

UDC 008:001.8

DOI: 10.34670/AR.2020.35.77.020

Culture of communication and intercultural communications**Namig A. Abbasov**

PhD in Culturology, Associate Professor,
Deputy Director for general matters, ANAS Institute of Architecture and Art,
AZ1001, 30, Istiglaliyat str., Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan;
e-mail: namiq_abbasov_70@mail.ru

Abstract

Spiritual and cultural communication is a necessary way of realizing spiritual life. People enrich each other in the process of communication. The ability to participate in communicative processes does not depend only on the emotional richness and intellectual level of people's individual spiritual life. The effectiveness and practical character of this participation often determines the spiritual climate of society. Some people see the richness of cultural life in the diversity of spiritual communication.

People are involved more in the management of production, society and government as society develops. Their socio-political activity is gradually growing. Not only knowledge and advanced ideas, but also human feelings such as friendship, responsibility, respect, wishing good feelings to people, etc. are passed down from generation to generation in the process of spiritual and cultural communication. These peculiarities concern peoples, almost all nations regardless of ethnicity. These concern also important development paths besides general ideas, common interests and responsibilities. Spiritual contacts between people take place in different figurative forms and in the most various directions within different societies. Humanity is the heart of its expansion and deepening. One of the most important roles in the above-mentioned socio-cultural context is the educational function of communication. The formation of a normal human type and the upbringing of people who are morally, spiritually and aesthetically rich, have been a desirable task in all times and in all societies. The active affirmation of new global consciousness and universal moral principles and norms is one of their complex problems. At the same time, conditions are created for the realization of these principles in the process of spiritual and cultural communication.

For citation

Abbasov N.A. (2021) Culture of communication and intercultural communications. *Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiya* [Culture and Civilization], 11 (1A), pp. 166-173. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2020.35.77.020

Keywords

Relation, information, communication, socialization, cultural cooperation, harmony.

Introduction

The study of communicative processes as a socio-cultural phenomenon in modern times began in USSR, or more precisely in the 70s of the 20th century. First of all, this showed itself in the manifestation of the public demand for philosophical, sociological and cultural research. Therefore, it was necessary to study different forms and types of communicative activity. Even communicative activity was deep and purposeful in the socialist era. It performed a certain function in meeting the spiritual and cultural needs of that society. This function also included the principle of demand for communication.

Communication between modern people brings to the fore the conditions for the formation of their characteristic features. Now the exchange of information is carried out with the help of mass media, especially the Internet, press, radio, cinema and television. And this is becoming an important tool of socio-political management. They can also be the most powerful means of influencing people's mind and behavior. Mass media not only helps to disseminate socio-cultural information, but also helps to stabilize existing opinions and has a significant impact on the process of human socialization.

There are various opinions about the socio-cultural nature of communication and its role in the educational process in the scientific literature. The scientific basis of communication has been interpreted mainly in terms of communist methodology in Soviet cultural studies and pedagogical science. For a long time, these studies were far from reality and the socialist way of life had to be adapted to communist principles. Communist society was described as a free environment for communication, but no scientific research or investigation were conducted on national and religious forms of communication and its historical tradition. It is clear from a number of studies conducted in historical and philosophical aspects that the evolutionary process of mankind also depended on its culture of communication. The culture of communication has influenced in one or another form on other areas of public consciousness and has become the embryo of movement and development of worldview, creative habits, morals, norms of behavior and all the factors surrounding the social environment.

While communication was an instinct in the early days of human history, the emergence of new forms of labor, also interest in the understanding of the universe deepened the human mind transforming it from a physiological being into a social being. As a result, the evolutionary process of conscious communication has begun.

The most important task of culture is the formation of personality. That is why the communicative function of culture plays an important role in the process of socialization of the individual. At the same time, information and management responsibilities are among the leading functions of culture. In general, although the concepts of communication and "relation" are considered in the modern literature, the complexity and sufficient development of these concepts have not been studied in detail.

The interpretation of the main material

The most important task of culture is the formation of individual. That is why the communicative function of culture plays an important role in the process of socialization of the individual. At the same time, information and management responsibilities are among the leading functions of culture. The concepts of communication and relation have been considered at different levels in the modern literature. Some scientists identify the terms "social communication" and "social relation". According to V.S.Yumatov, such identification is possible only if we are talking about the quality of social

information as an attribute of the public organism. When it comes to social communication, it should be taken into account that its nature is determined by the fact that people have sign, semantic connections in information relations. In other words, the problems of semantics, semiotics and social communication of syntax come to the fore. The genesis of the terms “relation” and “communication” is not the same (7, p. 45). V.S.Korabeynikov confirmed initially the above-mentioned idea (2). V.S.Yumatov mentioned also that idea. He appreciated the functional role of language as a unique means of spiritual communication. Not only social information was transmitted in the society, but also material was received, encrypted and collected with the help of the speech. But, V.S.Yumatov does not define the specifics of moral (social) communication. Its interactions in other concepts were not investigated. He was limited only by the scheme. He proposed this scheme with four main points.

- 1) Social communication (real communication - the basic form) - a set of historically formed material relations of people in the process of joint subject material activity.
- 2) It is an alternative property of human material interaction and the process of collecting and disseminating social information in society.
- 3) The need for the exchange of socially collected information creates an appropriate signaling system of information communication between people. It also participates in the social communicative formation of spiritual and intellectual communication.
- 4) In its turn, the process of actualization of information and communicative events and the processes in the spiritual life of society act by various means. The mass media and propaganda (mass communication) act especially at a certain stage of historical development (7).

Unfortunately, although the provisions are related to the characteristics of different forms and types of communication, it remained only at the level of thesis in Yumatov. Although each thesis needed a detailed explanation, the provisions put forward by Yumatov were not confirmed.

According to V.M.Sononov, the process of communication should not be limited to the exchange of information. It combines the act of interaction and action. Because they are connected with material and social relations with many strong threads (4, pp. 49-57).

Communication, which considers a certain type of activity, is an active activity of the subject in systems of subjective-objective relations. M.S.Kagan notes that communication differs from the three, except for one of the four types of activity. These are types of renewal, perception and value. He directed the subject not to the object, but to other subjects or to himself (3, p.41). In this case,

- 1) the personality;
- 2) social group;
- 3) society as a whole act as initiators of communication.

There are three main forms in the plan of morphological division of society - a) interpersonal, b) intergroup, c) intersocial (3, p.44).

The provisions put forward by Kagan were completed by Uledov. He noted that spiritual communication is a manifestation of activity among social actors. Regardless of the form in which this activity is manifested, it is characterized as an activity in all cases (6, p.97).

At the same time, Uledov stressed the need to amend his definition of spiritual communication. When Uledov spoke of spiritual communication, he saw it as a method of existence of spiritual life. He connected spiritual production with spiritual life. At the same time, he associated all forms of manifestation of the spiritual condition and spiritual needs with spiritual production. Sociologically, Uledov went on to say that communication served to meet demand as an activity in the process of analysis. So, communicative activity was shown in interaction here. The author rightly noted that the meaning of the term “communication” has not been fully clarified yet. It is often understood as the

activity of the media, under the concept of communication, especially under the name of mass communication. A characteristic peculiarity of the level of mass communication is that, although a large number is considered, usually a small group gathers in the audience and uses the means of interaction (6).

Following Y.M. Lotman, the attention approaches the analysis of communication (relation): A.A. Brudny and N.N. Taliz. Depending on the semantics of the information, the “signals” (information) are either directed to a specific address or, in some cases, to a set. The character of this orientation is the basis for the division of communicative processes into two parts. According to Brudny, the communicative process seriously defines information. N.N. Talizin distinguishes two types of communication based on the ideas of Lotman and his school:

- 1) Communication aimed at transmitting information while maintaining the volume (communication as a mechanism of reproduction of culture).
- 2) Communication aimed at the growth of information, the creation of new texts related to the development of individual (communication as a mechanism for the development of culture) (5, p.117).

The last principle assumes the active position of the individual. This, in its turn, reveals the discovery and formation of new abilities. They are actively related to new forms of communication. In general, the process of individual formation determines the contradictions between the definitions of the normative personality, the social life of the individual and the personal characteristics of social activity. The text plays the role of that mediating factor. Here, the text presents both the normative and the personal aspect of the activity as it is newly created. The formation of the spiritual culture of the transition society is a great creative task of the national and ideological sphere. For this reason, many customs and traditions were created during the communist regime, albeit artificially. However, these festive events organized by the government did not meet the social interests of the people. In any case, the broad masses of people were involved in this propaganda space by the heads of departments and enterprises and their minds were influenced.

Thus, the development of the social productive forces of human labor and, as a result, man as a subject of social activity is in deep conflict with the development of the majority of working individuals in conflicting societies and take the form of a force that is strange and hostile to man. The contradiction of the transformation of social forces into a force that enslaves and exploits people and tramples on their identities reaches its climax under conditions of improper domination in society. This is a form of social limitation on cultural development at this stage of history. A paradoxical situation arises: culture denies itself in its antagonistic form, because it is in conflict with its human content.

However, cultural development is a manifestation of man's existence as a free and perfect person and as a person who bears actively a relation to nature, other people and himself at the historical stage, which the humanists call the real human history, i.e. the stage of what they call universal society. It should be noted that the general historical meaning of culture is obviously manifested as a universal development of man. This is directly harmonic with the development of the whole set of social forces and relations created by man.

In general, taking into account the general historical development perspectives of culture, the views allow to avoid equally unfounded extremes in its explanation. These extremes are characteristic of both pre-Marxist and modern thinking. One of these extremes is the abstract interpretation of culture as a far-fetched category. It ignores the peculiarities of the cultural life of people at different historical stages and in different social conditions, covers up the essential differences between the cultures of different socio-economic formations and peoples, etc. In this case, we are talking about culture, regardless of

when it was created, who it serves, what goals it sets. Another extremism is the denial of unity, inheritance, commonality in the cultural development of the different forms, peculiarities (absoluteness) of culture and mankind. As a result, culture is divided into independent, isolated, disconnected “local” parts. This leads to the affirmation of cultural pluralism, the approval of the idea that the most diverse cultures are of equal importance, the disintegration of the ideas of cultural development and the denial of its universal understanding of the riches and achievements of all human beings.

Such a complex, multidimensional and multi-level structure of culture allows it to perform a number of social functions in society.

The function of understanding culture is an epistemological function. In general, culture is a certain measure of the degree of domination of man, the elemental forces of nature and society, as well as the degree of development of “humanity” in man himself. Culture encompasses all forms of social consciousness taken in unity and creates a complete picture of the perception and learning of the world. Of course, culture is not explained as a set of knowledge about the world, but systematized scientific knowledge is one of its important elements. This shows itself more clearly in connection with the expansion of scientific and technological achievements in modern times and the transformation of science and culture into a factor that unites and influences their all types.

As can be seen, culture does not only characterize the degree to which a man perceives the world around him. Society, people, nation perceives itself as a whole in culture, in all its forms and through culture. In this case, culture not only reveals all forms of social consciousness in their unity and completeness (degree of development), but also shows clearly the level of skills and habits that are manifested in the practical activities of people.

Culture acts by following means not taking into account the factor of technological activity. First, understanding; second, controlling behavior; third, evaluate the value system.

It should be noted that taking into account the time factor is the most important function of culture. Historical inheritance and transmission of social heritage from generation to generation play an important role here. In this sense, culture emerges instead of traditional forms of inheritance. Although these forms of inheritance prevailed in primitive society, they still exist at the family level.

Culture also allows man to fulfill his heuristic goals, i.e. to seek more productive forms of understanding its innovation, to find new ways and methods of social life and to strengthen man's dominance over the elemental forces of nature.

One of the main reasons why people communicate with each other is the need to get various relevant information. Since ancient times, the exchange of information has a special place in human society and has become one of the main means of communication and relationship between individuals. The Sophists, who lived in the 5th century BC, tried to link the influence of information exchange to the process of communication, albeit in an abstract way. Although simple, they divided communication into three important aspects. According to this division:

- 1) Communicative communication consists of the relationships that exist between people and their interactions with each other;
- 2) The communicative relations between people are spontaneous, in fact, they depend on the environment, the circumstances and for certain reasons;
- 3) Communicative communication does not only benefit both sides. One of the sides may suffer more or less from this relationship.

At the same time, according to the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates, communication also helps a man to understand himself, to guide him in a secure way.

The occurrence of the communication process depends on the feelings and practical activities of the two sides who want to exchange information. Of course, there is a collection of opinions and information in both of them and the sides can reveal this opinion and information by communicating with each other. In such a situation, both sides become both the object and the subject of communication.

The information and function of culture are inextricably linked with its communicative function. By perceiving the information engraved on the monuments of material and spiritual culture, a man communicates directly or indirectly with the people who created these monuments.

Conclusion

Culture plays a fundamental role in the modernization of society and serves as a generator of deep socio-economic transformations. First of all, it contributes to the development of specific principles of society of culture, on the other hand, it ensures ethno-historical integrity within a certain civilization. Integration processes, the universalization of lifestyles of different peoples and states contribute to the evolution of both local and global civilizations. In general, world civilization is at a certain stage in human history and meets the needs of people. The interchangeability of world civilizations is an expression of the progress of historical progress and the development of mankind.

Human communication processes have expanded and become more complex in the age of the scientific and technological revolution. If direct communication prevailed over indirect communication in the past, now indirect communication prevails with the help of technical means. The emergence of mass media (internet, press, radio, television, cinema, drama and video recordings, etc.) has been an important factor in the spread of culture. However, the role of these tools in the life of society depends on which group they own and which culture they spread. Culture also performs a regulatory, normative function acting as a system of norms of a certain stratum of society and a system of requirements for all spheres of human activity (labor, household, interpersonal relations).

The regulatory function of culture is protected by normative systems such as morality and law, which are part of its structure. A culture that evaluates the degree of conformity of the behavior and activities of a particular social group or individual to certain social and moral norms and principles regulates a man's daily behavior in various spheres of public life.

It should be noted that cognitive activity is one of the main components of information exchange. This type of activity also develops in two directions in the process of communication. The first stage is the process of transferring and getting information. The transmission of information to each other occurs mainly in the process of individualized communication. However, the process of conveying this information is also seen during lectures, debates, events and circle sessions. In both cases, the information budget is growing. It is exchanged at the same time. The exchange of information creates topics for new discussions and debates. A new heuristic activity of each individual is formed. That is, the exchange of information deepens thinking, also creates a heuristic environment for the acquisition of new knowledge.

In general, communication is the most important peculiarity of a man's emotional state. Communication usually has emotionality from tenderness to rudeness, from love to hatred. Therefore, people not only exchange information with each other in the process of communication, but also express their attitude to each other. As a result, a special environment is created around the people with whom they interact, which is desirable and important for them.

However, a man is able to look at himself and his actions through the eyes of others in

communication. The ability to see and analyze his own activities creates conditions for each individual to evaluate his actions and correct his mistakes in time.

The main functions of culture have a special role in society. Undoubtedly, such a definite division makes it appropriate to study it. These functions are interrelated and inextricably linked in real life. The main and only goal of the new society is the formation of a new type of person - a comprehensive, harmoniously developed founder of personality.

Reference

1. Brudny A. A. Communication and semantics. Vopr. Philosophy. M., 1972, No. 4.
2. Korabeynikov V. S. Spiritual communication, information exchange, ideological struggle. M.: Politizdat, 1976. (141).
3. Kagan M. S. Communication as a philosophical problem. Nauch. Dokl. Schools of Philos. Nauki, B., 1975, no. 5.
4. Sonovnin V. M. Problems of normative communication. Nauch. Dokl. Higher. Schools of Philosophy. Nauki, M., 1975, No. 2.
5. Talyzina N. N. Text and cultural context. In the book: Problems of the theory of culture. Moscow: 1980.
6. Uledov A. K. Communication as a way to realize the spiritual life of society. V. Kn: Socio-psychological and psychological-pedagogical problems of communication. M., AON under the Central Committee of the CPSU. 1981.
7. Yumatov V. S. Spiritual communication, social information and social communication. In the book: Socio-psychological and psychological-pedagogical problems of communication. Moscow: AON under the Central Committee of the CPSU. 1981).
8. <http://kultura.rossii.ru/> Culture of the Russian Federation
9. <http://www.culture.az> Ministry of Culture
10. of the Republic of Armenia 10. kultura.az/news/2013112109484942

Культура общения и межкультурные коммуникации

Аббасов Намиг Алекбер оглу

Доктор философии по культурологии, доцент,
Заместитель директора по общим вопросам,
Институт архитектуры и искусства НАНА,
AZ1001, Азербайджанская Республика, Баку, ул. Истиглалийят, 30;
e-mail: namiq_abbasov_70@mail.ru

Аннотация

Духовное и культурное общение - необходимый способ осознания духовной жизни. Люди обогащают друг друга в процессе общения. Способность участвовать в коммуникативных процессах зависит не только от эмоционального богатства и интеллектуального уровня индивидуальной духовной жизни людей. Эффективность и практический характер такого участия часто определяет духовный климат общества. Некоторые люди видят богатство культурной жизни в разнообразии духовного общения.

По мере развития общества люди все больше участвуют в управлении производством, обществом и правительством. Их общественно-политическая активность постепенно растет. В процессе духовного и культурного общения из поколения в поколение передаются не только знания и передовые идеи, но и человеческие чувства, такие как дружба, ответственность, уважение, добрые чувства к людям и т. д. Эти особенности касаются народов, почти всех народов, независимо от национальности. Они касаются также важных

путей развития, помимо общих идей, общих интересов и обязанностей. Духовные контакты между людьми происходят в разных образных формах и в самых разных направлениях внутри разных обществ. Человечество - это сердце их расширения и углубления. Одна из важнейших ролей в вышеупомянутом социокультурном контексте - образовательная функция общения. Формирование нормального человеческого типа и воспитание морально, духовно и эстетически богатых людей было желанной задачей во все времена и во всех обществах. Активное утверждение нового глобального сознания и универсальных моральных принципов и норм - одна из их сложных проблем. Вместе с тем создаются условия для реализации этих принципов в процессе духовного и культурного общения.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Аббасов Н.А. Культура общения и межкультурные коммуникации // Культура и цивилизация. 2021. Том 11. № 1А. С. 166-173. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2020.35.77.020

Ключевые слова

Отношение, информация, общение, социализация, культурное сотрудничество, гармония.

Библиография

1. Брудный А.А. Коммуникация и семантика. Вопр. Философии. М., 1972, №4.
2. Корабейников В.С. Духовное общение, обмен информацией, идеологическая борьба. М.: Политиздат, 1976. (141).
3. Каган М.С. Общение как философская проблема. Науч. Докл. Школы Филос. Науки, Б., 1975, №5.
4. Соновнин В.М. Проблемы нормативного общения. Науч. Докл. Высш. Школы – Философс. Науки, М., 1975, №2.
5. Талызина Н.Н. Текст и культурный контекст. В кн: Проблемы теории культуры. М.: 1980.
6. Уледов А.К. Общение как способ осуществления духовной жизни общества. В. Кн: Социально-психологические и психолого-педагогические проблемы общения. М., АОН при ЦК КПСС. 1981.
7. Юматов В.С. Духовная общение, социальная информация и социальная коммуникация. В кн: Социально-психологические и психолого-педагогические проблемы общения. М.: АОН при ЦК КПСС. 1981).
8. <http://kultura.rossii.ru/> Культура Российской Федерации
9. <http://www.culture.az> Министерство культуры АР
10. kultura.az/news/2013112109484942