

THE GLOBAL CRISIS OF CONTEMPORARY CULTURE: STATE AND PROSPECTS

В. М. Шейко

Національна академія мистецтв України, Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна
sekretar@xdak.ukr.education

V. Sheiko

National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3532-7439>

V. Sheiko. The global crisis of contemporary culture: state and prospects

The purpose of the article is to analyze the global crisis of modern culture, its state and prospects.

The methodology of theoretical analysis. The following scientific approaches were applied during the study: theoretical analysis and synthesis, generalization and interpretation of scientific sources.

The results. The key manifestations of modern global culture are identified, overcoming which, in our opinion, is a priority task in the process of humanity entering a new stage of cultural history:

1. The excessively rapid development of the technological structure of social life, compared to its humanization, leads to a rupture of cultural integrity, polarizing material and spiritual values in it, with the former gaining priority, although it is the latter that express the true essence of culture. After all, material manifestations of culture are only an external embodiment of a person's spiritual attitude to the world around them and acquire social value far from always in direct dependence on the degree of spirituality embodied in them.

2. The conditional "devaluation" of the humanistic content of the economic development of civilization leads to a crisis of its "material progress" — primarily due to the limited natural resources and the rapid growth of indicators of technogenic impact on the ecological balance.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that the problem of the globalization crisis of modern culture is investigated in a culturological aspect using the principles and methods of cultural studies, which makes it possible to comprehensively cover the topic, which is so important for the spiritual development of not only the current, but also the future globalizing society.

The practical significance of the article lies in the fact that the research carried out can be used as an important theoretical basis for developing a new strategy for overcoming the cultural global crisis and eliminating the threat of the disappearance of civilization as such.

Keywords: *global crisis of culture, technological development, moral aspects, ecology, human civilization, ecological doom, spiritual values.*

В. М. Шейко. Глобальна криза сучасної культури: стан та перспективи

Проаналізовано глобальну кризу сучасної культури, визначено її стан і перспективи. Відзначено наявність дисбалансу між технологічними та морально-ціннісними аспектами буття культури, результатом чого стало загострення проблем, що пов'язані з екологією, і підвищення загрози самому існуванню людського виду. Описано стан «екологічної приреченості», запропоновано шляхи виходу з нього. Наголошено на важливості якості та орієнтирів матеріальних і духовних цінностей, а не на зростанні об'ємів нинішнього виробництва. У контексті виживання сучасної культури акцентовано на необхідності поширення нових етичних принципів, гуманістичних цілей розвитку взаємозв'язків як у безпосередньо суспільстві, так і між людиною й природою. Розглянуто освітню сферу як своєрідний «лакмусовий папірець», що дозволяє оцінити реальний зв'язок духовних цінностей із повсякденним буттям людини. У висновках згадано головні прояви кризи нинішньої культури, подолання яких є першочерговим завданням у процесі входження людства в новий етап культурної історії.

Ключові слова: *глобальна криза культури, технологічний розвиток, моральні аспекти, екологія, людська цивілізація, екологічна приреченість, духовні цінності.*

Today, when humanity has entered the first quarter of the XXI century with significant achievements in the field of science, technology and culture, the world community faced large-scale threats of the planetary level, which in general is the result of civilizational evolution. And, more than ever, the question of the future fate of world civilization has become relevant. As is known, the determining factor in solving the problems of civilization development is culture, because its level, as well as the intellectualization and humanization of society in many aspects depend on the maximum complete control by the world community of the results of its own activities in the spiritual and material spheres. And, finally, the state and prospects of modern global culture determine the further existence of earthly civilization. That is why the purpose of this article is to analyze the global crisis of modern culture, its state and prospects. Such an analysis, in our opinion, is extremely relevant and extremely necessary.

Perhaps, that is why in recent years, scientists have increasingly paid due attention to the above-mentioned issues. For example, a collection of articles published in 2024 analyzes problems and ways to solve them in times of global crises, including in the field of culture (Verkuil, 2024). An article by Rachel May, published in 2024, discusses the new bachelor's program "Culture, Technology, and the Environment" (May, 2024). An article by A. Kadijević discusses the Russian aggression that led to colossal human casualties in Ukraine and the destruction of invaluable cultural values (Kadijević, 2022). Similar aspects of crisis phenomena, including in the field of culture, are considered in general terms in other numerous works by foreign authors (Frosh, Georgiou, 2022; Roy, 2024; Letisser, 2023). However, as a rule, they do not consider aspects of the global crisis of modern culture. A number of works by Ukrainian scientists have been published that are somewhat closer to this formulation of the question. For example, Viktoriia Nykytenko in her thesis raised the question of the global civilization of the XXI century and its possible fate — decay or revival (Nykytenko, 2023). An article by Liudmyla Tanska, published in 2023, is closer to the chosen topic, in which the issue of globalization culture is considered in the context of the dynamics of socio-cultural systems (Tanska, 2023).

And, finally, we consider it necessary to recall that the author of this publication has been working on the chosen problem for a long time and carefully. Let us indicate only a few of his monographic works that confirm this (see Sheiko, 2001a; Sheiko, 2001b; Sheiko, Bohutskyi, 2005; Sheiko, Aleksandrova, 2009; Sheiko, 2011 and others).

Presentation of the main research material.

One of the main signs of the modern era, it is sad to admit, is that the cultural crisis has spread to most levels of human existence, including the global one. This primarily indicates a threat to the very existence of earthly civilization, if humanity cannot manage to radically revise the directions and mechanisms of its own and its culture's development. Such a situation in the modern world is due primarily to the fact that the main value orientations that regulated human activity in society and the natural environment have largely exhausted their social and progressive potential, and this fact causes concern among many globalist researchers. As, for example, R. Sinai notes, "our modern urbanized, technological, ... mass civilization has exhausted all its opportunities for growth and creativity and is now entering a period (which may continue for several generations) of aging, characterized by a decrease in energy and quality, an increase in atrophy and stereotypes" (Sinai, 1978, p. 7).

On the other hand, this state is significantly reinforced by the permanent increase in technological and decrease in humanistic orientations in culture, by the deepening of the gap between material and spiritual values: "technocrats offer us bread, and that is good. But they demand to pay for it with our humanity" (Roman, Loebel, 1977, pp. 159–160).

The global cultural crisis that began after the Second World War, by the end of the 1960s acquired a wide scale. Since the beginning of the 1970s criticism of the technocratic approach to the future has been increasingly heard, which is accompanied by a constant tendency to see the paths of development of earthly civilization in a pessimistic way. The most interesting thing is that this pessimism did not prevail only within Europe, where it was concentrated, as in the part of the world that suffered the greatest losses in the war. After all, the 1960s-1970s are known for the crisis of the Western world, which has taken root deep into

the soil of Western culture. The values and norms that constitute the essence of European civilization are now being drowned in a tsunami of scientific and technological development, and its results are no longer at the service of man, and even threaten his existence (Tinbergen, 1976). In this regard, reflecting on the results of the application of scientific and technological achievements in modern society, many researchers conclude: a moral vacuum is the sphere where the activity of modern technology takes place (Mische, Mische, 1977, p. 203).

The result of such an imbalance between the technological and moral-value aspects of the existence of culture is the exacerbation of problems related to ecology. At the same time, it is also an increase in the threat to the very existence of the human species. The French researcher F. Saint-Marc emphasizes that we have now entered the “Age of Nature” — a new era, when the scarcity and instability of natural space becomes the most dramatic problem for the future of man and his survival (Saint-Marc, 1971). As is known, ancient and medieval history are associated with the stage of separation of man from nature and the affirmation of the autonomy of the human spirit. At the same time, one can also trace the opposite dynamics — the phase of “socialization of nature”, its subordination to man, which has become a key motif of the history of the Modern Age. Today, when this trend is also exhausted, completing the spontaneous logical-historical cycle of the evolution of the relationship between nature and society, there is an objective need to rethink the essence of this relationship. Otherwise, we will increasingly face the fact that nature again appears as “an adversary who is by no means defeated, but in some respects is more elusive and more formidable than we can imagine” (Meadows et al., 1972, p. 51).

The main role in this regard is played by the incommensurability between short-term, purely pragmatic tasks of production and consumption with promising global “survival programs”. In this context, it can be noted that the civilizational crisis is a consequence of exponential growth in a limited space (Mesarovic, Pestel, 1974, p. 12). This means that the critical thing for the development of civilization is mainly the exhaustion of natural resources, while in the current world their consumption is steadily

increasing. According to scientists, the essence of the problem is not whether there are external borders at all, the overcoming of which could end in tragedy, but that their existence should be thought of as something understandable, if only we did not find ourselves in a state of chaotic and unsupported technological optimism (Tinbergen, 1976).

That is why the fastest way out of the state of “ecological doom” of cultural civilization may be the transition from intensive growth to world balance. The latter involves the so-called “aspiration for zero growth” of the planet’s population indicators and the industrialization of society’s existence (Forrester, 1961). However, such a concept cannot be implemented within the chaotic spontaneity of cultural and economic development, that is, with its subordination exclusively to the laws of the market.

Thus, if the framework of the existence of civilization is characterized not only by objectively exhaustive natural resources and in many aspects depends on the qualitative content of culture itself, then in order to avoid the collapse of humanity, it is necessary to initiate cardinal changes in social institutions and values (Meadows, Meadows, & Randers, 1974, p. 563). As the president of the Club of Rome A. Peccei believed, “...the current global crisis ... is a direct consequence of the inability of man to rise to a level that would correspond to his new dominant role in the world” (Peccei, 2013, p. 22). Accordingly, E. Laszlo in his work “The Goals of Mankind” concluded that the boundaries of earthly civilization “...should not be considered as absolute, established by physical nature. The critical limits that confront humanity are not physical, but human. By breaking through the “internal boundaries” that are restrictive, existing “external boundaries” can be pushed back, and in some cases eliminated” (Laszlo, 1977, p. 258).

Thus, it can be argued that the most important role is played by internal, cultural and human problems rather than external, that is, those related to the environment. Therefore, what is important is not so much the growth of current production volumes as the quality and orientations of material and spiritual values that humanity produces and for the sake of which economic growth will be justified. After all, “growth for the sake of growth itself often contradicts human interests — it can rather reduce

than increase the quality of life. Economic growth must be subordinated to humane goals and should take place only if it is able to fulfill this function. The further increase in environmental pollution, traffic jams on the streets of urban conglomerates, automation and impersonal bureaucracy contradict human interests, although they can be seen as a contribution to economic growth, measured by such general quantitative indicators as gross national product, national income and turnover from international trade. But growth can also occur in many other areas where human needs are really satisfied ..." (Laszlo, 1977, p. 303).

In these conditions, we can propose:

1. To move from "undifferentiated growth" to distinguishing between favorable and unfavorable technogenic factors of development of both general cultural values and the degree of their influence on the most complete self-creation and self-realization of the human individual in society.

2. To warn against the other extreme — radical opposition and contempt for scientific and technological progress. As J. Forrester believes, "... now there is more and more doubt that technological progress is a means of saving humanity. And there are grounds for such doubt" (Forrester, 1961, p. 25). At the same time, we believe that "not blind opposition to progress, but opposition to blind progress" (Meadows et al., 1972, p. 116) is appropriate.

Paraphrasing, we can note: the imbalance between technical and moral development, which is now considered a fact of the last resort, requires an attitude and analysis of global problems without separating them from the context of ethical imperatives, spiritual values and human goals. Moreover, it is these "humanistic dimensions" that should be put at the heart of technical growth in culture. A. Peccei rightly notes, in our opinion, "... any new achievements of humanity, including what is usually meant by "development", can only be based on the improvement of qualities, and this is where we must concentrate all our efforts if we want to truly "grow" (Peccei, 2013, p. 161).

According to the above, the prospect of survival of human civilization is directly related to the need to spread new ethical principles, humanistic goals of developing relationships both in society itself and between man and nature. That is, "a new ethics of

the use of material resources must be developed" (Mesarovic, & Pestel, 1974, p. 147).

The relevance of this task is increasingly indicated in current research in the socio-historical, cultural, philosophical-anthropological and other spheres, within which the cultural-crisis processes that knock out bricks from the vital foundations of modern man lie primarily in his misunderstanding of social reality, in the helplessness of the individual, who found himself face to face with the forces and relations created by him, but which his rational control does not extend to. At the same time, the main marker of the crisis state of modern global culture is that the latter no longer plays the role of a harmonizer of the individual's existence in nature and society and, on the contrary, destabilizes this existence and destructively affects the very personal integrity of the individual.

As A. Schweitzer emphasized, "the normal attitude of man to man has become difficult for us. The constant bustle characteristic of our way of life, the intensification of mutual communication, joint work and joint existence of many in a limited space leads to the fact that we, continuously and under the most diverse conditions meeting each other, remain alienated in relation to our own kind. The circumstances of our existence do not allow us to treat each other as a person to a person. The restriction imposed on us in activity, inherent in human nature, is so universal and systematic in nature that we get used to it and no longer perceive our faceless, impersonal behavior as something unnatural..." (Sheiko, & Bohutskyi, 2005, pp. 485–486). As a result, an atrophy of the feeling of empathy for our neighbors is increasingly observed, which is gradually replaced by various forms of social indifference. The individual of modern civilization hardly suffers from the impossibility or inability to reveal truly human qualities and relationships even in situations where they would be quite natural. Indifference to strangers becomes the norm. It is no longer perceived as a sign of inner callousness or rudeness — on the contrary, it is often presented as a manifestation of decent behavior. Moreover, modern society is gradually losing the ability to recognize the unconditional human value and dignity of each individual person (Schweitzer, 1996).

Such depopulation of society results in the fact that material success becomes the main criterion of the intrinsic value of human existence in culture; and, therefore, not spiritual, but material wealth plays the main role in the formation of the individual's attitudes. Moreover, it is not his individual-personal world that determines the social face, but "material" achievements. It also happens that, as A. Peccei, "... man is gradually turning into a grotesque, one-dimensional Homo economicus" (Peccei, 2013, p. 1).

The modern paradoxical crisis situation in culture causes a completely natural reaction of its researchers, which is manifested in a rethinking of the main criteria of civilizational development. If before this "turning point" in cultural history, the progress of society was mostly assessed by the level of growth of material well-being, now, as noted by the famous French analyst F. Saint-Marc, the true development of man requires a transition from a civilization that almost exclusively sought to "have" to a civilization that is increasingly focused on "being" (Saint-Marc, 1971). In other words, one of the key ways to overcome this crisis may be the transformation of basic cultural paradigms, the result of which will be a radical reorientation of the ways of social self-affirmation of the individual: not through the desire to have more, but through the need to become a more "human" being.

Since true cultural existence involves harmonious coordination of human relations with nature and society, the existing disharmony and conflicts of values give grounds to speak of the "invalidity" of the existence of the individual within the framework of modern culture. At the same time, the activities of modern man are increasingly closely associated with responsibility not only for his own life, but also for the fate of all mankind. In other words, the crisis of cultural civilization as a holistic phenomenon is naturally accompanied by the "internal crisis of man himself" (Peccei, 2013, p. 130). His spiritual life takes on forms of extinction, which, under conditions of powerful material opportunities, carries the threat not only of "burial of the human self" (Hendin, 1975, p. 305), but also physical self-destruction.

Thus, the individual is already faced with a choice today: "either he must change — as an individual and as a part of the human community, or he will have to disappear from the face of the Earth" (Peccei,

2013, p. 67). And this, sadly to admit, is not just a rhetorical or "shock-therapeutic" warning common in post-industrial ideology. After all, where the stable balance between a person's inner life and his external activity is leveled, where a deep gap arises between the essence and the form of existence, self-destructive processes are inevitably launched. Culture, which is the social dimension of human nature, in such a context ceases to be a source of development — on the contrary, it becomes a factor in the collapse of human existence itself.

As E. Fromm noted, the main cultural problem of the XX century was the "death of God" — that is, his loss of the status of the leading value in the material life of society and a retreat into the sphere of the purely spiritual. At the same time, the modern era is faced with a much more serious challenge: man himself as a social being is on the verge of extinction. If the trajectory of civilizational development is not changed, the future may bring a situation in which "man will cease to be a man and will turn into an unthinking and insensitive machine" (Fromm, 1968, p. 29).

Analyzing possible ways of reorienting cultural history, most researchers conclude that the most promising direction is to shift the emphasis from the development of technical skills and capabilities of the individual to increasing the level of his own "human quality". As it is rightly noted: "...we have managed to improve certain qualities in athletes, cosmonauts and astronauts, improve machines, devices and materials, improve breeds of chickens, pigs and varieties of corn; we have also achieved significant success in increasing human labor productivity, increased his ability to read quickly and taught him to communicate with computers. But we have never seriously tried to make it more acutely aware of its own new position in the world, to increase the awareness of the power it now has, to develop a sense of global responsibility and the ability to evaluate the results of its actions" (Peccei, 2013, p. 32).

In this context, spiritual culture as a factor contributing to the formation and development of human qualities, more and more clearly demonstrates the deep gap between the values that actually dominate in society and universal human guidelines. In such a situation, the "massification" of

culture occurs not as an expansion and deepening of access of broad segments of the population to the spiritual and valuable heritage of humanity, but as a process of “primitivism” — the reduction of cultural experience to simplified, averaged forms. This trend is clearly reflected in the state of modern education, which, like the entire system of cultural existence, is currently in not only an organizational and structural, but also a deep content-target crisis. As K. Jaspers rightly noted, the life of a person as a component of a machine can be characterized by comparing it with the life he lived before: a person is uprooted, he loses his soil and homeland, and in return receives a place near the machine; the house and land that are allocated to him are themselves of the type of machine, transient, interchangeable, are not a landscape and are not a unique home. The surface of the earth takes on the appearance of a machine landscape. The horizons of a person's life become extremely limited in relation to the past and the future, he loses his cultural heritage and the desire for an ultimate goal, he lives only in the present. But this present becomes more and more empty, the less it is supported by the substance of memory and the less it carries in itself the already germinating seeds of future possibilities. Work becomes simply an effort in tension and haste, the expenditure of energy is accompanied by fatigue, and both these processes are devoid of reflection. In fatigue, nothing remains but instincts, the need for pleasure and sensation. Man lives by movies and newspapers, listening to the news and looking at pictures, everywhere within the limits of the mechanically conventional. The multiplication of technologically produced consumer goods allows this mass of people to increase to a seemingly limitless extent; at least, our era has led to the multiplication of the total population of the Earth in a short period of time (Bohdanov, 1995, p. 111).

In modern cultural discourse, “novelty” increasingly appears as a self-sufficient value. As a result, the predicate “new” (“new thinking”, “new era”, “new fashion”, “new body culture”, “new sense of life”, etc.) is automatically endowed with a positive meaning in almost all areas of culture — often regardless of the real content or consequences of such innovations. However, such absolutization certainly raises questions, since the true value of cultural

innovations is determined primarily by the extent to which they contribute to the socialization of the individual and the development of his spirituality as a factor in the harmonization of human existence in the world.

Therefore, all attempts to change the value orientation of man towards nature and society risk remaining nothing more than a “moral sermon”, which is unlikely to have a real impact if it is not consistent with the existential experience of the individual, his personal reactions to the specific conditions of existence. Without such an “ontological correlation”, calls for the formation of a “new ethics” or a “new spirituality” remain mostly declarative and do not differ from classical educational utopias.

In this context, it is quite justified to consider the educational sphere as a kind of “litmus test”, which allows us to assess the real connection of spiritual values with the everyday life of a person. Education acts as an indicator of the same “ontological correlation” — an indicator of the historical timeliness, relevance and vitality of certain values, as well as the degree of their integration into the universal cultural tradition.

Throughout modern history, the development of industrial civilization, oriented primarily towards economic growth, has led to the formation of a “technocratic dominant” in the field of education and upbringing. However, in the conditions of the modern post-industrial world, which is increasingly demonstrating crisis phenomena, the problem of humanization and humanitarianization of education at the global level is becoming increasingly urgent.

The predominant focus of the educational process on improving the means of material existence has led to a gap between this function of education and its deep purpose — the formation of the spiritual dimension of the individual as a subject of cultural and historical development. It is this imbalance, as a result of which the individual loses the status of the goal of social existence and is reduced to its instrument, can be considered as one of the main causes of the modern cultural and educational crisis.

The global crisis of education, as a manifestation of a general civilizational breakdown, indicates the loss of harmony between culture and mentality, the destruction of the traditional educational paradigm, the growth of dysfunctionality of educational

systems, the decline of intellectual activity of the individual and the spread of infantilism among young people. In general, the crisis manifests itself in:

- alienation of education from culture;
- crisis of the process of socialization of the individual;
- growing lag of education from the pace of development of science;
- degradation of the human qualities of the subject of education — both the one who studies and the one who teaches.

The deepening gap between the cultural achievements of civilization and their real spiritual and practical interpretation within the educational system indicates not only the crisis of the latter, but also a larger phenomenon — the decay of culture as a means of “humanizing” the social and natural existence of the individual. In this case, we are dealing with a two-way process: a decrease in the ontological effectiveness of culture leads to a narrowing of the sphere of socialization of the individual. At the same time, such a narrowing causes a corresponding decrease in the level of perception of cultural values in general and, accordingly, the subsequent reduction of the cultural range of the subject.

This means that, for example, the peculiarity of a person's perception of a particular work of art is the result of his ability to react to it not only as a finished result of creative activity, but also as the implementation of that creative process, the connection to which causes a feeling of harmony between this process and his own spiritual attitude to being. And therefore, the breadth of the creative possibilities of the subject of perception of art directly depends on the degree of the specified “involvement”, and, therefore, the sensitivity of the “inner calling” of the artist.

It is obvious that a person who has been involved in music, painting, literary work or other types of art, even at an amateur level, will perceive works of art much more deeply than someone who has never had such experience, limited to a purely “consumer” or even indifferent attitude to manifestations of spiritual culture. After all, if an individual is able to extrapolate himself to the place of the author, then he will, of course, perceive the contextual content of spiritual creativity much more deeply and more

fully, and therefore will react much more sharply to its results.

In this case, the sharpness with which, for example, a professional musician perceives a particular musical work is quite understandable: most likely, a primitive “three-chord hit” will cause him irritation, unlike a listener who has never been involved in music. For a non-amateur, the aforementioned composition is a sign of the decadence of the art form in which he invests himself; and, conversely, a musical work that the “average individual” is not capable of creating instantly interests a professional, since he feels “involved” in the development of the power of the human spirit, harmony. An average person in this case will either be indifferent to a profound composition (not even realizing his spiritual shallowness), or, even worse, will resort to criticism, turning to emotions.

Thus, the organization of the material life of society prevailing in the modern world causes and contributes to a “chain reaction” of a crisis of spiritual culture. The latter is increasingly perceived as a component of the individual's social self-affirmation, which reduces the latter's interest in spiritual development. That is, according to the above, the phenomenon of “cultural schizophrenia” is spreading, the essence of which is that the person loses his own integrity and gradually degrades, losing the ability to realize his own creative abilities, which are the main factor in maintaining the balance of human existence in the social and natural spheres. And this, at the same time, gives rise to a new wave of decline in the stabilizing functionality of culture in society with the inevitable further intensification of the crisis of culture both in the life of an individual and globally, on the scale of civilization as a whole.

Indeed, regardless of the depth of the humanistic content of culture, which they are trying to convey to the younger generation even with the help of the most modern educational approaches, its perception will occur only to the extent and through that “adaptive prism” that makes it possible to integrate this content into the context of current social realities. If the gap between the cultural sphere and the pressing problems of the basic level deepens, cultural values significantly lose their ability to influence youth as a regulatory factor. Relying on the “double accounting of thinking”, schoolchildren or students reproduce

the system of knowledge imposed on them mainly in formal situations (exams, tests, etc.). At the same time, it should be noted that youth forms their own system of norms and models of behavior within their subculture (Bohdanov, 1995, p. 26). The fact of the latter's existence within the "orthodox culture" also indicates its crisis state. After all, according to one of the universal principles of system dynamics, if within a certain system its "alter ego" arises — that is, an internal transformation into its own opposite — then this is a sign of the exhaustion of the potential for the normal functioning of this system in its current organizational form. In the context of the cultural existence of society, this situation testifies to the need for a deep rethinking of both the very nature of culture in the world and the place of man within the cultural space.

Regarding the first, according to the analysis performed, it can be noted that at this ontological level, the cultural crisis is primarily caused by a violation of the harmonious balance between the dynamics of the effectiveness of culturogenic formations and the degree of controllability of their functioning in the natural and social environment. This has led to a striking discrepancy between the global content of both potential and actual results of the "cultivating" activity of man, on the one hand, and the locality of its targeted subordination, and, therefore, its controllability, on the other. At the same time, we believe that such a crisis of cultural civilization is not the result of an accidental violation of the balance in the "nature — man — society" system. The analysis of culturogenesis in the logical-historical aspect clearly indicates a completely justified ontological conditionality of this phase of evolution, since it is quite organically integrated

into the context of both general trends of system dynamics and the logic of the course of the cultural-historical process in particular. To be specific, it should be clarified that this phase of the dynamics of the indicators of the harmonization efficiency of culture (declining) is due to the exhaustion of the progressive potential of such a cultural paradigm, which is based on the industrial-technological dominant. Therefore, it is more appropriate to interpret the crisis of the general cultural orientation as an objectively determined and logical factor that contributes to its transformation.

Conclusions. Summing up the analysis of the factors of emergence and barriers to overcome the modern global cultural crisis, it is necessary to recall its key manifestations, the overcoming of which, in our opinion, is a priority task in the process of humanity entering a new stage of cultural history:

1. The excessively rapid development of the technological structure of social life, compared to its humanization, leads to a rupture of cultural integrity, polarizing material and spiritual values in it, with the former gaining priority, although it is the latter that express the true essence of culture. After all, material manifestations of culture are only the external embodiment of a person's spiritual attitude to the world around them and acquire social value far from always in direct dependence on the degree of spirituality embodied in them.

2. The conditional "devaluation" of the humanistic content of the economic development of civilization leads to a crisis of its "material progress" — primarily due to the limited natural resources and the rapid growth of indicators of technogenic impact on the ecological balance.

References

- Bohdanov, V. S. (1995). Problems of innovating modern education in the system of philosophical and sociological arguments. *Problemy osvity*, 3, 22–28. [In Ukrainian].
- Forrester, J. W. (1961). *Industrial Dynamics*. The M. I. T. Press; Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [In English].
- Fromm, E. (1968). *The Revolution of Hope. Towards a Humanized Technology*. Harper & Row. [In English].
- Frosh, P., & Georgiou, M. (2022). Covid-19: The Cultural Constructions of a Global Crisis. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 25(3/4), 233–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13678779221095106> [In English].
- Hendin, H. (1975). *The Age of Sensation*. Norton. [In English].
- Jaspers, K. (2021). *The Origin and Goal of History*. Taylor & Francis. [In English].
- Kadijević, A. (2022). Heritage and the Global Crisis: The impact of geopolitics on cultural historiography and monument protection. *Nasledje*, 23, 177–190. <https://doi.org/10.5937/nasledje2223177k> [In English].

- Laszlo, E. (1977). *Goals of Mankind. A Report to the Club of Rome on the New Horizons of Global Community*. Dutton. [In English].
- Letisser, G. (2023). Queering the canon in *Middlemarch the series*. Collaborative Digital Creation and the Crisis in the Humanities. *Theory Now. Journal of Literature, Critique, and Thought*, 6(2), 55–80. <https://doi.org/10.30827/tn.v6i2.27902> [In English].
- May, R. (2024). Tackling Global Crises with the humanities: ASU's new BA in culture, technology and environment. *Enrollment Management Report*, 28(6), 7–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/emt.31285> [In English].
- Meadows, D., Meadows, D., & Randers, J. (1974). *Dynamics of Growth in a Finite World*. Mass. [In English].
- Meadows, D., Meadows, D., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. (1972). *The Limits of Growth*. Universe Books. [In English].
- Mesarovic, M., & Pestel, E. (1974). *Mankind at the Turning Point*. Dutton.
- Mische, G., & Mische, M. (1977). *Towards a Human World Order*. Paulist Press. [In English].
- Nykytenko, V. (2023). Global civilization of the XX century: decline or revival? In O. I. Bezliudnyi (Ed.), *Nauka. Osvita. Molod* (pp. 253–257). Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University. [In Ukrainian].
- Peccei, A. (2013). *The human quality*. Pergamon Press. [In English].
- Roman, S., & Loeb, E. (1977). *The Responsible Society*. Cambridge University Press. [In English].
- Roy, O. (2024). *The Crisis of Culture: Identity Politics and the Empire of Norms*. C Hurst & Co Publishers. [In English].
- Saint-Marc, P. (1971). *Socialisation de la nature*. Stock. [In English].
- Schweitzer, A. (1996). *Kultur und Ethik*. C. H. Beck. [In English].
- Sheiko, V. M. (2001a). *Culture. Civilization. Globalization (late XIX — early XXI centuries): Monograph*. (Vol. 1). Osnova. [In Ukrainian].
- Sheiko, V. M. (2001b). *Culture. Civilization. Globalization (late XIX — early XXI centuries): Monograph*. (Vol. 2). Osnova. [In Ukrainian].
- Sheiko, V. M. (2011). *Culture of Ukraine in the globalization and civilization dimension (historical and methodological aspects): Monograph*. Institute of Cultural Studies of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine. [In Ukrainian].
- Sheiko, V. M., & Bohutskyi, Yu. P. (2005). *Formation of the foundations of cultural studies in the era of civilizational globalization (second half of the XIX — early XXI centuries): Monograph*. Heneza. [In Ukrainian].
- Sheiko, V., & Aleksandrova, M. (2009). *Culture and civilization in the historical and cultural thought of Ukraine in the era of globalization: Monograph*. Institute of Cultural Studies of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine. [In Ukrainian].
- Sinai, R. (1978). *The Decadence of the Modern World*. Mass. [In English].
- Tanska, L. V. (2023). Globalization of culture in the context of the dynamics of socio-cultural systems. *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii kerivnykh kadrov kultury i mystetstv*, 2, 42–47. [In Ukrainian].
- Tinbergen, J. (1976). *Reshaping the international order: a report to the Club of Rome*. Dutton. [In English].
- Verkuil, A. H. (Ed.). (2024). *Start-up Cultures in Times of Global Crises*. Springer Nature Switzerland. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53942-8> [In English].

Надійшла до редколегії 02.06.2025

В. М. Шейко

доктор історичних наук, професор, заслужений діяч мистецтв України, дійсний член (академік) Національної академії мистецтв України, радник ректора, почесний ректор Харківської державної академії культури, м. Харків, Україна

V. Sheiko

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Honored Arts Worker of Ukraine, Full Member (Academician) of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Advisor to the Rector, Honorary Rector of Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine