

On the Actualisation of Archaics

Vladimir K. Egorov✉

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration,
Moscow, Russiavk_egorov@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1070-6213>

Abstract: The article examines the dominant methods in Russian humanities for understanding the phenomenon of actualization of the archaic. Some researchers, when analyzing the archaization of modern societies from the perspective of political science and history, philosophy of history, politics, culture and religion, put forward concepts that focus on the search for key factors that determine the development trends of almost all countries, peoples, and civilizations. At the same time, for example, A. S. Akhiezer and B. M. Kondorsky proceed from non-coinciding basic foundations. More and more experts believe that it is necessary to consider the actualization of the archaic, taking into account the uniqueness of their historical, cultural and civilizational development. Among the authors adhering to this research, philosophical paradigm, it should be noted V. G. Fedotov, A. A. Belomytseva, V. B. Zemskova, A. V. Rubanova, A. P. Sitnikova, M. S. Uvarova and others. A study is underway of the specifics of transformation and modernization of cultural heritage values, including archaics, in politics and economics, in the social sphere, and the influence of ethno-confessional and civilizational characteristics of various regions on these processes. Reflections and conclusions formulate a vision of the most promising ways of developing the phenomena under consideration.

Keywords: archaic, cultural heritage actualisation, politics, civilizational and national peculiarities

For citation: Egorov V.K. On the Actualisation of Archaics. *Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue*, 2024. 1(11): 86-101, [doi.org/10.53658/RW2024-4-1\(11\)-86-101](https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2024-4-1(11)-86-101)

Introduction

The problems of the archaic, as well as the essence and characteristics of what is called the archaization of modern societies, are actively discussed in the scientific community and are concentrated in the political discourse too. Among the pressing scientific and practical issues of “archaic” problems, there are those that require special attention. Firstly, appeals to various problems united by the concept of updating the archaic, as if “by inertia”, are often captive of the initial negative interpretation, secondly, many ideas that invite in-

depth research are essentially ignored, the main thing is that development is required, understanding of concepts based on a panoramic civilizational-country approach to what is included in this thematic field.

Materials and methods

The article discusses the ideas and concepts of philosophers, cultural scientists, sociologists, political scientists, historians, religious scholars, and economists devoted to the problems of the archaic, cultural and historical heritage, and various interpretations of the actualization of these phenomena. The theoretical and methodological basis of the work was the general scientific principles of studying the past and present of culture, social reality, a systematic approach, methods of comparative analysis, etc. It should be emphasized our commitment to the principles of historicism, historical and philosophical analysis, methods of hermeneutics, structuralism, logical and critical analysis.

Discussion

The need for cultural-national, civilizational, regional (historical-cultural-geographical) “dimensions” of historical development and modern problems arising from the past is well understood by specialists. There is no shortage of examples from the past illustrating certain judgments, since the dialogue between the past and the present fills the lives of individuals, social groups and communities, peoples and countries. However, the interpretation of phenomena associated with the actualization of the archaic is almost invariably politicized. As for the “models” of updating cultural-historical inheritance, experts justifiably conceptualize it as follows: “evolutionary, indicating the growth of diversity and differentiation of cultural patterns, or wave (discrete type of inheritance), when interest in certain objects of the past either increases or falls on a scale from complete oblivion to maximum interest” [19: 13] In reality, of course, there are various modifications of them.

It should also be emphasized that this subject field is closely intertwined with the consideration of such phenomena as archetypes, mentality, language, codes and cultural memory. There are many publications devoted to the study of these phenomena [1]. An invitation to a more in-depth study is contained, for example, in the reflections of M. Yu. Gurova and M. Yuan on the essence and manifestations of the phenomenon of cultural codes: “<...> a cultural code can be understood as a system of archetypes of the collective unconscious of a culture, and as a system of experiences meaningful in a culture, and as a system of stable artistic techniques and mnemonics” [7:156]. But the judgments of I. A. Nikolaychuk, T. S. Yakova and M. M. Yanglyayeva: there is the possibility of “building



hierarchical systems of cultural codes: global, regional, local, as well as the anisotropic nature of such systems.” Based on materials devoted to the study of regional, cultural and national characteristics of culture, they note: “The more regional societies have retained the features of traditionalism, the less <...> they are associated with Western civilization, the stronger the craving, personal interest in eternal feelings <... > enduring ethical metameanings” [16:51, 60]. There is a need to study and comprehend these complex and not existing phenomena in isolation.

It is generally accepted that in art history, archaic refers to the stage of development of ancient Greek art or, in general, to an early, ancient stage in the development of a particular phenomenon. But regarding the second reading, a far from idle question arises: what phenomena with their numerous modifications should be attributed to the early, ancient stages and how to qualify their modernized states and qualities? How to evaluate them if they have not been museumized, preserving almost their original properties in their current state (in various forms)? The original ones, which have come down to us from ancient times. In addition, we cannot continue to underestimate the fact that seemingly similar elements of the archaic flow into the system of traditions in different ways and are actualized in their own way in different cultures.

Until recently, the popular “archaization concept” could include the one proposed by A. S. Akhiezer: “Archaization is the result of a subject following cultural programs that historically developed in simpler conditions, in conditions of pre-state life, which do not correspond today to the increased complexity of the world <...> Archaization acts as a form of regression, where activity programs are associated with the pre-axial structure, with the dominance of the values of purely local worlds, where relationships are based on the emotions of people whose circle of contacts was very limited. Development was not their cultural value <...> Archaization is always an attempt to escape the complexity of mediation and return to the simplicity of the dominance of inversion. This phenomenon does not appear in its pure form, but is always chaotically mixed with the achievements of subsequent development and can have destructive consequences, the scale of which can grow as society becomes more complex. Archaization embraces thought, mass practical action <...> Archaization moves from the form of culture to the form of mass social behavior... It can take the form of archaization of the culture of individual elite groups, including the ruling elite <...> The clash of archaization and progress occurs primarily between cultural values, forms of lifestyle <...>, oriented either “to statics” or “to dynamics”, etc. The special importance of myth-making, the spread of prejudices, the formation of “hybrid forms of culture”, “artificial myths (ideologies)” are also noted “in politics, economics, public life, science” [4:90-91, 93-95, 97-99].

The “model”, built on the presence in history of almost everything that defines “reference points” (“pre-state life”, “pre-axial culture”) is attractive and logical in its own way. It is presented by the author mainly “based on” his reading of Russian history. When applying the “matrix”, based on the interpretation of the phenomenon of “pre-state life”, to the historical development of other countries and regions, problems arise related to its conceptual incompatibility with various “pre-state” histories, features of acquiring

statehood, etc. It is axiomatic that there is great cultural and civilizational diversity in the formation, development, transformation of the very phenomenon of statehood in the East and West, in the North and South, in the colonial metropolises and among colonized peoples. And the noted enlarged historical-geographical and cultural-civilizational areas are not uniform within themselves.

Such a “reference point” as pre-Axial history and culture looks more reasonable. Introducing this concept, “K. Jaspers called the era of VII-II BC the axial time of world history (in the territory from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic), assessing it as a watershed between the inertia of pre-Axial traditionalism and the awareness of the possibility of independent value choice with simultaneous responsibility for it <...>. A new social phenomenon has become the denial of the extremely strict requirements of a tribal, ethnic or sacred community and an appeal to a person to overcome the inertia of the established practice of life, to make a value choice himself <...>” Noting these well-known provisions, A. V. Rubanov rightfully draws attention to the fact that the origins of new value orientations should be sought in Zoroastrianism, in ancient Indian philosophy, in Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, in Greek philosophy and then in Christianity and Islam. “The new life guidelines formulated then became the basic value coordinates of human life throughout historical time and remain so for modern society” [18]. It should be noted that the imposition of “matrices” based on all sorts of “milestone turns” on the history of individual countries almost always requires clarifications and reservations. It is more fruitful to prefer thinking about the unique vectors of country, regional, and civilizational development to abstract schemes. And there are many vectors of movement towards the “highway” of the development of human civilization. And what is a “highway”?

The cultural-historical and at the same time “geographical” “angle of view” when addressing problems called archaization is present, but not focused. M. S. Uvarov was right, when analyzing domestic and foreign research on cultural geography, he wrote: “The problems of the relationship between culture and space, their interaction turn out to be extremely relevant both in the field of scientific research in various humanities disciplines (cultural studies, political science, history, philology, psychology, etc.) and in the sphere of direct practical human activity – be it the protection of cultural and natural heritage, foreign and domestic policy of the state, international relations, socio-economic development of various regions and countries” [22]. V. N. Streletsky and A. S. Gorokhov, focusing on the issue of “the relationship between ethnic and regional identity in multi-ethnic regions,” note that “Confessional geography is a new direction of cultural geography for Russia, which has acquired great relevance in the post-Soviet period in the conditions of the revival of religious life in a country characterized by exceptional complexity and mosaic of the religious composition of the population” [21]. Taking into account the spatial, ethno-national, confessional uniqueness of Russia, many observations and conclusions based on domestic soil acquire broader significance, especially in dialogue with the processes occurring and growing in the modern diverse world.

V. G. Fedotova whose judgment was underestimated drew some decades ago attention to many of the problems. She formulated: “...the archaic exists in societies of

any type – both traditional and modern, as a remnant, a rudiment of past experience, a feature of the established archetype <...>” Moreover, “with all the reactionism <...> archaic principles are people’s response to not projects and programs that reach them <...> At the same time, revolutionaries and unsuccessful reformers do not take responsibility for archaization, completely attributing it to the negative qualities of the people <...> But the desecularization currently occurring throughout the world has many common reasons. Among them is globalization, which created a global market, but did not eliminate local cultures and religions and their significance for peoples. Modernizations ceased to be catching up with the West; they began to use all acceptable positive examples found both in the West and in the East. They took on a national character, taking into account local cultures. Modernizations occur in the coordinates set by the social, cultural, human and symbolic capital of the countries implementing them <...> Thus, managing archaization is managing modernization and returning the past in forms that do not destroy the present” [23:26-30, 36]. This is an essential vision of archaization options, an invitation to a discussion that is not overloaded with political and ideological stereotypes.

I would also like to draw attention to the informative article by A. A. Belomytsev. Summarizing the ideas of V. D. Laz, Ch. K. Lamajaa, V. I. Przhilensky and I. B. Przhilenskaya, he interprets archaization in a comprehensive manner: it is a reworked anti-mediation, a conflict reaction to the corresponding modernization; “an expression of desire to return to old ideas that have proven their effectiveness”; “a fairly wide range of actions in politics, management, economics, culture, which, as a rule, is interpreted as a “return to the principles of the functioning of traditional societies,” but one should “distinguish between the concepts of archaization and traditionalism,” since they “are distinguished by their appeal to different layers of traditions – the archaic and any (including archaic) respectively”; “archaization is not exclusively reactive in nature and manifests itself not only in societies with a “catch-up” economy, but also in developed countries; one should not simplify the “opposition “modernity – demodernization”, since archaization “never appears in its pure form, accompanying innovation processes to a greater or lesser extent”; “The processes of archaization should not be viewed solely in a negative way. Archaization mechanisms presuppose protection from entropic processes <...> ensure stabilization of social life on a consensus, albeit relatively more primitive basis”; “it is the preservation of the social archetype, expressed in traditional spirituality, that protects society from the destructive manifestations of archaization, while at the same time promoting successful modernization and economic prosperity of society (a striking example of this is the modernization breakthrough of the so-called “Asian tigers”); archaization is “a process that is historically inevitable, but at the same time manageable”; finally, the same modern extremism has a “double source” and should be considered “as a response to both modernization and the archaization of society” [6:68-73].

The underestimated judgments of V. B. Zemskov are also promising, also long ago she proposed to the scientific community: “Culture, mentality, consciousness at every moment of its historical existence keep all layers of the original and later created “ready” for action: archaic, traditional, modern <...> The middle member of the triad – the traditional – is

once modern, which emerged from the archaic in interaction with innovation and became normative, “holding” the system” [11:224,223]. The recent publication of A.P. Sitnikov is in line with similar approaches. His vision is based on the ideas of V. G. Fedotova, “considering archaization as something rooted in the culture and psyche of the people and coming to life during the period of radical reforms and social upheavals” and V. M. Khachatryan that “in a number of cases <...> archaization can be considered as a necessity caused by reality itself, and in this aspect it appears as a social mechanism of survival, self-preservation of society” [20:95]. In his “methodological construct,” archaization is interpreted as “one of the modes of development of a sociocultural system in the era of transformation.” The source of such processes as “archaization, traditionalization and modernization <...> is tradition, the transformation of which gives rise to these processes, considered as modes of tradition – the substance of a sociocultural system that ensures the reproduction and preservation of the culture of society. Depending on the degree of destruction of traditional foundations and the basis of society’s life and the adequacy of the innovations being introduced, their organicity to the socio-cultural roots of society, archaic, traditionalist or modernist processes dominate in it. In turn, archaization can take two main forms (modes) – rearchaization and neo-archaization. These modes arise as a result of the intersection of traditionalization and modernization processes in society <...> Everything depends on the specific socio-cultural situation and the social practices of archaization implemented in the space of socio-cultural transformation, which can be either spontaneous, irrational, unconscious, or rational, conscious in nature” [20:103]. He also introduces such a concept as neo-traditionalization. There is food for thought here, especially when projecting such approaches onto real soils, including the Russian one.

In parallel with the noted conceptual proposals, the search for “reference points”, turning points in history, including those that stimulate the revision of assessments of the past, does not stop. B. M. Condorsky wrote: “Each stage of historical development is based on a certain type of revolution: neolithic, archaic, feudal, revolutions of the New Age. Each stage was characterized by a certain type of social (in the broad sense of the word) space and consciousness <...> One of the main tasks of the revolutions was the elimination of the carriers of the “old consciousness” <...> At the same time, continuity with the previous period in a certain sense prevented further development and the level of such continuity played a significant role in holding back progress” [14:85-86]. Earlier, he wrote that the essence of his concept “lies in the fact that all revolutions in a single state constitute a revolutionary period as a system that has its own internal laws.” Such judgments, of course, have potential for further research, but one can hardly agree with such statements: the appeal to “traditional culture” in China, for example, is of a decorative nature, and in all “post-Soviet states the patterns of archaic social institutions in the 1990s had a more significant influence on processes in the economic, political and cultural spheres” [13:113, 114].

Features of the manifestation of archaization and traditionalization are also analyzed in relation to various public spheres, social institutions, and political structures [9]. Some authors rightfully focus on the fact that the processes of archaization and traditionalization are significantly influenced by the phenomenon of interaction between the unconscious

and the conscious, and any actualized phenomena have a dual nature. Apparently, there is reason to assert that, on the one hand, the unconscious enters into their essence, and on the other, the unconscious exists in them as consciously exploited qualities, as something that is influenced, controlled, and this control itself is constantly modified. As the English sociologist Z. Bauman noted, new societies are “fluid modernity”, in which there is a departure from the past and a seeming loss of identity, the acquisition of a new identity according to new “patterns”. “Submission to standards is now achieved through seduction and temptation, rather than coercion” [5:94]. At the same time, a clarification suggests itself here: we need to talk only about special types of coercion through conscious appeal to the unconscious.

All noted is related to digitalization and the problems of virtualization and interaction between the virtual and the real caused by it. However, which is not very explicable, in most cases the connection of these pressing problems remains outside the scope of discussions about the existence of archaism in the modern world, about options for archaization or traditionalization. It is known that the invasion of digitalization into everyday life occurs in various areas of personal and public life through the capabilities and characteristics of numerous actors, components of the information sphere, culture and art, etc. In this case, I will highlight among the publications the article by S. Zheng, in which reflecting on such a new form of media art as immersion, the author notes that it “bridges the gap between time and space, between the work and the viewer, between reality and virtuality” and we have before us the presence of four realities created by this type of art. We are talking about virtual reality, which refers to “computer creation and modeling of a virtual environment”, about additional reality, which differs from “virtual reality in that it must depend on the real environment”, about mixed reality, which “contains both virtual and additional reality and can be understood as a new virtualization environment that arises as a result of the merging of the virtual and real worlds” and about extended reality, which means what is created by “a combination of the above technologies” [24:378-379].

It seems that we have reached the stage of concentrated and substantive understanding of the specifics of the existence of archaic principles, traditional values in previously “non-traditional” environments. S. Zheng, he starts from the actualization of shamanic culture by modern technical means, but a wide range of phenomena of cultural and historical heritage is organically present in his thoughts: “In the process of creating works of immersion art, artists have their own understanding of shamanic culture and cannot reproduce shamanic rituals, therefore the problem arises of the inability to interpret the cultural implications and show the depth of the rich traditional shamanic culture <...> From the point of view of the spread of shamanic culture, this can lead to an incorrect interpretation of its basic elements <...> Primitive religious rituals retain some fragmentary “archetypes” and are a model for understanding the origin of things and initialization of spiritual emotions” [24:377, 382]. Are such model interpretations adequate to the original meanings, values, what is the nature of these modifications and their diverse impact on the consciousness and behavior of people in the present?

The impact of new technologies on various spheres of human life and activity, society is a huge scientific and practical field. And the issues of humanitarian and legal

response of societies, civilization to the opportunities, challenges and risks of digitalization are becoming increasingly important. I will touch upon only one aspect. Turning to the issues of the peculiarities of legal regulation of generative artificial intelligence in various countries, Li Yao, also relying on the opinion of Chinese experts, notes: “The generative AI service has a strong autonomous quality, and even if the processed data is obtained from reliable and accurate sources, the generation of false information as a result of algorithmic integration of data based on the generative AI service cannot be ruled out. Another risk is that the basic structure of generative AI data is now dominated by English-language data, and the output content inevitably has a different concept of the history and culture of non-English-speaking countries, such as China and Russia, and sometimes generates false information. In this case, the population may subconsciously change its long-term understanding of traditional culture and national characteristics after long-term exposure to false information containing value biases. If generative AI is used in cognitive warfare at the national level, it will pose a threat of undermining national sovereignty... How to combine the rule of law and innovation and promote healthy development and standardized application of generative AI is an important question facing the legislator” [15:249, 264].

Among the actively discussed problems of managing archaization and traditionalization, the problem of political dominants apparently claims primacy. There is still clarity not only with the goals, but also with the mechanisms for managing these processes and their exploitation by numerous political entities. It is more difficult with economics, since the conviction has become firmly established that we know both the general patterns of progressive economic development and the ways, forms, and methods of their development by various countries. It often even seems that economics is the most universal direction of general civilizational development, less dependent than others on “extraneous” influences, i.e., non-economic influences.

In the article by A. A. Auzan “The “Rut Effect”, the problem of dependence on the trajectory of previous development”, the famous domestic economist, based on a comparative analysis of the trajectories and development results of various countries, noted that in economic management the phenomenon of “culture relay” is of considerable importance: “Institutions, like standards, determine the choice of trajectory, and culture makes it a “stable track” and this is “a hypothesis that has some basis,” etc. [2:8, 11]. In a course of lectures published later, A. A. Auzan, analyzing how certain hypotheses and forecasts “work” in various cultural and civilizational environments, formulated it differently. The problems of sociocultural economics, in his opinion, “can be presented using five theses”: “There are economic phenomena that cannot be explained by factors other than cultural”; “From the point of view of the theory of informal institutions, cultures are values and behavioral attitudes shared by a certain community and slowly changing over time”; “Culture influences economic development, but does not determine it. The impact of culture is stable over time, but is associated with other factors.” In the whole world, in the course of historical development, “no convergence that was predicted by theoretical models occurs – divergence occurs” [3:8, 128]. And in such conclusions there are meaningful intentions for the transformation of some approaches to the issues under consideration.

Separately, the following should be highlighted: a realistic assessment of a person, various social communities, their behavior and stereotypes, national psychology, culture, traditions can only be done by remembering that the surrounding reality in all the originality of its formation, characteristic features and their shades, etc., is known and comprehended not only by scientific methods, but also by artistic ones. V. I. Vernadsky generally argued that “the separation of the scientific worldview and science from <...> human activity in the field of religion, philosophy, social life or art is impossible...” [8]. Based on this understanding, it should be said that further study of the issues discussed in the article will be more productive if their development is accompanied by reaching new horizons. Otherwise, the “stamps” cannot be overcome. M. S. Kagan rightly asserted: “The spiritual content of human existence is not amenable, in all its real completeness and integrity, to scientific and theoretical knowledge...” Art has the potential to cognition of spiritual principles in their “real concreteness, inaccessible in this existential quality of analytical thought, not only scientific physiology, but also psychological science, not only the methods of sociology, but also ethics” [12:10]. It’s all about the ability to handle the legacy of the past. As J. Huizinga beautifully formulated, history is “the spiritual form in which a culture is aware of its past.”

I will also highlight such an important aspect as studying the content of cultural policies. This is a large independent topic; I will only touch on the issue of some features of the cultural policies of different countries. Thus, in a substantive review of the Laboratory for Cultural Studies of the National Research University Higher School of Economics, it is noted that “in the field of cultural policy, more than in any other sphere of public life, there is a problem of incommensurability of national policies, due to different historically established and institutionally fixed <...> interpretation of the concept of “culture”, semantic goal-setting of cultural policy as such.” The conclusion is indicative: “Cultural policy goes beyond the usual boundaries of the field associated with traditionally understood art and creativity; programs are increasingly being formed that connect it with other spheres of social life: economics, education, politics (preserving cultural identity, ensuring equal rights of various social and cultural groups, etc.), environmental management and preservation of various types of socio-cultural communities” [10]. The dependence of cultural policy on “official philosophy”, the “roll call” of political practice, information content, etc., is beyond doubt. And options for updating the archaic, especially its elements transformed into traditions, are present in both internal and external politics and concentrated in information policy. In politics, as we know, almost everything is determined by the ideas, interests, and values that dominate in the ruling structures – in government agencies, in business, in civil society institutions, which are purposefully formed and dominant in the mass public consciousness.

Finally, one cannot help but dwell on the problems of originality, distinctive features of civilizations and their relationships. The ongoing discussions in the West around S. Huntington’s ideas about the clash or cooperation of civilizations seem indicative. It is noteworthy in them that “most Western specialists <...> do not pay special attention to his (Huntington – V. E.) author’s definition of “civilization” and do not recognize the active role of civilization in relation to the state, shifting the focus of their research to the clash of

political, economic and social interests of countries, their populations and political leaders.” This is from an extraordinary article by young researcher K. V. Rakova, which also cites the following opinion of the British scientist and former Egyptian journalist E. Aish: “The sense of national identity among the US population is not supported by centuries of history or ethnicity <...> The identity of US citizens, their collective “we” is based on political values <...> and also on ideology<...> Hence the need for an external enemy in the person of a state, region or ideology arises...” [17:24, 28-29]. And it becomes clearer why in these discussions there is no due respect for the position of their “initiator,” i.e. Huntington: “People of different civilizations look differently at the relationship between God and man, the individual and the group, the citizen and the state, parents and children, husband and wife, and have different ideas about the relative importance of rights and responsibilities, freedom and coercion, equality and hierarchy. These differences have evolved over centuries. They will not disappear in the foreseeable future” [17:22]. But it is no secret that adherence to or rejection of the values listed by Huntington most often underlies the division of countries, peoples and cultures, civilizations into modern and archaic or archaizing.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it must be emphasized once again that professing traditionalism does not mean engaging in archaization. Almost everything that stands behind traditionalism for political and ideological purposes is called archaization. Archaization is only a component of the actualization of intangible cultural heritage as a type of modernization change that is immanently present in the cultural and historical process. Elements of the archaic order exist in different ways and manifest themselves in the present in different national cultures. Traditional principles, including stable, persisting archaic principles, manifest themselves in different ways in various spheres of social life and activity. This series includes not only phenomena, without which a productive dialogue of heritage and cultural and historical experience is unthinkable, but also ideologies, “value” preferences, the actions of various quasi-cultural and quasi-religious associations, satanic organizations, and new formations grouped around “issues” of gender relations or “groups” influences” parasitizing on them, like them, etc. It should be noted that many active subjects of current socio-political activity use ideas, perceptions, tools of influence borrowed from the archaic, with the support (direct or indirect) of the institutions of modern democracy. Therefore, of particular interest is the study of the entire “archaization package” through the prism of traditional and new phenomena in the culture of national, ethnic, secular and religious, folk, mass and elite, rural and urban, in socio-demographic, professional subcultures, etc. And the coordinating role in connecting various branches of humanities to this work should apparently belong to regional studies and regional studies.

References

1. Avanesova G.A., Kuptsova I.A. Codes of culture: essence and purpose. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kody-kultury-suschnost-i-naznachenie> [In Russian].
2. Auzan A.A. "The track effect", the problem of dependence on the trajectory of previous development – the evolution of hypotheses. Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 6. Economics. 2015; 1 [In Russian].
3. Auzan A.A., Nikishina E.N. Socio-cultural economics: how culture affects the economy and the economy affects culture. Moscow: Economy. M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2021 [In Russian].
4. Akhiezer A.S. Archaization as a category of social sciences (based on the experience of Russia). Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology. 2001; IV (1) [In Russian].
5. Bauman Z. Fluid modernity. Available from: <https://coollib.com/b/427264-igmunt-bauman-tekuchaya-sovremtnnost/ready?sclid=lgw69wl5o2842700521> [In Russian].
6. Belomycev A.A. Understanding the phenomenon of social destructiveness from the perspective of the theory of archaization in the domestic socio-philosophical discourse. Philosophskaya mys'l. 2021; 4 [In Russian].
7. Gurova M.Yu., Yuan M. The concept of "cultural code": levels of meaning. Intellect. Innovatsii. Investitsii, 2022; 4 [in Russian].
8. Drobzhev M.I. V.I. Vernadsky on science, philosophy and scientific worldview. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/v-i-vernadskiy-o-nauke-filosofii-i-nauchnom-mirovozzrenii.pdf> [In Russian].
9. Erokhov I.A. Postglobalization and political archaization in Russia. Mirovaja politika, 2020; 2 [In Russian].
10. Foreign experience in the implementation of cultural policy. Available from: https://meia/75/ru/documents/14010/06_0_zarubejnyy_opyt_realizacii_kulturnoy_politiki?21pdf [In Russian].
11. Zemskov V.B. Imbalance in the archaic – traditional – modern interaction system as a factor of cultural dynamics. Culture in the era of civilizational breakdown: Materials of the International Scientific Conference. Moscow: Scientific Council on the History of World Culture at the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2001 [In Russian].
12. Kagan M.S. That is the Man... Life, death and immortality in the "magic mirror" of fine art. St.Petersburg: Logos, 2003 [In Russian].
13. Kondorsky B.M. Relapses of archaic social institutions within the political regimes of post-Soviet states. Istorija i sovremennost', 2019; 3 [In Russian].
14. Kondorsky B.M. Some aspects of the theory of social systems. Istorija i sovremennost'. 2021; 4 [In Russian].
15. Li Yao. Regulation of artificial intelligence in the UK, USA, European Union and China. Pravo. Journal of the Higher School of Economics. 2023; 3 [In Russian].
16. Nikolaichuk I.A., Yakova T.S., Yanglyaeva M.M. Cultural codes in modern public space: meta-meanings and their consumption in Russia and abroad. Bulletin of the Moscow State Pedagogical University. Series "Philosophical Sciences". 2023; 1 (45) [In Russian].
17. Rakova K.V. Clash or cooperation of civilizations? Current assessments by Western experts of S.Huntington's concept. Problemy tsivilizatsionnogo rasvitija. Electronic Journal of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 2021; 3 (2) [In Russian].
18. Rubanov A.V. The values of axial time. Available from: <https://elib.bsu.by/bitstream/123456789/1/4-8/pdf?ysclid=II7r1xhivf935322137> [In Russian].
19. Selezneva E.N. Theoretical and methodological problems of actualization of cultural heritage. Kulturologicheskij Journal. 2013; 2 (12). An electronic periodical peer-reviewed scientific publication. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/teoretico-metodologicheskie-problemy-actualizatsii-kulturnogo-naslediya?sclid=Iryopz9ofm12552514> [In Russian].
20. Sitnikov A.P. The archaization of Russian society in the focus of research practices and methodological parameters of research. Humanitarij Yuga Russii. 2020; 9 (1) [In Russian].
21. Streletskiy V.N., Gorokhov S.A. Specifics and trends of cultural geography development in Russia at the beginning of the XXI century. Available from: <https://sciencejournals.ru/view-article/?j=izvgeo@y=2022@n==3@a=jzvGeo220301> [In Russian].
22. Uvarov M.S. Cultural geography in a cultural perspective. Available from: <https://ceberleninka.ru/article/n/kulturnaya-geografiya-v-kulturologicheskoy-perspektive> [In Russian].
23. Fedotova V.G. Archaization in the modern world. Philosophical sciences. 2012; 5 (in Russian)
24. Zheng S. The role of immersive arts in the interpretation of traditional cultural phenomena. Observatorija Culture. 2023; 20 (4) [In Russian].

About the author

Vladimir K. EGOROV. DSc (Philos.), Professor, Head of the UNESCO Department, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Moscow, Russia. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1070-6213> Address: 84, Vernadskogo Avenue, Moscow, 119571, Russian Federation. vk_egorov@mail.ru

Contribution of the author

The author declares no conflicts of interests.

Article info

Received: November 23, 2023. Approved after peer review: December 25, 2023.

Accepted for publication: January 14, 2024. Published: March 20, 2024.

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

Peer review info

«Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue» thanks the anonymous reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.