

CONCEPT OF "A CULTURAL IMPERIALISM" AND ITS MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION EMBODIMENT TODAY

Iuliia Gudova

¹Mrs., Ural Federal University, Russia, jgudova@mail.ru

Abstract

The cultural imperialism in the broadest sense is a domination, domination of one country over another by means of culture. The concept of a cultural imperialism one of the first Edward Said used in the seventies of the XX centuries. In the book "Culture and Imperialism" (1993) he has given him a conceptual character, has proved theoretically intellectual approach realized by him in relation to the analysis of an imperialism and its demonstrations in culture. He understood two interconnected processes as a cultural imperialism: cultural domination and cultural expansion of one country in culture and cultural development of another country.

E. Said defined a phenomenon of "a cultural imperialism" as multilateral cultural suppression as a result of which the dominating culture forces out and subordinates to himself all manifestations of the subordinated culture — from high to local, from personal to public, from the system of values to consumer interests, from symbols and rituals before their imitations in mass art. Culture as integrity forms imperial feelings, thoughts and imperial imagination.

Today the cultural imperialism is investigated by Y. J. Dal, P. Golding, P. Harris, S.P. Mains, G. Munkler, H. Schiller, and others have given. They consider a cultural imperialism as a way of realization of the symbolical power which manifestations can be cultural submission of other people by means of advance of language of the mother country as state and language of the international communication (a communication imperialism), domination in production and distribution of a cultural product (a media imperialism), domination in financing of the cultural industries (an investment imperialism). The definition of a cultural imperialism was given by S.P. Mains: "The cultural imperialism is a process of disproportional influence on social practices and ideologies of one sociopolitical group on politically weaker and (often) less healthy groups".

The cultural imperialism can be directed to the outside world and can be directed to the remote regions of the country. In that case, we speak about an internal cultural imperialism. The analysis of a cultural imperialism as a difficult system of the relations in the system "Center and Periphery" on principal directions of the social and cultural interaction of the present is a current scientific problem. We will consider an internal cultural imperialism on the example of a media and communication imperialism in modern Russia.

In the modern Russian media space, the capital's center broadcasts most of the information content to the regional periphery. Some Russian regions do not exchange news information, the entire information flow moves two-way: the capital - regions, regions - the capital. It is the Periphery that produces events that the Center turns into news. This is done by journalists trained to see events through the eyes of the Domination Center and to set up a communication chain that filters and processes events so that they correspond to the dominant pattern. For this purpose, correspondent points of the central mass media work in the Russian regions, and a training system for representatives of local media is organized through the capital's center.

Keywords: cultural Imperialism, communication imperialism, media imperialism, E. Said, internal cultural imperialism.

1. METHODOLOGY

The notion of "cultural imperialism" was introduced into scientific context by E. Said in his book "Culture and Imperialism". According to the concept of E. Said, cultural imperialism clearly exists and manifests itself in the 20th century in the situation of postcolonialism, when empires and colonies in the classical historical and political notion practically do not exist, but some social communities continue to exert an extremely strong influence on others through cultural domination (Said, 1993, p. 10).

Summing up the ideas of many contemporary researchers of cultural imperialism, G. Munckler shows that imperial domination includes superiority in the four most important spheres of interstate interaction: political, economic, military and cultural. In accordance with this structure, G. Munckler identifies varieties of modern imperialism: "investment" (economic) imperialism, "network" (political) imperialism, and "cultural" imperialism (Munkler, 2015, p.68).

However, such representations do not fit into the understanding of culture as a system that permeates all social phenomena and processes when culture is inseparable from investment economic processes and how different networks are developing in modern society: trade, financial, information or transportation. From the point of view of the cultural-philosophical approach, cultural imperialism incorporates into all forms of social, economic and political interaction carried out from the position of imperial domination, that is, the predominant ownership and disposition of investment financial-economic, infrastructure transport, communication and institutional resources.

Another theorist of cultural imperialism, Johan Galtung, in his work *The Structural Theory of Imperialism* sharpens his attention on communication imperialism, which he views as one of the manifestations of cultural imperialism. Communicative imperialism, according to the scientist, is based on the domination of the Center in the world's communication networks and the translation of objects and ideas (Galtung, 1971, p. 94). In his view, the vertical nature of the division of labor in the field of communication/broadcasting has particular importance.

J. Galtung argues that, despite the triviality of the idea that for the high level of industrial (production) culture it is necessary to develop the technology of broadcasting and communication, meanwhile the most developed countries manage to achieve domination in this sphere. This is connected, in the opinion of J. Galtung, with the fact that the previous generation of means of translation and communication had the character of material values and could always be sold, sometimes even second-hand. The buyer of second-hand means of broadcasting and communication was, according to the scientist, Periphery as part of the overall vertical trade structure, together with the means of production (the sector of the economy), the means of destruction (the military sector) and the means of creativity (the cultural sector). Meanwhile, while Periphery bought traditional means of broadcasting and communication, the Center has long dominated the creation of space communication satellites (communications), developed telecommunications technologies and Internet commerce.

Another researcher of cultural imperialism Dal Jong Jin says that in the sphere of media, cultural imperialism has gone through several stages of its development (Dal, 2007, p. 761). Initially, the Center owned communication and information networks and determined exactly where it would be delivered and in which options in the first place, as well. The center was engaged in the direct production of all the broadcasted content. At the second stage, the Center began leasing out networks and financing local information broadcasting channels and began selling franchises for its content production.

From this point of view, the Communication Center is located where the production of original media content is located, which is distributed as samples and for which the franchise is sold. Where the franchise is bought - only the cultural Periphery because it is not independent and not creative in the production of content. At the present stage, the Center exercises control over media communication networks and their content through monitoring of financing and legislative regulation. The center is always busy with the production of norms, including the norms of the law, and the norms of taste, and the norms of morality.

2. RESULTS

The consequence of this principle is a special combination of cultural and communication changes, and in particular, the production and delivery of news. We all know that the largest news agencies are in the hands of the countries that dominate the global world, use the communications networks controlled by the Center, and leased lines. What is not so well analyzed is how news from the dominant Center captures most of the news flow broadcast by the news media of the Periphery. According to the sociological data of J. Galtung, Periphery countries do not write or read about each other, especially about their neighbors abroad military-

political alliance, they read more about "their" Center, because the Periphery wants to know more about the "important" for her part of the world (Galtung, 1971, p. 95). In our opinion, the situation is similar in the modern Russian media space, when the capital center broadcasts most of the information content to the regional periphery. And some Russian regions do not exchange news information, the entire information flow moves two-way: the capital - regions, regions - the capital.

According to J. Galtung, another aspect of the vertical division of labor in the news business is that it is the Periphery that produces events that the Center turns into news (Galtung, 1971, p. 96). This is done by journalists trained to see events through the eyes of the Domination Center and to set up a communication chain that filters and processes events so that they correspond to the dominant pattern. For this purpose correspondent points of the central mass media work in the Russian regions, and a system of internships and training for representatives of local media is organized through the capital's center.

The latter concept refers us directly to cultural imperialism, the subtype of which, according to J. Galtung, is also scientific imperialism (Galtung, 1971, p. 97). The division of labor between teachers (metropolitan journalists) and students (journalists from the periphery) is very clear: it is not the division of labor as such (found in most knowledge transfer situations), but the location of teachers and students in the sociocultural geographic space. If the Center always provides teachers and criteria for a worthy journalist and journalism, the Periphery always provides students, and its journalists occupy a position apprentice to the capital. In the process of training, a sample of the realization of the tastes of imperialism is formed.

Neighboring regions in the Periphery always know for sure that nothing flatters the Center so much as having the right to encourage students. In professional interaction, the capital's journalism will always act as an exemplary model, and journalism from the Periphery can receive in response a modest strategy of the cultural experiment. In the course of cultural communication, Periphery represents for the Center the embodiment of the model of culture developed at the Center, regardless of whether the Center is internal or international. This serves to strengthen the Center in the status of the Center, as it will then continue to develop a culture model along with its translation, thus creating a lasting demand for the latest innovations.

To all this, it is necessary to add a brain drain, when the most creative 'raw' brains (students) and the original 'raw' texts/projects move from the Periphery to the Center and are 'handled' with sufficient benefit for the central source of imperial power, then the picture of cultural and communication imperialism becomes completely complete.

3. CONCLUSION

As we see, the theory of cultural imperialism, which arose in order to explain the socio-cultural inequality in relations between different countries in today's open global and media-organized world, also works productively to explain the relationship between the information center and the Periphery within a single taken state.

REFERENCE LIST

1. Munkler H., 2015. Empires. The Logics of Domination all over the World: since Ancient Rome to the USA.
2. Dal Y. J., 2007. Reinterpretation of cultural Imperialism: emerging domestic market vs continuing US dominance. *Mass Culture and Society*, vol.29.
3. Galtung J., 1971. A Structural Theory of Imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 8, 2.
4. Said E.W., 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*.