



Youth policy in the age of globalization

Akbar SAFAROV¹

Samarkand State Architectural and Civil Engineering Institute

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received August 2022
Received in revised form
10 September 2022
Accepted 25 October 2022
Available online
15 November 2022

Keywords:

globalization,
politics,
assimilation,
youth,
society,
development.

ABSTRACT

This article discusses modern theoretical aspects of the concept of globalization and considers the issue of using it as one of the factors in formation of state youth policy in terms of cultural assimilation.

2181-1415/© 2022 in Science LLC.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-1415-vol3-iss5-pp174-179>

This is an open-access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Globallashuv asrida yoshlar siyosati

Kalit so'zlar:

globallashuv,
siyosat,
assimilyatsiya,
yoshlar,
jamiyat,
rivojlanish.

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada globallashuv tushunchasining zamonaviy nazariy jihatlarini tadqiq qilinib, madaniy assimilyatsiya nuqtai nazaridan yoshlarga oid davlat siyosatini shakllantirish omillaridan biri sifatida undan foydalanish masalasi ko'rib chiqiladi.

Молодежная политика в эпоху глобализации

Ключевые слова:

глобализация,
политика,
ассимиляция,
молодежь,
общество,
развитие.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье рассматриваются современные теоретические аспекты концепции глобализации и вопрос использования ее как одного из факторов формирования государственной молодежной политики с точки зрения культурной ассимиляции.

¹ Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Samarkand State Architectural and Civil Engineering Institute, Uzbekistan.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization as a multifaceted theoretical construct has controversial moments already in the fact of its existence. The idea itself is not new at all – even Diogenes used the term cosmopolis – that is, societies of the whole world. In sociological science, theory of globalization began its development already in the 19th century in the works of one of “founding fathers” of sociology, K. Marx, who understood this term as the process of integration and unification of economic relations between different countries. However, the subsequent development of the concepts of globalizations has passed through certain critical points.

First of all, there was doubt about the existence of globalization as an empirical phenomenon. The question is simple: isn't globalization another term designed to satisfy the scientific desire for rationalization, rather than describing an objective phenomenon of social reality? Shifting this issue to empirical track, the following problem arises: what percentage of real events is described by the category of globalization? Its solution requires an answer to the question – how to define the boundary between authentic phenomena and the influence of global culture? In addition, globalization as a meta-discourse [1. P. 541] is related to fundamental question of the legitimacy of postmodern social theory [2. PP. 541–542] – is it possible to describe a modern society, subject to ideals of postmodernity, through such comprehensive concepts that belong to logic of modernity?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Like the philosophical dilemma of nominalism and realism, the answers depend rather on subjective worldview of the researcher, since science at present stage of development cannot offer a sufficiently reliable methodology for processing the volumes of empirical phenomena described by this term. W. Beck, E. Giddens, J. Ritzer, J. Urry and many other major authors of modern sociology devoted their works to studying globalization. Despite this, the questions of definition of term of globalization, the definition of theoretical boundaries of its applicability are still topical in scientific discussion; problems of identification and measurement of this phenomenon in empirical field, as well as its existence in principle. It is explained by macroscopic scale, the variety of forms of empirical manifestation, the multidimensionality of the essence of this phenomenon, affecting all social and cultural structures of society [3. P 32]. In our work, we adhere to the point of view of E. Giddens that now this discussion is rather of historical interest [4. P. 56], this process objectively exists and it is specific to modern society.

The scientific diversity of points of view, trail of near-scientific populist slogans, globality and empirical “elusiveness” have turned the idea of globalization from an objective scientific theory into subjective worldview of researchers, politicians, and ordinary people. W. Beck believes that key feature of such view of the world is departure from logic of container scheme of social structure [5. PP. 47–48], which sees society as subordinate to macrostructure of nation-state. In this picture, the differentiation of societies is carried out along the borders of national states (for example, “German” or “French” society), and social relations are subject to disciplinary influence of state power. The state, by its power, unifies heterogeneous chaos of local processes, representing for society a kind of container that forms, among other things, territorial unity [6. P. 49].

Globalization as a worldview opposes such a container logic of perception of society, blurring territorial boundaries of states in cultural and social terms. In fact, the state is transformed from superstructure that defines the boundaries of society into just one of substructures that performs administrative functions in certain territory.

Globalization separates national meanings from territorial-state context. A clearer understanding of this phenomenon requires some clarification of concepts often associated with globalization in social and political and scientific discourses.

METHODOLOGY & EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

W. Beck points out that globalization should not be confused with globalism – ideology of the development of single economic system of mankind [7. P. 202]. Globalism is a unipolar activity strategy that establishes a model of behaviour of specific economic entities, while globalization describes the impact of global social and economic and political process on its objects [8. P. 39]. Globalism, on the other hand, reduces political and social reality to economic relations, being the basis of various neoliberal trends in economy [9. P. 23].

The key prerequisite for emergence of globalization is emerging property of globality of social relations. This means that the area of interest of the largest communities (states, transnational corporations, virtual communities), as well as the depth of social relations, covers the entire planet. Moreover, global nature of relations does not mean the existence of common economic or political centre (the so-called “world government”). On the contrary, transnational and national-state actors operate in competitive environment, the world is becoming polycentric and increasingly multidimensional. The global market was formed without creation of global state, which, according to J. Urry, led to emergence of era of globally disorganized capitalism [10. P. 5], in which we now live.

Globalization, unlike globality (state) and globalism (ideology), is a process (to be more precise, a set of processes) in which local actors interact with transnational ones in social, political and economic dimensions. W. Beck proposes to measure globalization through three main indicators: expansion in space; stability over time; density of transnational communication networks [11. P. 28]. The current state differs from previous eras in that the levels of all these parameters are orders of magnitude higher than in the past.

J. Urry considers globalization in a slightly different, more “cultural” perspective. In his opinion, this process proceeds in five main directions:

- globalization of strategies of transnational corporations that go beyond the boundaries of one state;
- globalization of images, clearly demonstrated in commercials;
- globalization of ideologies;
- globalization of political mobilization, manifested in postulation of a number of problems as global ones;
- globalization of stream channels [12. PP. 200–201].

The “channel” is understood as a technological canvas (transport network, global information system, etc.) that arises between two subjects, along which material and intangible objects move, forming a flow. Going beyond state formations, the flows lead to reorganization of capitalist communities. The administrative and bureaucratic foundations of social order are giving way to information and communication ones, creating the globally disorganized capitalism we have already mentioned above, blurring traditional boundaries of local and global [13. P. 201].

In his works, J. Urry develops the idea of “gardener state”, which is practically synonymous with the concept of “container state” presented by W. Beck. In this metaphor, the state, through the three branches of government, regulates society like a

garden, and inclusion of an individual in particular society is determined by citizenship. Sociology is subordinate to the state in the sense that its task is to develop the most optimal ways of doing “gardening” [14. P. 202]. Urry, like Beck, notes that globalization dismantles this logic by moving society beyond the nation-state.

RESULTS

As we can see, Urry’s theory links the material and economic dimensions of globalization with cultural phenomena. Streams within technological channels carry not only material things, but also non-material symbols and information, producing, first of all, cultural interaction. Next, we will focus on cultural aspect of globalization as an objective process of interpenetration of global and local cultures. Here it is necessary to make some clarifications about the content of concept of “global culture”.

The culture of Western society, in particular American culture, is often considered as a global culture [15. P. 499]. This thesis is relative, since global culture is a construct individually formed here-and-now in every society and, more narrowly, in social group. For example, most of the youth of the city of Saratov had no contact with the bearers of American culture, if only because of language barrier. Despite this, in this social group there is a construct of global culture created through various media.

Thus, the process of globalization among Saratov youth proceeds on the basis of unique construct of global culture formed at local level. In addition, youth culture is structured by different cultural styles, each of which is aimed at different reference group. In other words, in the process of constructing their identity, a young person chooses only individual elements of global and local cultures. This process of mixing global and local cultures, forming a unique cultural mix, is commonly called glocalization. Naturally, there are legitimate questions about whether it is possible to somehow regulate this process. This issue for human history is far from new.

After the 1930s, social and political discourse of globalization took on negative tone. First of all, this is due to changes in economic sphere – during this period, major participants in the world economy begin to introduce actively elements of protectionism into their trade policies. The denial of external influences becomes part of state strategic response to globalization in all spheres of society.

In cultural dimension of globalization, protectionism is built into very essence of culture. A conservative response to imported cultural elements, backed up by institutionalized information blockade, has been and still is the basis of various authoritarian regimes. However, modern information technologies, the values of individual freedom and other integral elements of developed society, level out possibilities of strict institutional control.

Therefore, development of modern social, and, in particular, youth policy of state requires the use of more developed model of globalization regulation, rather than simple denial. In our work, as such a model, we use the theory of hybridization proposed by American researcher of post-Soviet space, Douglas Bloom.

Cultural hybridization of global and local D. Bloom outlined the main provisions of his concept in the work “National Identity and globalization” [16]. Based on large-scale empirical study in three major cities of the CIS: Astrakhan, Alma-Ata and Baku, he substantiates the theory about the structure of the process of cultural globalization in youth environment. He calls his theoretical model hybridization. Here, globalization is presented as a process of transferring knowledge and cultural practices that implement it between global and local cultures. This process is two-way, that is, as elements of global

culture are introduced into local one, and, conversely, local practices become part of global culture construct. An example is practice of wearing dreadlocks (a hairstyle consisting of braids intertwined in special way), which came into global culture from local culture of African peoples.

REFERENCES:

1. Ритцер Дж. Современные социологические теории. – СПб: «Питер», 2002. – С. 688.
2. Rizaev I.I. The structure of the social system as the basis for the self-organization of society // Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. – 2019. – Т. 1. – №. 7. – С. 151–156.
3. Байдаров Е.У. Глобализация в культурно-цивилизационных процессах современности // Материалы международной научно-практической конференции «Глобализация как этап развития мирового сообщества». – Пенза, Сургут, Баку: «Социосфера», 2011. – С. 154.
4. Покровский Н. В зеркале глобализации // Сумерки глобализации: настольная книга антиглобалиста. – М.: АСТ, Ермак, 2004. – С. 352.
5. Бек У. Что такое глобализация? – М.: Прогресс, Традиция, 2001. – 304 с.
6. Аликулов С.А., Ризаев И.И. Синергетический анализ онтологической сущности процесса либерализации общества // Социальные институты в правовом измерении: теория и практика. – 2022. – С. 280–286.
7. Ризаев И.И. и др. Коэволюционное развитие самоорганизации: взаимосвязь стабильности и нестабильности в социальной системе // Человек. Знак. Техника: II междунар. междисциплинар. молодеж. форум: [сб. ст.]. – Текст: электронный. – Текст: электронный. – 2022.
8. Сафаров А.И., Хаккулов Н.К. Свойственные качества совершенному человеку в суфизме // Современная наука как социально-политический фактор развития государства. – 2019. – С. 48–50.
9. Момджян К. Об одном многократно упоминаемом процессе // Сумерки глобализации: настольная книга антиглобалиста. – М.: АСТ, Ермак, 2004. – С. 352.
10. Lash S., Urry J. The end of the organized capitalism. – Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1987. – P. 357.
11. Усмонов Ф.Н., Усмонова Л.Р. Рациональный анализ восточной миниатюры // Молодой ученый. – 2016. – №. 2. – С. 987–991.
12. Тысячнюк М.С. Мобильная социология Джона Урри // Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии. – 2004. – № 4. – Т. 7. – С. 200–208.
13. Alikulov S.A., Rizaev I.I. Methodological problems of research of social systems // Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – № 2. – С. 717–720.
14. Тураев Б.О. Фанда толерантлик ва интолерантлик // Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2022. – Т. 2. – №. Special Issue 23. – С. 41–48.
15. Тураев Б.О. Информационное свойство пространства и времени // Естествознание и время. – 1992.
16. Blum D.W. National identity and globalization: youth, state and society in post-Soviet Eurasia. – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. – P. 240.
17. Ризаев И.И., Муминова З.О. Профессиональная подготовка личности: оздоровление и духовное воспитание // Система менеджмента качества в вузе: здоровье, образованность, конкурентоспособность. – 2021. – С. 264–268.

18. Haqqulov N.Q. International tolerance in the educational views of Siddiki-Ajzi // Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. – 2020. – Т. 2. – №. 10. – С. 262–268.
19. Alikulov X., Haqqulov N.Q. Духовная зрелость и философское мышление зависимость развития // Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – №. 4. – С. 164–167.
20. Husan M. Dialectics of Potentiality and Virtuality in Space and TIME // European Scholar Journal. – 2022. – Т. 3. – №. 1. – С. 40–42.
21. Сафаров А.И., Ризаев И.И. Факторы развитие экотуризма в Узбекистане // Глобальные проблемы модернизации национальной экономики. – 2022. – С. 629–633.
22. Саматов Х., Исомиддинов Й. Система социальной защиты «химсистема социальной защиты «химойят» как в система общения с людьми по идея Ходжа Ахрара Валиойят» как в система общения с людьми по идеи Ходжа Ахрара Валиойят и // InterConf. – 2020.
23. Mardonov R. Humanization and humanitarization of higher education in the conditions of the information society // Conferencea. – 2021. – С. 21–28.
24. Yuldasheva Y.D. The role of scientific knowledge in the formation of moral and ethical values.