe, and this is obvious, starting with the upbringing of children), it symbolizes not only the compulsion to normal behavior, that ostensibly causes “discontents” (Freud). Culture also humanizes, first of all, in terms of ennobling the human mental structure, in connection with which the degree of civilizing the culture is emphasized.

References

- Deleuze G. and Guattari F. 1983. *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by R. Hurley, M. Seem and H. R. Lane, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. India: Penguin Books.
- Ray L. 2013. *Mark of Cain: Shame, desire and violence*. European Journal of Social Theory, 16 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431013476536>
- Rougemont, Denis de. 1983. *Love in the Western World*. Translated by Montgomery Beligion. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Sajtarly, I. & Utiuzh, I. 2020. *Why the poststructuralist refutation of psychoanalysis should not be trusted?* Humanities Studies: Collection of Scientific Papers / Ed. V. Voronkova. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University, 5 (82).
- Sinis̆a Males̆evic □. 2013. *Forms of brutality: Towards a historical sociology of violence*. European Journal of Social Theory, 16 (3) 273–291, <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav> DOI: 10.1177/1368431013476524 est.sagepub.com
- Smith, D. 2001. *Norbert Elias and modern social theory*. SAGE Publications /London · Thousand Oaks · New Delhi, published in association with Theory, Culture & Society, Nottingham Trent University
- Spengler, Oswald. 1928. *The Decline of the West: Perspectives of World-history*.



- Charles Francis Atkinson [translation with notes], Georg Allen & Unwin Atkinson.
- Spengler, Oswald. 1926. *The Decline of the West: Form and Actuality*. Charles Francis Atkinson [translation with notes], Georg Allen & Unwin Atkinson LTD, 1 Vol., London: 429.
- Weber, M. 1930. *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons, Harvard University, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: George Allen & Unwin.

Öz: Bu makale, insan zihinsel yapısının oluşumu da dahil olmak üzere, kültürün özelliklerinin tüm sosyal alan üzerindeki belirleyici etkisine dayandırılan bazı felsefi yaklaşımları incelemektedir. Başka bir deyişle, yazarları, toplum ve kültürün o kadar yakından bağlantılı olduğunu, örneğin kültürel veya medeniyetsel çöküş sürecinin, ayrı bir unsuru insan birey olan birçok kilit sosyal sistemin çökmesine neden olduğunu iddia ediyorlar. Modern ve postmodern kültürel yansımaların özgül dinamiği ışığında, çağdaş kültür teorisinde iki ana yaklaşımın karşılaşması en çok dikkat çekmeye değer. Postyapısalcı söylem ve sözde medeniyet yorumu da dahil olmak üzere yapısalcılığa belirli varyasyonlarında atıfta bulunuyoruz. Her iki yönün temsilcilerine göre, sosyal sistemin temeli kültürdür. Bu yaklaşımların farklılığı, kültür-medeniyetin kökenlerine ilişkin farklı bakış açılarından kaynaklanmaktadır. Bu yazının amacı, bu iki yön arasındaki farkı açıklığa kavuşturmadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İnsanlaşma, medeniyet, medeniyet süreci, medeniyet yaklaşımı, psikanaliz, yapısalcılık.



