

THE PARADIGM OF CREATIVITY AND CULTURAL TECHNOLOGIES IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL PHILOSOPHY

O PARADIGMA DA CRIATIVIDADE E DAS TECNOLOGIAS CULTURAIS NA FILOSOFIA CULTURAL CONTEMPORÂNEA

Natalya Posokhova

Belgorod State Institute of Arts and Culture,
Russia

natalina_76@mail.ru

Viktor Rimsky

Belgorod State Institute of Arts and Culture,
Russia

rimskiy@bsu.edu.ru

Olga Rimskaya

Belgorod State Institute of Arts and Culture,
Russia

olgarimskaja@rambler.ru

Evgeny Syrovatsky

Belgorod State Institute of Arts and Culture,
Russia

e89722359@gmail.com

Denis Anikeev

Belgorod State Institute of Arts and Culture,
Russia

dnkv0809@rambler.ru

Received: 17 Mar 2023

Accepted: 05 Jul 2023

Published: 20 Jul 2023

Corresponding author:

natalina_76@mail.ru



Desenvolvimento espiritual e moral. Espiritualidade. Identidade. Isolamento. Estabilidade moral. Memória histórica.

Abstract: The article investigates the relevance of the study of innovation in culture and new cultural technologies and industries emerging on their basis. The key goal of the study is to determine the creative paradigm in the ritualization and technologization of new knowledge, as well as models of productive activity in cultural and civilizational systems. The study design is based on comparative-philosophical and cultural-civilizational analysis conducted with a critical interpretation of M.K. Petrov's. As a result, the authors create a series of concepts linking innovativeness and creativity with the development of cultural production of new knowledge and its ritualization and technologization in culture and creative industries.

Keywords: Social psychology. Information society. Sovereignty. Psychological space. Spiritual and moral development. Spirituality. Identity. Isolation. Moral stability. Historical memory.

Resumo: O artigo investiga a relevância do estudo da inovação na cultura e das novas tecnologias e indústrias culturais que surgem em sua base. O principal objetivo do estudo é determinar o paradigma criativo na ritualização e tecnologiação de novos conhecimentos, bem como modelos de atividade produtiva em sistemas culturais e civilizacionais. O projeto do estudo baseia-se em uma análise comparativa filosófica e cultural-civilizacional conduzida com uma interpretação crítica de M.K. Petrov. Como resultado, os autores criam uma série de conceitos que ligam a inovação e a criatividade ao desenvolvimento da produção cultural de novos conhecimentos e sua ritualização e tecnologiação na cultura e nas indústrias criativas.

Palavras-chave: Psicologia social. Sociedade da informação. Soberania. Espaço psicológico.

1. Introduction

Innovation in culture, as well as new cultural technologies and industries emerging on its basis, remain largely understudied. In the past, novelties used to define the historical and cultural evolution of various communities, and now they shape the economic and sociocultural dynamics of humankind. Innovative change can have both positive and revolutionary effects and negative, devastating consequences. The study of these issues can contribute to a deeper understanding of the processes and practices associated with cultural innovations.

To determine the creative paradigm in the ritualization and technologization of new knowledge, as well as models of productive activity in cultural and civilizational systems, in this study we analyze the philosophical and cultural system of ideas of M.K. Petrov (1923-1987), a remarkable Soviet writer and translator, an outstanding scholar and philosopher. Petrov's philosophical, cultural, and scientific studies represent a little-known page in the Soviet history of philosophy and science of the 20th century. Petrov's philosophical and cultural discourse fits well into the global philosophical context and is comparable to the thematic field of M. Heidegger, M. Foucault, B. Latour, and other Western intellectuals. The main methodological approaches utilized in this paper to identify the features of Petrov's philosophy of culture are comparative-philosophical and cultural-civilizational, which implies a critical interpretation of the texts of the Soviet author in the context of the world and Russian philosophy.

The ideas and concepts developed by Petrov can be compared with Heidegger's discourse not only in the space of ontologizing language ("language is the house of existence" (Heidegger, 1947; Petrov, 1991, 2004)) but also in striving for an adequate understanding of ancient philosophy and culture through greater precision and historical accuracy of translations (Heidegger, 1979, 1982; Petrov, 1997, 2015). To illustrate, the philosopher from the Soviet era scrutinized the enigmatic interplay between the eternal and the temporal within Plato's philosophy, framing it through the lens of the ancient Greek concept of *nomos*. Furthermore, this analysis was intertwined with the nuances of the Hellenic language and the laws of the polis. However, diverging from Heidegger's approach, Petrov refrained from delving into the ontological dialectics between divine existence and the Platonic concept of the One. Petrov viewed the all-encompassing ontological inquiries, which he labeled as "fusional", as peripheral outcomes of the classical era's philosophical codifications or *nomothetics*.

From a semiotic standpoint, numerous parallels can be discerned with Foucault—these similarities are both semantic and incidental, evident in the synchronicity of text production

(Foucault, 1969, 1972; Petrov, 2006). The intellectual contributions of Petrov and Foucault align not only in the temporal coincidence of their lives and demises but also in the consistency of their principal works. They both transitioned from structuralist-semiotic notions towards the exploration of "subjectivity practices" and "the mortal man" (Foucault, 1994; Petrov, 1991). Furthermore, their approach to the history of philosophy in a cultural context and their fresh interpretation of antiquity underscores this compatibility (Foucault, 2001; Petrov, 1995). Foucault's "discourse" and Petrov's "thesaurus," like their other ideas and "thought-forms," are comparable not only along the lines of convergence and coincidence, but the trajectories of *divergence*, a special kind of argumentative dialogue from opposite sides of the Iron Curtain. The two philosophers show stylistic similarity and ease of command of the native language in writing theoretical texts.

In the 1970s and 1980s, Latour put forward similarly nontrivial models of science at virtually the same time as Petrov (even somewhat later) (Latour, 1984, 1985; Petrov, 1968, 1992), although no one in France persecuted Latour for these ideas. The intellectual discourse of both scholars also exhibits remarkable similarities. Petrov (1996) prominently showcased his "hypotheses" and "field studies", mirroring the ethos of P. Bourdieu (1987). He persistently underscored the fact that his conceptual frameworks, including typological constructs, were built using a hypothetico-deductive method premised on field studies. Moreover, Petrov proposed that such a method could be adapted to the realm of philosophy, negating the empirical facts detailed by presenting counterexamples.

2. The series of concepts of creativity and cultural technology

In recent decades, on the wave of repudiation of everything Soviet, there has been a trend to excommunicate Petrov from Marxist philosophy, although the scientist himself constantly emphasized that he always proposed and developed new ideas and concepts within the framework of Marxist paradigms. However, he had always been not only a "creative Marxist", but rather a neo-Marxist.

For this reason, we cannot but compare Petrov's ideas and concepts with those of the Western neo-Marxists, in particular T. Adorno and M. Horkheimer's "Dialectic of Enlightenment" (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1997), in which they introduced the notion of Kulturindustrie. Relying on this concept, many Western and Russian cultural scholars have recently been introducing the concepts of cultural industries and creative industries in

investigating current practices and phenomena of mass culture (Hezmondalsch, 2014; Mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal issledovaniï kultury, 2022). Here we would like to briefly discuss the concepts of cultural technologies, creativity, and creative industries from the position of Petrov's ideas and concepts to prove true the proverb "everything new is a well-forgotten old".

Petrov consistently resisted the confines of academic discipline, much akin to what Foucault described as "the founders of discursiveness" (Rimskii, 2017, p. 6-25). He refrained from conforming to particular schools, trends, or movements. This encapsulates the role of a philosopher: to transcend the constraints of disciplinary orthodoxy and pedagogical paradigms, ensuring freedom, primarily in intellectual pursuits and life stance.

This approach enables the reconstruction of the conceptual series of creativity while linking the problem of creativity and cultural production with the development of production of new knowledge ("innovatics" in Petrov's sense of the word) and the institutional forms of "the production of man" in the history of culture and current sociocultural dynamic. Furthermore, this opens new opportunities to develop methodological explications in the construction of cultural and civilizational typology and theoretical definitions of the specificity of innovation, creativity, and its industrialization in culture.

We have a certain experience of comprehensive examination and interpretation of Petrov's cultural studies and philosophical concepts (Rimskii, 2007, 2012, 2017). We intend to elucidate Petrov's notions of creation or creativity within a contemporary framework. We posit that it is advantageous to critically engage with Petrov's ideas in order to link the thematic threads of innovation not only with creativity, but also with the more foundational notions of culture and civilization. After all, creativity can be viewed as an integral facet of cultural expression. Does innovation in Petrov's view imply only creativity-innovation in the sphere of culture, or are innovations also possible and necessary in the space of creativity-reproduction in their association with civilizational development? What is the relationship between creativity, reproduction, and the typology within the context of culture and civilization? How does reproduction in culture differ from cultural (and spiritual) production and creative industries? This subject matter is, in one way or another, rooted in the methodological priorities and strategies related to the understanding of the more fundamental philosophical and cultural categories of culture and civilization.

In his works, Petrov used the *semiotic criterion* (personal-name, professional-name, and universal-name sociocodes) to construct a cultural-civilizational typology and at times, unfortunately, reproduced the banal "archaic – traditionalism – modernization" scheme. One can

make other critical remarks about Petrov's philosophical and cultural constructions. Let's highlight one particular aspect: he recognized that his contributions were not merely confined to introducing novel terminology. Instead, he formulated his concepts as unformalized ideas imbued with existential and metaphorical significances. This was, in part, attributable to their verbal (discursive) component and a polemical stance against scientific dogmatism.

Apart from the semiotics of sociocodes, fruitful (with some modification) for creating a cultural and civilizational typology and identifying the place of cultural creativity in human history are Petrov's ideas about the ritualization of culture as a sound foundation of cultural ontology: "Ritual, the bond of wholeness as such, appears to be a natural and universal relationship that is represented in our consciousness by a universal category" (Petrov, 1992, p. 9-10). Upon a cumulative reading of Petrov's works, it becomes clear that Petrov's research method focuses on the examination of cultural diversity, emphasizing the inertial and functionally stabilizing aspects of culture. His approach underlined the inertial, functionally stabilizing aspects of culture, and viewed rituals as a universal integral factor. He recognized the sociocode of culture as a repository of social memory, and the institution of renewal as instrumental in accumulating and transforming innovative ideas and new information into the sociocultural system (Rimskii, 2012). This methodological approach also factored in intergenerational dynamics, a concept that has only recently begun to attract attention from humanities scholars and sociologists.

Rituals, sociocodes, and institutions of renewal materialize in specific sign-semiotic systems, referred to as matrix-texts. These systems facilitate human participation in rituals and incorporate distinctive forms of activity and technology types. These forms are "dominant in this culture and connected in a system of socially necessary practical relations with the world" (Petrov, 1992, p. 11). In our assessment, the system (ritual, sociocode, institution of renewal, semiotic forms, technology) underscored by Petrov as the shaping foundation of diverse cultural types aligns with the conceptualization of civilization.

We perceive civilization as an integrated entity, the universal foundation of which consists of historically-specific types of sociocultural technologies. These technologies manifest as meaningful, reproductive methods of action embodied in semiotic systems and sociocodes. They also include institutions responsible for the dissemination of innovation and social memory (information matrices), forms of rationality (knowledge and their applied technologies), and unique mental-anthropological structures influencing human behavior in both mundane and social contexts.

Different production methods combine technologies that both conserve the heritage of previous civilizations and potentially incorporate technological novelties, often in the form of volatile growths that presage future modes of production. This includes spiritual production and cultural and creative industries. Sociocultural technologies encoded within semiotic systems become the vectors of specific rationality types. These types, as formal-ideal structures, can be utilized across different cultural types, thereby forming a civilizational mechanism for continuity, reproduction, and the connection between cultural-civilizational worlds.

This perspective facilitates a clear demarcation between civilization and culture: civilization, as a socio-cultural aggregate, serves as a universal, reproductive foundation for distinctive cultures, each exhibiting diverse spatial, temporal, and ethnocultural characteristics. These cultures serve as venues for the realization of creative innovation, which bears unique relevance and individuality. Over time, these facets of creation-creativity solidify into the universality and shared significance of creativity-reproduction, or social technology-innovation.

3. Conclusion

The proposed operational instrumental methodology of cultural-civilizational typology and our definition of technological (reproductive) and creative innovations based on the development of Petrov's ideas show us that the *dialectical principle of separation and juxtaposition* (exclusion and inclusion) of creative creation and creative reproduction human activities in cultural and spiritual production is embedded in the mechanisms of the dialectic of culture and civilization and has been present throughout the cultural history of humanity. Then the cultural and creative industries themselves are products of the civilization of modernity, generating and reproducing industrial spiritual production in the products of mass culture.

References

- Adorno, T.; Horkheimer, M. **Dialektika Prosveshcheniia. Filosofskie Fragmenty** [Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments]. Transl. by M. Kuznetsov. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Medium, Iuventa, 1997.
- Bourdieu, P. Fieldwork in philosophy. In: **Choses Dites**. Paris: Minuit, 1987.
- Foucault, M. **L'archéologie du Savoir**. Paris: Gallimard, 1969.
- Foucault, M. **Histoire de la Folie a l'Age Classique**. Paris: Gallimard, 1972.
- Foucault, M. Le sujet et le pouvoir. In: **Dits et Ecrits. Vol. IV: 1980-1988**. Paris: Gallimard, 1994. p. 222-223.
- Foucault, M. **L'herméneutique du Sujet. Cours au Collège de France (1981-1982)**. Paris: Seuil/Gallimard, 2001.
- Heidegger, M. **Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit: Mit einem Brief über den Humanismus**. Bern: A. Francke AG, 1947. p. 53-119.
- Heidegger, M. **Heraklit. 1. Der Anfang des Abendlandischen Denkens. 2. Logik. Heraklits Lehre vom Logos**. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1979.
- Heidegger, M. **Parmenides**. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1982.
- Hezmondalsch, D. **Kulturnye Industrii** [Cultural Industries]. Transl. from English by I. Kushnareva, scientific ed. by A. Mikhaleva. Moscow: Higher School of Economics Publishing House, 2014.
- Latour, B. **Pasteur: Guerre et Paix des Microbes Suivi de Irréductions Éditions**. Paris: A.-M. Metailie, 1984.
- Latour, B. Les “vues” de l’esprit: Une introduction à l’anthropologie des sciences et des techniques. **Culture Technique**, v. 14, p. 4-30, 1985.
- Mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal issledovaniia kulture** [International Journal of Cultural Research], v. 1, n. 26, 2017 (thematic issue “Kulturnye industrii” [cultural industries]) [Electronic resource]. Available at: <https://old.culturalresearch.ru/ru/archives/108--126->
- Petrov, M. K. Nekotorye problemy organizatsii nauki v epokhu nauchno-tekhnicheskoi revoliutsii [Some problems of the organization of science in the era of scientific and technological revolution]. **Voprosy filosofii**, n. 10, p. 36-45, 1968.
- Petrov, M. K. **Iazyk, Znak, Kultura** [Language, Sign, Culture]. Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

Petrov, M.K. **Samosoznanie i Nauchnoe Tvorchestvo** [Self-Consciousness and Scientific Creativity]. Rostov-non-Don: Publishing House of Rostov University, 1992.

Petrov, M. K. **Iskusstvo i Nauka; Piraty Egeiskogo Moria i Lichnost** [Art and Science; Pirates of the Aegean and Personality]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1995.

Petrov, M. K. **Istoriko-Filosofskie Issledovaniia** [Historical and Philosophical Studies]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1996.

Petrov, M. K. **Antichnaia Kultura** [Antique Culture]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997.

Petrov, M. K. **Istoriia Evropeiskoi Kulturnoi Traditsii i ee Problemy** [History of the European Cultural Tradition and its Problems]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004.

Petrov, M. K. **Filosofskie Problemy "Nauki o Nauke". Predmet Sotsiologii Nauki** [Philosophical Problems of the "Science of Science". The Subject of Sociology of Science]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2006.

Petrov, M. K. **Problemy Determinizma v Drevnegrecheskoi Filosofii Klassicheskogo Perioda** [Problems of Determinism in Ancient Greek Philosophy of the Classical Period]. Rostov-on-Don: Southern Federal University, 2015.

Rimskii, V. P. **Demony na Perepute: Kulturno-Istoricheskii Obraz Totalitarizma** [Demons at the Crossroads: The Cultural and Historical Image of Totalitarianism]. Belgorod: Belgorod State University, 2007.

Rimskii, V. P. Kontsept "innovatsii" v filosofii kultury [The concept of "innovation" in the philosophy of culture]. In: Nikolsky, S. A. (Ed.) **Problemy Filosofii Kultury**. Moscow: Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2012. p. 138-152.

Rimskii, V. P. Editor. **Uchrezhdaiushchaia Diskursivnost Mikhaila Petrova: Intellektual v Interere Kulturnogo Kapitala: Monografia** [Mikhail Petrov's Establishing Discursiveness: The Intellectual in the Interior of Cultural Capital: Monograph]. Moscow: Kanon+ ROOI "Reabilitatsiia", 2017.