

# „Glocalization“ Models for the Social Formation of the „Mankind Community of the Common Destiny“

A. A. Radugin

Department of philosophy, sociology and history  
Voronezh State Technical University  
Voronezh, Russia  
aradugin@yandex.ru

L. S. Perevozchikova

Department of philosophy, sociology and history  
Voronezh State Technical University  
Voronezh, Russia  
perevozch@vgasu.vrn.ru

O. A. Radugina

Department of philosophy, sociology and history  
Voronezh State Technical University  
Voronezh, Russia  
radugina@yandex.ru

**Abstract**— The relevance of the research topic is determined by the fact that the key process of the modern era is the community formation of the common mankind’s destiny. A specific feature of the current stage of this process is the determining role of mechanisms and tools of ‘glocalization’. Based on these mechanisms and instruments various models of the participation of states and societies in this process emerge nowadays. Despite the great importance of the process of globalization, which is based on different models of participation of states and societies, it has not yet become the subject of special socio-philosophical analysis. The purpose of the article is to reveal challenges and risks of each model on the basis of the analysis of the main models of the ‘glocalization’ within the formation process of the mankind community of common destiny. **Methodology:** comparative analysis allows to compare different participation models of states and societies in the social process of formation of the mankind community of the common destiny and to define specific features of each model. Depending on the measures of ‘glocalization’, which are acceptable to the national state and society, it is possible to choose the ways and sequences of entering the globalization process. Four basic models are revealed, challenges and risks for each of them are defined. The practical significance of this research is determined by the fact that knowledge of these models allows choosing the strategy of interaction with these states and societies.

**Keywords**— *models of ‘glocalization’ process, globalization, a formation of mankind community of common destiny, national state, national cultural identity.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the key modern age processes is the formation of the global „mankind community of common destiny“. The present stage of this formation is specifically featured by the prevalence of „glocalization“ mechanisms and tools. Based on these mechanisms and instruments, different models of the state and society levels of involvement in this process do emerge nowadays. Despite the great importance of the

„glocalization“ process, which is based on various models of states“ and societies“ participation, it has not yet become the subject for special social and philosophical analysis. However, certain aspects of this problem have been considered in the number of works of the worldwide and domestic social and humanitarian scientific literature.

While developing this topic, important philosophical and methodological study of the phenomenon of globalization were conducted by domestic philosophers E.A. Azroyan [1], Yu.D. Granin [2], A.N. Chumakov [3], V.I. Pantinov [4]. In the foreign science, similar studies were conducted by A. Appadurai [5], U. Beck [6], P. Berger [7], A. Dirlic [8], G. Peterson [9], Robert Robertson [10], E. Hannertz [11], G. Thorburn [12], D. Hal-house [13], M. Featherstone [14], W. Shurikens [15].

In order to further evolve this topic, it is crucial to study the correlation between „globalization“ and the „nation-state“. This problem was analyzed in the works of B. Anderson [16], Barber [17], E. Bearstein [18], E.A. Narochnikskaya [19], H. Khondeker [20], J. Tomlison [21], S. Huntington [22].

The processes of glocalization in various societies were investigated by E. Bernstein [23], S.S. Jononov [24], A.S. Lomanov [25], S.M. Xiao [26], and others.

Analysis of the specific scientific literature shows that in many respects the problem of the „mankind community of common destiny“ formation as a social process did receive proper reflection. We also observe serious studies of the problem of the formation of the „mankind community of common destiny in the social and humanitarian literature

Nonetheless, despite the great importance for the development of models for the participation of national states and societies in the formation of the „mankind community of common destiny“, it has not received proper consideration in the social and humanitarian literature on the global level. There is no specific scientific research on this problem.

The purpose of the paper is to describe the main „glocalization“ models applied to the process of formation of the „mankind community of common destiny“ and to demonstrate that the ways and sequence of its entry into the „glocalization“ process could be then determined based on the appropriate „glocalization“ measure acceptable for a certain country.

## II. MAIN PART

Since the process of globalization is comprehensive, no nation-state in the world could completely exclude itself from this process. However, one should not consider that there is a complete predominance of national states and societies in the globalization process.

The nation-state has a number of resources to support, restraint, and ignore global flows and institutions. Understanding the national interests each state and society develops its own model of approach to the globalization process acceptable to them. Depending on the openness level of national states and societies to global flows and institutions, four main models of their participation in the process of globalization can be identified, on which the appropriate measure of globalization also depend.

The first model envisages maximum openness and tolerance of national states and societies related to the action of global flows and institutions. This model is not concerned with the preservation of the national cultural identity and does not limit the formation of „glocalism“. As a result of such a policy, we observe the emergence of „glocalism“, which seriously undermines the national cultural identity. However, the state and society do not see this as a threat and do regard this situation with relative tolerance.

The second behavioral model in relation to global flows and its attitude to the institutions recognizes the possibility of coexistence of global and national forms in the culture of national states and societies without their significant interaction and integration. Firstly, coexistence may arise as a manifestation of the so-called „cultural strength“ of a given society. Coexistence emerges when global flows and institutions do not affect the deep levels within the structure of cultural identity, the values and the lifestyles of different representatives of the cultures, whereas they simply complement each other and coexist in parallel.

The third behavioral model of national states and societies is the adoption of globalization flows and institutions based on their own socio-cultural and political traditions and resources. This model expresses the desire of making maximum participation in globalization processes, but at the same time to adapt global flows to the already existing system of values and institutions. This behavioral model results in adaptation and transformation of global flows and institutions supported by the strong local reaction and new forms of „glocalism“ with the above background.

The conscious policy of the state authorities, which seek to create the most effective institutions for their country, namely, to adapt the established global institutions to local specifics

would be the most logical consequence of achieving such a goal.

The fourth model induces the policy of closure of national states and societies. It urges the protection of national culture from globalization flows and institutions, and, finally, the fight against them. At the same time, the level of isolation and closeness of national states and societies from the global world can seriously vary. One of the reasons for adopting such a strategy could be that national societies and communities interpret global flows and institutions as a threat to their national identity. Appeal to local institutions, values, the revival of traditional cultures and the accentuation of local cultural identity provides for the required sense of stability and confidence in the face of globalization. It has to be mentioned that focusing on specific culture while choosing this strategy is not directed against any particular culture or state, but, rather against the frightening effects of the globalization process itself.

## III. CONCLUSION

Hence, in the course of analysis and depending on the measures of globalization acceptable for the national state, four main models, followed by the challenges and risks for each of them were identified. The practical significance of this research is determined by the fact that knowledge of the above models allows the decision-makers to choose the strategy of interaction with certain states and societies.

## References

- [1] Azrojants E. Globalization: „Catastrophe or Path to Development“, Moscow: The New Age, 2002, 413 p.
- [2] Granin Yu.D. „Globalism and nationalism: history and modernity. Socio-philosophical analysis“, Abstract of Dissertation, Dr.Ph, Social philosophy, Moscow, 2008.
- [3] Chumakov A.N., „Globalization. Contours of the whole world: a monograph“, Moscow, „Prospekt Publishing House“, 2005, 432 p.
- [4] Pantin V.I., "Cycles and Waves of Global History, Moscow, " New Age" Publishing House, 2003, 279 p.
- [5] Appadurai A. Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. - Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996
- [6] Beck W., „What is globalization?“, Translated by A. Grigoriev and V. Sedelnikov. - Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2001. - 304 p. Berger P. Four Faces of Global Culture // National Interest, 1997. – Vol.49. – P. 23-29
- [7] Berger P., „Four Faces of Global Culture“, National Interest, 1997., Vol.49., pp. 23-29.
- [8] Dirlik A. The Global in the Local // Global/local: cultural production and the transnational imaginary. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996. P. 37
- [9] Pieterse J.N. Globalization as Hybridization // Global Modernities/ed. by M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson. – London: Sage, 1995. – P. 45-68
- [10] Robertson R. Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture / R. Robertson. – London: Sage, 1992. – pp. 445.
- [11] Hannerz U. Transnational connections. Culture, People, Places. – London and New York: Routledge, 1996. – 201 p.
- [12] Therborn G. Globalizations. Dimensions, historical waves, regional effects, normative governance // International Sociology. June 2000. Vol. 15 (2). – P. 151-179.

- [13] Held D., McGrew A., Goldblatt D, Perraton J. *Global Transformations*. Cambridge: Polity, 1999. – 515 p.
- [14] Featherstone M. *Localism, Globalism, and Cultural Identity // Global/local: cultural production and the transnational imaginary*. – Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996. – P. 46-77
- [15] Schuerkens U. *Social Transformations Between Global Forces and Local Life-Worlds // Global Forces and Local Life-Worlds*. – London: Sage publications Ltd, 2004. – P. 1-13
- [16] Anderson B, “Imagined communities. Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism”, //newpast.sfedu.ru> archive / chtoby ... 1-2016 ... andersona /
- [17] Barber B. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. - N.Y. : Ballantine Books, 1996, 389 p.
- [18] Bernstein, E., "Globalization, culture, and development. Many-faced globalization", Edited by P. Berger and S. Huntington; Per from the English. V. V. Sapova, ed. M. M. Lebedeva. - Moscow: Aspect Press, 2004, p. 202.
- [19] Narochnitskaya, “Prospects” [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: [http://www.perspektivy.info/oykumena/kotel/multikulturalizm\\_kak\\_filosofsko-politicheskaja\\_koncepcija\\_2013-12-12.htm](http://www.perspektivy.info/oykumena/kotel/multikulturalizm_kak_filosofsko-politicheskaja_koncepcija_2013-12-12.htm)
- [20] Khondker H. H., "Glocalization as Globalization: Evolution of a Sociological Concept", *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 1. No 2. July 2004. - Access mode: <http://www.bangladeshsociology.org>
- [21] Tomlinson J. “Globalization and Culture”, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999, p. 96.
- [22] Huntington S., “Who are we? Challenges of American National Identity”, Translated by Bashkirova A., Moscow, AST, Transit book, 2004, p. 36.
- [23] Bernstein, E., “Globalization, culture, and development. Many-faced globalization”, Edited by P. Berger and S. Huntington, Moscow: Aspect Press, 2004, p. 202.
- [24] Dzhononov S., “Formation of national self-consciousness in conditions of state building of Tajikistan. Abstract of the dissertation”, Dushanbe 2010, pp. 35-36.
- [25] Lomanov A.S., “China: Economic globalization with the support of wisdom”, // *International affairs interaffairs.ru*, China
- [26] Xiao S.M. “Coexistence and synthesis. Cultural globalization and localization in modern Taiwan”// *Multifaceted globalization / Edited by P. Berger and S. Huntington*, Moscow: Aspect Press, 2004, p. 66.