

CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND ITS ROLE IN THE SOCIOCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANKIND

Mykola Zaitsev

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Management
The National University of Ostroh Academy
vul. Seminarska 2, Ostroh 35800, Ukraine
E-mail address: mykola.zaitsev@oa.edu.ua
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1876-9232>

Dmytro Shevchuk

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Management
The National University of Ostroh Academy
vul. Seminarska 2, Ostroh 35800, Ukraine
E-mail address: dmytro.shevchuk@oa.edu.ua
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5609-2600>

Kateryna Khudoba

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Management
The National University of Ostroh Academy
vul. Seminarska 2, Ostroh 35800, Ukraine
E-mail address: kateryna.khudoba@oa.edu.ua
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8168-8921>

ABSTRACT

Aim. The article aims to analyse the problem of cultural diversity in the situation of intensifying globalisation processes. The authors emphasise that cultural diversity is constituted in our time as one of the essential problems of cultural studies and humanities. They aim to show that the existing cultural diversity is the result of the adaptation and development of various natural and sociocultural circumstances in which people lived in previous eras.

Methods. The method of the current investigation is the interpretive analysis of modern cultural phenomena.

Results. It is emphasised that the interaction of cultures plays a significant role in the formation of the cultural diversity of humankind. The authors note that the change in human attitudes to the natural environment and changes in sociocultural circumstances

es due to globalisation processes create, at first glance, the erosion of cultural diversity and contribute to the formation of unified forms of collective life and individual existence in the world.

Conclusion. The authors conclude that the contradictions of globalisation processes are forming new forms and ways of cultural diversity. Cultural diversity is constituted in our time as one of the fundamental problems of socio-humanitarian knowledge because it will preserve or become a thing of the past and depend on the anthropological horizons of the sociocultural progress of humankind. The existing cultural diversity results from adapting and developing various natural and sociocultural circumstances in which people lived in previous epochs.

Keywords: culture, diversity, interaction, globalisation, human existence

INTRODUCTION

If not disguised as unified products, world culture is produced in the semantic fields of individual sociocultural regions. Also, this culture is a dialectical unity of global and local and later appears in the variety of regional and ethnic diversity due to natural and historical circumstances in which different forms of human formation took place. Initially, cultural diversity was formed in the conditions of the relative isolation of other regions of the planet and was a variety of activities, worldviews, and attitudes to the world. However, sporadic contacts of peoples intensified in historical progress, growing into relatively stable operations of cultural interaction. From this, global cultural progress began to take shape.

The concept of *interaction of cultures* captures the equality of interacting parties and the fact that the parties cannot get out of this process in its original certainty. However, whether the consequences of this interaction will be equal is an open question. It depends on the intentions of the interacting parties and the situation in the cultures themselves. The latter can be defined as follows: external cultural interactions, their nature, and diversity depend on the internal development and the nature of the interaction subjects' way of life.

Cultural diversity is an implicit feature of our times. It plays a significant role in politics, management of institutions, business, etc. We can also find statements that appreciating human diversity is one of the most essential cultural values in the modern globalised world (Kottak 2013). However, most of the recent investigations of this phenomenon pay attention to particular aspects but do not provide an analysis of its essence. As Oya Aytemiz Seymen states,

It is seen that a lot of research has been conducted, particularly in recent years, related to the dimensions of values involving business and the need to know how cultural variety in the organisational concept should be managed. However, the research brings in the dif-

ferent perspectives apart from each other and hence a lack of implicit agreement. (Seymen, 2006, p. 297)

The problem of cultural diversity is significant for countries undergoing democratic transformation and simultaneously are characterised by multiculturalism and must ensure tolerance. For example, Manana Darchashvili notes the following:

Georgia, which is situated at the crossroads of East and West, even during the period of the country's political-economic-cultural prosperity, paid great attention and cared for its multicultural heritage. Since the country's authorities understand that tolerance has always been an important guarantee of the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional country's success. (Darchashvili, 2020, p. 492)

Usually, two theoretical guidelines have been defined concerning cultural diversity. Suppose the first theoretical guideline is expressed in the idea of the unity of world culture. In that case, the second one is in the concept of self-sufficiency of individual cultures and their relative isolation. The latter is justified because they carry out their activities on unique principles of existence and are incapable of fruitful interactions.

However, such a construct of attitude to cultural diversity is somewhat mechanical and too superficially reflects the actual state of affairs. The fact that any culture expresses human existence testifies to a certain commonality of cultures, ethnic culture. The problem arises from the local realisation of human existence. Therefore, the possibility of their interactions, mutual understanding, and mutual enrichment is an opportunity and a reality of historical progress.

Unfortunately, the problem of the nature of cultural diversity, its importance in the sociocultural progress of humanity, forms of manifestation at different structural levels of culture, and even more so, the question of its significance largely remains in the shadow of intellectual pursuits. Such epistemological indifference is observed when cultural diversity of cultures is increasingly emphasised as one of the fundamental problems of socio-humanitarian knowledge. However, the issue of cultural diversity is essential for creating a decent society based on principles of realising human rights: "Protection and promotion of cultural diversity are possible only when human rights and fundamental freedoms are guaranteed, such as freedom of expression, information, and communication, as well as the opportunity for individuals to choose forms of cultural self-expression" (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010, Article 2).

International organisations have underscored the significance of cultural diversity, as exemplified by their dedicated attention to this phenomenon. Specifically, the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2001). acknowledges cultural diversity as both a fact and a catalyst for innovation, exchange, and creativity, constituting the foundation of human existence as a cohesive entity. This diversity is portrayed as an inherent characteristic of culture, with cultural expressions taking varied forms across different

times and locations. The uniqueness and plurality of identities within groups and societies collectively shape the diverse tapestry of humanity. Serving as a wellspring for exchange, innovation, and creativity, cultural diversity is indispensable for humankind, akin to the essential role biodiversity plays in nature. Consequently, it is the shared heritage of humanity and warrants recognition and affirmation for the benefit of both current and future generations

All this confirms that cultural diversity is constituted in our time as one of the fundamental problems of socio-humanitarian knowledge. Analysis of this problem is the purpose of this article.

The Concept of Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity is a reality with which humanity has existed throughout its history and, therefore, does not require special theoretical justification. However, its existence requires at least a small explanation, that is, answers to the question: why a single species of living beings, covered by the concept of *homo sapiens*, carries out its existence in a plurality of ways? The reason for this is rooted in the whole system of functions performed by culture.

One of the most important is the adaptive function, which ensures human survival, mainly in natural and social environments. Unlike animals, man does not adapt to his environment but changes it *for himself*. As a result, an artificial environment is produced, and the world of human existence is culture. In reality, it appears not only as a specific set of material objects but also as a system of worldviews, norms of morality, traditions, customs, etc. All this is the environment of human existence and what constitutes the necessary circumstances of human birth. In this regard, culture appears in the guise of its definition as *second nature*. Understanding culture as a *second nature* reveals an essential property of human activity – the ability to *double the world* by highlighting the subject-artifact and worldview-setting levels (layers). In essence, the level structure of culture is revealed here, where the subject-artifact level is a direct (external) phenomenon of culture, which includes what we habitually call objects of material culture and specific means necessary for existence in society: traditions, moral norms, customs, various ways of organising society - particularly the state, as the most developed form of organisation of political power.

As for the worldview-instructional level, it is decisive concerning the subject artifact. At this level, culture appears as a picture of the world where worldviews, images, and meanings act as coordinates in which the environment is perceived. Due to the worldview-instructional level, the subject-artifact level of culture appears not as a conglomerate but as a semantically ordered grid of objects, phenomena, and information flow. Anything outside receives certainty of significance, mainly in three dimensions: usefulness, indifference, and harmfulness (hostility) toward a person.

According to its adoptive function, culture appears as a solid human reaction to the environment. Inhabiting the earth, people found themselves in different natural and climatic conditions and, therefore, had to adapt to them, producing specific ways and forms of existence. Hence, ultimately – the cultural diversity of humankind. According to the Kyiv School of Philosophy and Anthropology guidelines, culture will be understood as “a special reality of collective existence and individual existence” (Bystrytsky, 1992, p. 7). Culture is a way of being human in ideal and objective forms or a way of man’s collective and individual existence in the world.

Thus, the diversity of cultures is an assortment of historically formed ways of being human, revealing the differences of man from what he or she is not and reacting to existing and possible natural and sociocultural circumstances.

In reality, this diversity is an accumulator of manifestations of the human being as such, in its independence from specific value systems and which, at the same time, can become the basis for the maturation of not declared but actual, i.e., not formed in the semantic field of a particular cultural region produced (matured) in a broad segment of interactions of integral and self-sufficient, within its limits, cultures. Cultural diversity is a natural phenomenon, and as such, it reveals the historical fact that each nation has a specific semantic community of people, which arises based on related meanings of life that are combination of unique and universal features. Moreover, nations and their cultures, regardless of their number, are equal in the face of existence and meaning (Nesterenko, 1991). Cultural diversity reflects the way of life of a particular socio-historical and ethnic community in specific natural and socio-historical circumstances. At the same time, the culture of each community (not the essence of big or small) as complete integrity becomes a sociocultural factor, influencing the historical and social progress of the community. The unique features of cultures make them in some respects equal to each other – this idea is quite common in discourses of cultural studies. However, this equality is not justified by the statement of uniqueness. Therefore, the significance of cultural diversity does not receive a proper theoretical justification, and thus, the thesis of its preservation appears only as a declared intention. Nevertheless, considering cultural diversity as the primary origin of the varied historical processes contributing to their diversity is not a notion that can be regarded as a substantial argument. This view captures only the functional significance of cultural diversity but does not reveal its semantic dimension. Its nature, essence, and semantic content remain largely unexplained. We cannot correctly justify or refute the thesis that cultural diversity is necessary for the real sociocultural progress of humankind.

Quite another matter is the problematisation of this phenomenon. Its essence is the realities of the late twentieth - early twentieth century. This gave rise to two interrelated and, at the same time, opposite tendencies - the erasure of cultural differences of peoples (unification) and, at the same time, the desire of these same peoples to preserve their cultural identity. Hence, the natural phenomenon, which, with the light hand of the British sociologist, the theorist of globalisation process-

es Roland Robertson (1995), was called glocalisation. In his essay *Glocalisation: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity*, he proclaimed that we need to step over the debate on global homogenisation versus heterogenisation. The question should not be asked as *either-or*, choosing one of these trends, but rather to explore how both trends have become characteristic of our lives in most of the world (Robertson, 1995). In our opinion, this term captures the fact that we do not have sufficient grounds to be convinced of the irreversibility of the unifying influence of globalisation processes and that the local cultural specificity of peoples will remain unchanged. We can only say that such trends exist and are clearly defined with some certainty. All this raises a problem that requires answering several questions: how and why there is a diversity of cultures, its significance, and, most importantly, what are the possible consequences of its loss, or, if it persists, in what forms and in what way? Among the researchers of these processes, there are supporters of general homogenisation and those who criticise such approaches, focusing on the cultural uniqueness of each ethnic group in each nation. However, regardless of the position of researchers, it is clear that the diversity of cultures, in the complete sense of the word, has become a problem for the sociocultural progress of humankind.

What does it mean when we say something has become a problem? Usually, we do not significantly differentiate the concept of problem, task, question, or even just the actualisation or legitimisation of something. So we note that our understanding of the problem is characterised by a significant degree of uncertainty of the results obtained as a result of its solution; we get a new point of view on things, i.e., reflected methodological foundations of cognition; contradictions without the explanation of which the problem is not solved. The problem cannot be bypassed or partially translated. It is either solved or not, and then the situation, which is generally characterised as a problem, is reproduced again.

Regarding the cultural diversity of humankind, as a problem, it appears in two aspects. The first, which we will define but will not focus on because it requires separate consideration, is that in a situation of intensification of intercultural contacts, cultural diversity will most likely not be able to remain within the existing limits. It will acquire some new forms, and the way of life of its bearers, at least on an everyday level, will be different. Of course, it is not difficult to predict that the acceleration of tendencies towards unification will lead to the resistance of cultures and the relief of manifestations of national self-consciousness. As a result, one should expect a slowdown in the formation of global consciousness, a situation of growing global problems (environmental, food, etc.) that can have catastrophic consequences. Unfortunately, globalisation trends in their modern forms are not catalysts for forming this consciousness.

The second dimension refers to the erosion of the cultural diversity of humankind, which, on the one hand, seems inevitable and, on the other, raises the question of in what new forms it can appear as a necessary condition for the stable progress of humanity as sociocultural integrity.

The Problem of Preserving Cultural Diversity

We can state that cultural diversity is based on the essence of culture itself. The culture can be presented as a diversity and mixture of elements. According to Aytemiz Seymen (2006):

culture [...] is a mixture including knowledge, belief, art, law, morality, and conventions shared by nearly all of the members of a specific society and separating one group member from another; other skills and habits; also common attitudes and responsibilities learned subsequently, such as original lifestyles, emotions, etc. (Aytemiz Seymen, 2006, p. 299)

Preservation of cultural diversity is a necessity of sociocultural progress. The forms and methods of such variety as they were formed in the previous historical period do not correspond to the realities of today. They can only be the basis and *material* from which new ones will emerge. In this process, globalisation acts as a catalyst for their emergence. As a hypothesis, it can be argued that unique cultural diversity will emerge from individual behaviour and ways of being in different life situations. If the variety of natural and sociocultural circumstances was a determining factor in the emergence of cultural diversity in previous historical epochs, now we are witnessing when these circumstances lose such a role. Instead, they are unified, or our attitude towards them is unified, depriving them of this role

Instead, variations in the dynamic development of social and individual spheres generate diverse life situations, encompassing the variety within the unity of people and the events they experience. All this necessitates various reactions to them, or in other words, various types of behaviour. This is where the roots of the *liquid modernity* should be seen (Bauman 2007). However, this is another type of diversity – *the diversity of individual cultures*. The latter can no longer be stored and passed on as an experience of being to future generations. Dynamism and unprecedented diversity will make such a case useless.

Another thing is needed here: constantly creating new behaviour adequate to life situations. The basic principles of such innovation should be taught, and then the individual must create ways and forms of such behaviour and be responsible for its adequacy. This is the significance of permanent self-learning, and individual-personal existence is the initial factor of sociocultural progress.

As mentioned, the existing cultural diversity results from adapting and developing various natural and sociocultural circumstances in which people lived in previous epochs. We should also include the interaction of cultures, which is due not to the population in past centuries despite the unsystematic and even sporadic. The millennium and the underdevelopment of communication still played a significant role in shaping the cultural diversity of humankind. To what extent does this legacy correspond to today's realities? After all, both natural circumstances (especially man's attitude) and the intensity and nature of cultural interactions have changed dramatically.

It should be borne in mind that everyday interactions are much more dynamic than before. We are witnessing drastic changes that history did not know before. In this situation, humanity is faced with the need to find in the cultural heritage or to produce new forms and ways of adapting to circumstances that have changed dramatically and continue to change. In addition, there is a semantic need to preserve the anthropological essence of these forms and methods of collective and individual human existence.

Due to internal diversity, humanity exists as a dynamic sociocultural system. Throughout history, ethnic groups and cultures have disappeared. Still, the cultural diversity of humankind has not diminished; its forms and ways of expression have constantly changed, but diversity as such has been preserved.

If not disguised as such unified products produced in the semantic fields of individual sociocultural regions, world culture is a dialectical unity of local, regional, national, and ethnic diversity due to natural and historical circumstances in which various forms of human communities are formed. Initially, cultural diversity was created in the conditions of the relative isolation of different regions of the planet and was a variety of activities, thinking, and worldviews. However, sporadic contacts of peoples intensified in historical progress, growing into relatively stable operations of cultural interaction. As a result, individual cultures became involved in global cultural progress.

Such involvement is necessary because the system must be internally diverse enough to respond to environmental challenges adequately. Sociocultural systems are more stable the greater their internal diversity. The regular, dynamic balance of the sociocultural system depends on its cultural diversity. Reducing it determines the reverse processes. The absence or insufficiency of variety indicates a violation of the integrity of the subsystems of this system.

Two theoretical approaches identified cultural diversity, which was conceptualised in two ideas: *the idea of the unity of world culture* and *the idea of self-sufficiency of individual cultures and their relative isolation*. The latter is justified because they carry out their activities on unique principles of existence, so they are incapable of fruitful interactions.

However, this attitude to cultural diversity is somewhat mechanical and too superficially reflects the actual state. The fact that any culture expresses human life testifies to a certain commonality of cultures. Any ethnic culture appears as a local realisation of human existence. Therefore, the potential for interactions, mutual understanding, and mutual enrichment stands as both an opportunity and a reality in historical progress.

Usually, the interaction process of cultures is seen as a factor in their mutual enrichment. Still, such a one-sided vision of a complex and contradictory process leaves in the shadows several, so to speak, *shadow* aspects of the existence of cultures and their carriers. In particular, the interactions of cultures reveal a chronotopic limitation of specific ways of life in the world.

Throughout human history, people and their cultures have interacted and influenced each other. The resettlement of people and population growth made these processes inevitable. We are now witnessing a previously unknown trend in cultural interactions when cultural diversity is replaced by one model of human existence in the world. At the same time, it is not a consequence of complex and contradictory interactions of the cultural diversity of humankind. Still, it is mainly a product of one cultural paradigm, presented as a universal reference point and represented only in positive dimensions. Thus, the values produced in one culture are presented as universal, and the culture itself is universal. This tendency does not bring anything positive for humanity and this culture, as it deprives it of self-critical guidelines.

The interaction of cultures, in essence, is the interaction of the worlds of human existence and, hence, the meanings that define the horizon of human realisation of being.

The concept of *interaction of cultures* captures the equality of interacting parties and the fact that the parties cannot get out of this process in its original certainty. Nevertheless, whether the consequences of this interaction will be equal is an open question. It depends on the intentions of the interacting parties and the situation in the cultures themselves. The latter can be defined as follows: external cultural interactions, their nature, and diversity depend on the internal development and nature of the way of life of the interaction subjects.

The diversity of human culture manifests itself through various ethnic, national, regional, and local differences. At the same time, each of these cultural formations, in its historical progress, presupposes, so to speak, its internal diversity in the form of subcultures and interior regional features. All this is evidence that cultures do not arise and exist in isolation but only in a coalition of cultures. Therefore, the presence of diversity is a necessary condition for the existence of culture. At the same time, all this necessarily gave rise to processes of interaction between cultures, which became more complicated as history became world history. As a result, various forms of worldview, activity, thinking, etc., produced in the semantic field of individual cultures, became the property of humankind.

CONCLUSION

Thus, we have found that cultural diversity necessarily generates interactions of cultures that intensify historical progress. The diversity is facilitated by population growth and migration processes, the development of industry and trade, and especially the emergence of previously unknown media opportunities. As a result, there is a phenomenon of cross-border cultures. Modern cultures (with few exceptions), regardless of their spatial localisation, are in a situation of permanent cross-border expansion. By and large, all cultures, with some exceptions, are cross-border. There are no non-cross-border cultures nowadays. This factor determines the significant po-

tential for acculturation, which enriches and expands the segment of possible responses to possible challenges.

There are changes in cultural identities, which no longer appear as a constant definition of cultural carriers. In the situation of *liquid modernity* (Bauman 2007), the identifying certainty acquires a procedural character, which, while preserving the invariant structures of a particular way of life, simultaneously fills them with the achievements of other peoples.

The interaction of cultures generates integrative phenomena, the consequences of which unfold in the segment from mutual enrichment to creating a new culture. It all depends on the nature and condition of the interacting cultures themselves. Theoretically, the situation of cross-border cultures can have different consequences. Thus, mutual enrichment stimulates the growth of internal diversity and contributes to the stability of civilisation. In a condition of complementarity, coalitions of cultures can form dynamic integrity despite their subjects' political, military, and economic relations. In certain circumstances, new cultures may arise, which begin new horizons of human realisation by being (new worlds) based on the intersection of semantic fields. Finally, the integrated part of cross-border cultures is isolated into a separate original culture.

Nowadays, the development of means of communication crosses borders, even cultures that are not spatially compatible, that is, space, or rather space-time, no longer plays the role of a factor that distances cultures. This situation introduces a new problem in the interaction processes of cultures – the recipient must immediately accept or reject cultural values, mainly in their autochthonous semantic content. The *distance* that previously arose from overcoming the spatial and temporal boundaries between cultures is increasingly disappearing. Thus, it ceases to play the role of a *filter* due to which, so to speak, *digestion* takes place, i.e., the transformation of cultural artifacts and values to the sensory-objective and ideal-image levels of one's culture. It no longer plays a significant role in the processes of intercultural interaction.

The old balanced cultural chronotype no longer plays a significant role in intercultural interaction. There is a situation when cultural borrowings are not as enriching as putting pressure on the recipient culture, causing the erosion of its cornerstones. As this becomes a reality in cultures, resistance to any intrusion into the semantic field of a particular culture is awakened. It is resistance to invasions that do not coincide with the peculiarities of the existence of this culture, and its carriers reveal the reality of culture, which appears as the last limit of the exceptions of the presence of this culture and its pages (Bystrytsky, 1992). This resistance manifests unwillingness to *erode* one's own identity and submit to someone's cultural domination. The latter can be a source of civilisational conflicts. In this situation, the marginalisation of cultural carriers is spreading. Due to the weakness of their culture, they adopt cultural values, becoming in the second or third generation, the ethnographic material of another, more vigorous cultural civilisation.

As mentioned in its functional manifestations, culture is a consequence of adapting specific communities to natural and sociocultural circumstances. At the same time, it carries the mechanisms of such transformations in the form of traditions, prescriptions, taboos, etc. Suppose we accept the thesis of the unifying nature of globalisation and consider adapting the function of culture from this hypothetical position. In that case, we must recognise that globalisation, taken in the dimension of cultural studies, leads to forming such mechanisms of adaptation that would be functionally suitable for any reality of human existence. However, we need to find the answer: Is this possible? After all, such adaptive mechanisms would mean that all possible changes in the coordinates of human existence are considered. This view is possible only based on the worldview that the world is an entirely sound system. In reality, it was the cornerstone of the Modern era – an *educational project* for which everything must pass the limbo of the mind. However, such a guideline was questioned even at its general recognition (during the Enlightenment). The eminent German poet and thinker Goethe once remarked that being is not divided into the mind without remainder. Later, during the nineteenth century, representatives of philosophical irrationalism showed that the world of human existence is far from rational. Evidence of this is that human conditions do not always allow a man to be realised by human presence, i.e., to preserve humanity as a defining characteristic of his being.

The problem of cultural diversity in a situation of its intensive interaction with necessity raises the question of those universals, which depends primarily on the definition in this cultural vision of the essence and purpose of man. The most common determining factor is the idea of man's space, time, and place in the world. All this is present in the structure of any culture. In its functionality, culture first forms the self-consciousness of man, i.e., the idea of himself, his place in the realities of being, and corresponding to these realities' forms of behaviour. At the same time, self-awareness appears as a system-forming factor of the whole group or individual-personal culture system.

Taken from these positions, the diversity of cultures appears as a diversity of actual life practices based on specific mythological, religious, philosophical, and other possible spiritual constructions. Thus, the interaction of cultures appears primarily as an interaction of behavioural dispositions of individuals - carriers of these cultures. Misunderstanding (ignorance) of certain mythology, religions, and worldviews, in general, can lead to rejection, and even hostility to cultural life practices can generate intercultural and even inter-civilisational conflicts. Knowledge of these guidelines opens the possibility of predicting the reactions of real individuals - bearers of culture to cultural contacts. At the same time, it can enrich interacting cultures, opening up other ways of organising the world of human existence and relating to it.

In the history known to us, ethnic cultures were the most stable forms in which the cultural diversity of humankind realised its existence. Ethnic cultures are the *atoms* from which the multicoloured cultural fabric of humanity *spins*. At the same time,

they constitute the limit beyond which the dispersion of culture cannot continue. It is a Hegelian measure because the exit beyond causes a change in qualitative certainty, i.e., the inevitability of culture. If reality can eradicate it, it will mean that culture as a way of collective existence and the individual presence of man will also be eliminated. The border with its *before* and *after* will noticeably declare the reality. *The limit* of the attitude of individual and personal existence to ethnonational culture is manifested as cultural dimensions.

As for *after*, there is a situation *abroad (after the border)*, which is the opposite of the problem *before the border*. The determining factor here is the dispersion of culture in its ethnonational definitions. Individual personal existence loses culture as a horizon of its realisation. It remains in a state of civilisation, unknown how and by whom it is given because there will be no culture that determines the coordinates of its existence. First of all, it problematises identification certainty. However, whatever it is, it may be something unknown so far. Post-culture will replace culture, where everything will be turned upside down structurally. The very paradigm of cultural diversity will be replaced.

The characteristic of culture is the level structure: the core, which is based on archetypes, worldview-setting level, and subject artifact, will give way to the system of *individual culture*. Here, the level structure will be somewhat different: the individual-unconscious as its core, everyday instructive prescriptions, uncritically assimilated at the level of individual consciousness mythologies and the corresponding subjectivity. The determining factor will be that *individual culture* is based primarily on the experience of everyday life and its emotional and mental comprehension.

In a situation *to the limit*, the formation of culture (individual culture) appears due to the interaction of their own life experience and various forms of community cultures. They set the boundaries of the formative influences of each other. The culture of a specific historical community *here and now* traditionally determines the horizon of individual culture (culture).

In the situation of *abroad (after the border)*, the ability of an individual to set his cultural horizons of existence becomes decisive. That is, to build in what Immanuel Kant called the *moral law in itself*.

Various forms of education and upbringing have performed these functions throughout history. The individual-personal activity, bringing a person closer to the boundaries of the community's way of life, pushes them and thus contributes to changes in community culture. Mass media, computer technology, and dynamic emigration processes have fundamentally changed the situation in the late twentieth century. As a result, the educational opportunities of each individual have increased significantly. Nevertheless, existing education systems continue to operate according to current guidelines, at one time progressively, that all people are the same and should all acquire the same knowledge, skills, and abilities. New educational systems, where personality development comes first, are still in their infancy.

Thus, cultural diversity is constituted in our time as one of the fundamental problems of socio-humanitarian knowledge because it will be preserved or become a thing of the past and depend on the anthropological horizons of the sociocultural progress of humankind. The existing cultural diversity results from adapting and developing various natural and sociocultural circumstances in which people lived in previous epochs. A significant role in its formation was played by the interaction of cultures, which contributed to the mutual enrichment of cultures and even the construction of new ways and forms of human existence.

Changes in human attitudes to the natural environment and changes in sociocultural circumstances caused by globalisation processes create, at first glance, the erosion of cultural diversity and contribute to the formation of unified forms of collective life and individual existence in the world. However, this vision of cultural diversity and its historical destiny manifests the point of view of a bygone era. The dialectical concept of the prospects of sociocultural progress shows that new forms and ways of cultural diversity are formed in contradiction to globalisation processes. The possible negative consequences of these processes are emphasised.

REFERENCES

- Aytemiz Seymen, O. (2006). The cultural diversity phenomenon in organisations and different approaches for effective cultural diversity management: A literary review. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 13(4), 296–315. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527600610713404>
- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid times. Living in an age of uncertainty*. Polity Press.
- Bystrytsky, Y. (Ed.). (1992). *Bytie chelovieka v culture: Opyt ontologicheskogo podhoda* [The human being in culture: The experience of ontological approach]. Naukova dumka.
- Darchashvili, M. (2020). The issue of cultural diversity and tolerance in modern Georgian politics. *Journal of Education, Culture and Society*, 11(2), 490–498. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2020.2.490.498>
- Kottak, C. P. (2013). *Cultural anthropology: Appreciating cultural diversity*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Nesterenko, V. (1991). *Vstup do filosofii: Ontologia lyudyny* [Introduction to philosophy: The ontology of man]. Abrys.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalisation: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities. Theory, culture & society* (pp. 25–44). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2001). *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/5_Cultural_Diversity_EN.pdf
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2010, January). *Konventsia pro ohoronu i zaohochennya rozmajittya form kulturnogo samovyrazhennya* [Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions]. http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/952_008