



Share this: Facebook Twitter Reddit LinkedIn WhatsApp This essay will attempt a brief review of the concept 'culture' and its relationship with the concept s, without making any claims towards offering anything new in the analysis of the chronological account of how the definition of culture changed over time. Instead, the essay will attempt to explore the harmonies and dis-harmonies in the utilization of the two concepts, as a way of coming to terms with immanent ruptures and continuities which were explicated in various ways in which the logic and lexicon of these concepts were deployed in the different anthropological traditions over the years. From the outset, I would like to mention that I almost abandoned this particular topic because of the difficulties I encountered in finding a concise definition of, mainly the concept of 'culture'. When, after several weeks of reading, it finally dawned on me that actually there was none, it all started to make sense - that the concept of 'culture'. subject of defining the concept of 'culture' has never been closed and was never intended for foreclosure. This meant that understanding how the concept was variously deployed was as important as appreciating the manner of its deployment, especially in ways in which this was always associated with the concept of civilization, whose definition was more straightforward. The notion of Culture: Following a very unsuccessful search for a concise definition of the concept 'culture' was one of the few very complicated concepts to have ever graced the English language (Armstrong, 2010: 1; Eagleton, 2006: 1; Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). Culture was a very difficult concept to define because the evolution of its etymology and its deployment varied in America and in etymological terms, its contemporary usage has its origin in attempts to describe man's relationship with nature, through a process of labor, for example, through crop farming and livestock production (Eagleton, 2006: 1). It was in this sense that the concept was first formally deployed in the 19th century in Germany, where the word culture was heavily influenced by Kant, who, like his followers, spelled the word as culture, and used it repeatedly to mean 'cultivation' or 'becoming cultured', which subsequently became the initial meaning of civilization (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 10). The way the concept was first used in modern English borrowed from the usage first made of the word by Walter Taylor, which dates back to 1871, although according to Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952: 9), Taylor's use of the word culture, which was borrowed from German, was similar to the way the word civilization was used in Germany. The above sense in which the concept culture was for long deployed depicted it as an activity or occupation that entailed a materialist dimension related to the extraction of resources from nature. the word culture no longer refers primarily to the process of cultivation, but more generally as a manifestation of customs, beliefs and forms of government (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 10). The latter sense signifies some abstraction to the transcendent and divine realm of spiritualism. Over time, the concept was also deployed in other ways that depicted it as an entity (Eagleton, 2006: 1). There was also a sense in which the concept of culture also depicted the transformation that took place in society's experiences with changing technologies of production as capitalism developed, although this understanding was quite often deployed in racist terms to differentiate between less industrialized nations of the non-west from the more industrialized European societies. It is true, as observed by Eagleton that the relationship between nature which changes nature' (Eagleton, 2006: 3). In this sense, there is a part of nature that is cultural, and another that is not. The part of nature which is cultural is that part which labor transforms, for example, into works of art, monuments, skyscrapers (or building structures) or cities. Such products of culture are as 'natural as rural idylls are cultural' (Eagleton, 2006: 4). Because culture are as 'natural as rural idylls are culture originally meant 'cultivation', or managing the growth of crops, which means 'husbandry', the cultural therefore would imply that which was within ones means to change. As pointed out by Eagleton (2006: 4), 'the stuff to be altered has its own autonomous existence, which then lends it something of the recalcitrance of nature' in much the same way as the extent to which culture transforms nature and also influences the rigorous limits nature imposes on the culturel project. To this extent, I am in agreement with Eagleton (2006: 4-5) that the idea of culture as an embodiment of autonomous spiritualism; and, on the other, as an interpretation of culture is an organic (biological) determinism; and, on the other, as an interpretation of culture as an embodiment of autonomous spiritualism. rebuffs naturalism and idealism founded in biological determinism by insisting that from the point of view of culture, there was also a represented a refusal of idealism because even the highest-minded human agency had its humble roots in our biology and natural environment. The resulting contradiction from this rejection of naturalism (emanating from organic determinism) and idealism (as a result of autonomy of spirit) led to a contest between making and being made, between rationality and spontaneity' (Eagleton, 2006: 5). Consequently, although the relation between humans and nature in the course of extracting from nature, through which humans change nature to be the most important. This is what is central to understanding the concept of culture, which makes it possible to view it as a systematic way of life and living, that humans consciously develop that is transferred from the past to the present and into the future. It depicts some semblance of historically assembled normative values and principles internal to social organizations through which a diversity of relationships are ordered. In this way, it is possible to see how culture becomes an abstraction of itself, in its own right, which does not reify culture as a thing as this essentializes culture. I am inclined to agree with Armstrong (2010: 2) in her definition, which presents culture more as a process of meaning making which informs our sense of who we are, how we want to be perceived and how others perceive us. The above said, we also need to recognize that while culture is important, it is also not the only factor that shapes social relations between humans in the course of impacting on nature in ways that change it. Several other social, economic, political, historical and physical factors come into play. It is necessary to recognize that culture, which embodies as much as it conceals its specific history, politics and economics; is, as also pointed out by Franz Boaz , not inert. It is an inherently Boasian conception to view culture as extremely dynamic; as having life, and existing in a continuous state of flux, as new notions of and about culture continues to emerge. This means that cultures cannot be expected to be static and homogenous. As new cultures emerge, tensions are usually generated. The totality of any culture cannot be understood if taken out of its general setting. Likewise, culture cannot also be conceived as controlled by a single set of conditions (Benedict, 1934: xv). It is also Franz Boaz who noted that culture is some form of standardized or normative behavior. An individual. Culture has a materiality that makes it manifest in diverse patterns implying that it meaningless to try and generalize or homogenize about cultural patterns (Benedict, 1934: xvi). Thinking of culture as socially constructed networks of meaning that distinguish one group from another implies not only a rejection of social evolution but also an endorsement of 'cultural relativism', which is also a Boasian tradition. Boaz rightly argued that perspectives that view culture in evolutionary terms tend to end with the construction of a unified picture of the history of culture as a single and homogenous unit, and as an individual historical problem is extremely problematic (Benedict, 1934: xv). I consider the distinctive life-ways of different people as the most basic understanding of the notion of culture. 'Cultural relativity' is a recognition that different people have culture, also has a complex etymology. By 1694, the French were already using the verb civilization; The notion of civilization, like culture, also has a complex etymology. By 1694, the French were already using the verb civilization, like culture, also has a complex etymology. By 1694, the French were already using the verb civilization, like culture, also has a complex etymology. By 1694, the French were already using the verb civilization, like culture, also has a complex etymology. By 1694, the French were already using the verb civilization etymology. By 1694, the French were already using the verb civilization etymology. referred to the polishing of manners, rendering sociable, or becoming urbane as a result of city life (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 11). The French notion of civilization referred to the achievement of human advancement manifest in certain customs and standards of living. that took place over centuries (Elliot, 2002). The English lagged behind the French. In 1773, Samuel Johnson still excluded civilization (from the word civilization from his dictionary, preferring civilization deriving it from the verb to civilize and associated it with the notion of civilization as: "A developed or advanced state of human society; a particular stage or type of this" (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 12). By the 18th century, the word civilization in German was associated with the spread by the state of political developments akin to the German state to peoples of other nations. It was somewhat similar to the English verb to civilization invoked an imperial political agenda that was apparent in the way they deployed the concept. The harmony and dis-harmonies in deployment of concepts of culture and civilization: The evolutionary thinking about culture and civilization in the philosophy of Durkheim: Among the scholars who attempted a very rigorous narrative intended to distinguish between culture and civilization was final civilization was final civilization in the philosophy of Durkheim. with the complex division of labor and associated behavioral changes that occurred with the industrial revolution in England, Durkheim, argued that inside modern industry, jobs were demarcated and extremely specialized, and while each product was a specialty, it entailed the existence of others in form of the labor they input into its production. As society evolved from agriculture to industry, so did culture of the pre-industrial era give way to civilization associated with the conditions of progress in human societies. Durkheim extended the concept of division of labor from Economics to organisms and society, from which its association with culture was derived, arguing that the more specialized an organism's functions were, the more exalted a place it occupied in the animal hierarchy. For Durkheim, the extent of division of labor in society influenced the direction between culture as a preserve of the pre-modern mediaeval society and civilization as belonging to the modern industrial societies, where social bonds were based on customs and norms, this solidarity was mechanical while in the industrial societies, which were highly individualistic, the solidarity was organic, and social bonds were maintained by contracts which regulated relations between highly individualistic beings. To Durkheim, societies transition from relatively simple pre-modern societies to relatively more complex industrial societies to relatively more complex industrial societies transition from relatively simple pre-modern societies to relatively more complex industrial societies to relatively simple pre-modern societies to relatively more complex industrial societies (Durkheim, 1984: 3). influenced the moral constitution of societies by creating moral rules for human conduct that influenced social order in ways that made industrial societies distinct from the pre-industrial ones. It created a civilized, individual man, capable of being interested in everything but attaching himself exclusively to nothing, able to savor everything and understand everything, found the means to combine and epitomize within himself the finest aspects of civilization. For Durkheim, tradition and custom, collectively defined as culture were the basis of distinction of the simpler societies, according to Durkheim. were characterized civilization (Durkheim, 1984: 3-4). Durkheim advanced an essentially Darwinian argument. In the biological determinism of Durkheim, it is argued that the shift from mechanical to organic solidarity was comparable to the changes that appeared on the evolutionary scale. Relatively simple organisms showing only minimal degrees of internal differentiation ceded place to more highly differentiated organisms whose functional specialization allowed them to exploit more efficiently the resources of the ecological niche in which they happened to be placed. The more specialization allowed them to exploit more efficiently the resources of the ecological niche in which they happened to be placed. value. In similar ways, the more differentiated a society, the higher its chances to exploit the maximum of available resources, and hence the higher its efficiency in procuring indispensable means of subsistence in a given territory (Durkheim, 1984: xvi). There were fundamental contradictions in the perspectives of Durkheim. If Durkheim denigrated culture to the pre-modern, and viewed society as developing in evolutionary terms to the industrial, it could be assumed that he also believed that the solidarity which was associated with the industrial society was better. modern capitalist society? Durkheim did not believe that the pathological features of the industrial society were caused by transitional difficulties that could be overcome through the emergence of new norms and values in the institutional setting of a new corporate organization of industrial affairs (Durkheim, 1984: xxi). For Durkheim, the flaws in industrial society and were associated with the structure of capitalist society would be overcome by the emergence of a new corporate society in which relations between employees were harmonized. Beholden to none of the political and social orientations of his day, Durkheim always attempted to look for a balanced middle way (Durkheim, 1984: xxii). The contemporary play of relationships between culture and civilization has, to say the least, rendered wanting, the ideas which were advanced by Durkheim. For example, if culture is a preserve of the pre-modern, what explains the pervasiveness of barbarism within civilization? Or are societies that are said to possess culture devoid of civilization? The contradictions in the etymology and deployment of concepts of culture' and 'civilization' in terms of the other. 'Culture' was a particular state or stage of advancement in civilization. 'Civilization' was called advancement or a state of social culture. In both popular and literary English, they were often treated as near synonyms, though 'civilization' was sometimes restricted to 'advanced' or 'high' cultures (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 13). As early as the 1950's, there were some writers who were inclined to regard civilization as the culture of urbanized societies characterized by cities. Often, civilization was considered a preserve for literate cultures, for instance, while the Chinese had civilization was considered a preserve for literate culture of urbanized societies characterized by cities. between civilization and culture made in the past was different from that made in the German language. In German, civilization, while the English expression sometimes included psychic, moral, and spiritual phenomena (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 13). The German Kultur also referred to material civilization, while culture in English over time came to mean something entirely different, which corresponded to the humanities. The German Kultur also related to the term civilization denoted a stage of advancement higher than savagery or barbarism. These stages in advancement in civilization were even popularly known as stages of culture; implying that the word culture was used synonymous with the German Kultur (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 13). In English, 'culture' was a condition or achievement possessed by society. It was not individual. The English phrase 'a cultured person' did not employ the term in the German sense. There was a sense of non-specificity in the way in which the concept 'culture' ('Kultur') was deployed in reference to 'civility'; then in the 18th century, it became more or less synonymous with 'civilization', in the sense of a general process of intellectual, spiritual and material progress. In Europe, civilization as an idea was equated to manners and morals. To be civilized included not spitting on the carpet as well as not decapitating one's prisoners of war. The very word implied a dubious correlation between mannerly conduct and ethical behavior, which in England was equated to the word 'gentleman'. As a synonym of 'civilization', 'culture' belonged to the general spirit of Enlightenment, with its cult of secular, progressive self-development (Eagleton, 2006: 9). Form my reading of the literature on this subject, it was not clear at what point culture and civilization begun to be deployed interchangeably. Suffice to mention, however, that in English, as in French, the word culture was not unconditionally interchangeable with civilization, which predated the other, they both shared a transcendental association with the notion of cultivation, as something which is done to (or changes in) humans in the course of exacting labor upon nature to change it, that leads to the development of human qualities to suit the needs of collective humanity. Culture, which emerged in German from the notion of Kultur, which emerged in German from the notion of Kultur, which emerged is a form of universal subjectivity at work within the particularistic realm of our separate individualities. For Eagleton (2006: 8), it was a view of culture as a component of civilization which was neither dissociated from society nor wholly at one with it. This kind of focus also portrayed an essentially Kantian notion of man as becoming civilized by an essentially Kantian notion of man as becoming civilized by a component of civilized by a c attaining a variety of social graces and refinements (or decencies), in which the state had a role to play. This Kantian conception therefore distinguished between being cultivated and being cultivated referred to intrinsic improvement of the person, while being cultivated and being cultivated referred to interpersonal relations), some kind of ethical pedagogy which served to liberate the collective self buried in every individual into a political citizen (Eagleton, 2006: 7; Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952: 11). There was a sense in which the concept of civilization had an overwhelming French connection (coming from the concept civilizer), in the same way culture was associated with the Germans (from the concept Kultur). To be described as civilized was associated by the French with finesse with regards to social, political, economic and technical aspects life. For the Germans, 'culture' had a more narrowly religious, artistic and intellectual reference. From this point of view, Eagleton (2006: 9) was right when he observed that: (i) 'civilization' was deployed in a manner that played down national differences, while 'culture' and 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that: 'civilization' had much to do with the rivalry between Germany and France. I am reminded here of Eagleton's famous phrase that had betwe culture was stereotypically German' (Eagleton, 2006: 10-11). Towards the end of the 19th century civilization and culture were invariably viewed as antonyms. If, however, the description by Eagleton (2006: 9) of French notion of civilization as a form of social refinement is acceptable, then one can also accept Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952: 14) description of civilization as a process of ennobling (or 'creating nobility') of humanity through the exercise by society of increased control of the elementary human impulses. This makes civilization a form of politics. In the same light, I also agree with Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952: 14) that culture's German connections link it with the control of nature through science and art, which means culture embodies technology (including equipment) as well as knowledge systems (including skills) relevant for subduing and employing nature. The implication, can not be looked at as antonyms or binary opposites, in the sense in which evolution theorists would want us to view the relationship between these two concepts - with culture as being akin to an inferior status while civilization is ascribed to the superior; (b) both tend to depict not only elements of normativity in advance in life-forms, but also constantly improving internal conditions of the internal elements of these concepts that define humanity which they embody. There is a way in which the elements depicted by these two concepts, for example, their association with politics, art, technology and urban living, there is a sense in which both concepts cannot be viewed as stages of development one from the other. It appears to me that Eagleton viewed civilization as a value-judgmental concept that pre-supposed an improvement on what went before, to whatever was not only right, but a great deal better than what was (Eagleton, 2006: 10). Eagleton was also non-presumptive when he pointed out that historically, the deployment of the term put it within the lexicon of a pre-industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile and early industrial European middle class, which used the concept to justify imperial ambitions of mercantile ambiting ambitions of mercantile ambitions of mercantil concept when the concept is deployed today. Culture on the other hand, required certain social conditions that bring men into complex relationships with natural resources. The state becomes a necessity. Cultivation was a matter of the harmonious, all-round development of the personality. could do this in isolation, this helped to shift culture from its individual to its social meaning. Culture had a social dimension (Eagleton, 2006: 10). Whichever was, between culture and civilization, the progenitor of the other, there is a dual sense in which these concepts appear linked by their enlightenment era roots; and also not linked at the same time. I agree with Eagleton that "civilization sounds abstract, alienated, fragmented, mechanistic, utilitarian, in thrall to a crass faith in material progress; while culture seems holistic, organic, sensuous, autotelic and recollective". However, I have reservations with Eagleton's postulation of, first, a conflict between culture and civilization, and secondly, presentation of this conflict as a manifestation of a quarrel between tradition and modernity (Eagleton, 2006: 11). One of the greatest exports from the Enlightenment rea was its universalism. Post-enlightenment political philosophy contributed significantly to critiques of enlightenment of the greatest exports from the Enlightenment political philosophy contributed significantly to critiques of enlightenment era was its universalism. universal humanity. We can look at the discourse of culture as a contribution to understanding the diversity inherent in different life-forms with their specific drivers of growth. Increasingly, it had become extremely perilous to relativize non-European cultures, which some thinkers of the time idealized as 'primitive' (Eagleton, 2006: 12). In the 20th century in the primitivist features of modernism, a primitivism which goes hand-in-hand with the growth of modern culture, which now plays the expressive, spontaneous, quasi-utopian role which 'primitive' cultures had played previously (Eagleton, 2006: 12). While todate the concepts 'civilization' and 'culture' continue to be used interchangeably, there is also still deployed almost as the opposite of civility (Eagleton, 2006: 13). It is not uncommon to encounter culture being used in reference to that which is tribal as opposed to the cosmopolitan. Culture continues closed to rational criticism; and a way of describing the life-forms of 'savages' rather than a term for the civilized. If we accept the fact that 'the savages' have culture, then the primitives can be depicted as cultured and the civilized as uncultured. In this imperial Modern states plundered the pre-modern ones, for whatever reasons, is it not a statement of both being uncultured and lack of civilization, on one hand, and civilization as culture, on the other hand, help to resolve the impasse in the contemporary deployment of these concepts? One fact is clear, either way; it has potential to breed 'postmodern' ambiguities of cultural relativism (Eagleton, 2006: 14). Alternatively, if culture is viewed, not as civilization, but as a way of life, it simply becomes an affirmation of sheer existence of life-forms in their pluralities (Eagleton, 2006: 13). Pluralizing the concept of culture begins to entertain culturel forms. Rather than dissolving discrete identities, it multiplies them rather than hybridization. which as we know, and as Edward Said observed, all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and non-monolithic (Eagleton, 2006: 15). Attempts to valorize culture as a representation of particular life-forms associated with civility can also be perilous. There is a postmodern sense in which culture can be considered as an intellectual activity (science, philosophy and scholarship), as well as an 'imaginative' pursuit of such exploits as music, painting and literature. This is the sense in which 'cultured' people are considered to have culture. longer be regarded as creative or imaginative. This also suggests that 'civilized' values are to be found only in fantasy. And this is clearly a caustic comment on social reality. Culture comes to mean learning and the arts, activities confined to a tiny proportion of humanity, and it at once becomes impoverished as a concept (Eagleton, 2006: 16). Concluding Remarks: From the foregoing analyses, it is clear that understanding the relationship between culture and civilization is impossible until we cease to view the world in binaries in which the West (Europe) was constructed as advanced and developed with the non-West perceived as primitive, barbarous and pagan. Historically, the West's claim of supremacy was always predicated on their provincialization of the non-west, whose behavioral patterns were judged from the experience of the West, and characterized in generalized terms as traditional customs and therefore culture. I agree with Benedict, that the West did all it could to universalize its experience to the rest of the world even when this experience was different from the non-west (Benedict, 1934: 5). Assumptions of the mutual exclusivity of culture and beliefs. Religion was always used in the West to posit a generalized provincialism of the non-west. It was the basis of prejudices around which superiority was justified. No ideas or institutions that held in the other. Rather all institutions were seen in opposing terms according as they belonged to one or the other. Rather all institutions were seen in opposing terms according as they belonged to one or the other. financial brands set themselves apart through visual storytelling? Our experts explain how.Learn MoreThe Motorsport Images CollectionS captures events from 1895 to today's most recent coverage.Discover The CollectionS captures events from 1895 to today's most recent coverage. brands set themselves apart through visual storytelling? Our experts explain how.Learn MoreThe Motorsport Images Collections captures events from 1895 to today's most recent coverage.Discover The CollectionCurated, compelling, and worth your time. Explore our latest gallery of Editors' Picks.Browse Editors' FavoritesHow can financial brands set themselves apart through visual storytelling? Our experts explain how.Learn MoreThe Motorsport Images Collections captures events from 1895 to today's most recent coverage.Discover The CollectionCurated, compelling, and worth your time. Explore our latest gallery of Editors' Picks.Browse Editors' Favorites This chapter tries to explain the difference between "Culture" and "Civilization," because without understanding the meaning of each concept and how they relate to each other, the evolvement of history and the fates of civilizations and cultures and societies would not be understood correctly. Institutional subscriptions Specialized workers were another sign of development. Because people were no longer busy following their food as nomadic hunter-gatherers, they had more time on their hands. This meant that they had the time to develop specialized skills. For instance, some city dwellers became artisans. An artisan is a skilled worker who makes goods by hand. Artisans were known for making pottery, clothes, baskets works of art, etc., and they played an important role in early civilization because their wide range of crafts helped cities to become centers of trade. Complex institutions developed naturally because a civilization meant that lots of people were living in one area. City populations were soaring, which meant that people needed a system of ruling, or government to keep order. Leaders of civilizations eventually emerged so that they could create and enforce laws. Before civilization, religious beliefs, as was seen in cave paintings. However, in early civilization, religious beliefs as was seen in cave paintings. from religion to rules. In this time, record keeping extended far beyond pictures. In Mesopotamia, Sumerians developed a writing system called scribes. Scribes would keep records of important information such as the names of rulers, laws, and important historical events on these clay tablets. Technology continued to advance in early civilization. For hunting, it went beyond using the potter's wheel for the first time. With the potter's wheel, artisans were able to make jugs, plates, and bowls. By 2500 BCE, metalworkers in Sumer produced thousands of bronze spearheads. Just imagine how much time was saved by the development of such technology. The first civilizations saw a way of life almost entirely different from the prehistoric era. Agriculture, financial systems, religion, law, and technology all defined a new way of human life. When we think about the world around us, two words often come to mind: culture and civilization. These terms are frequently used interchangeably, yet they represent two distinct aspects of human society. people, while civilization refers to the material and technological advancements they achieve. Understanding the difference between these two concepts is essential in exploring how societies evolve and develop. In this blog, we will trace the evolution of both culture and civilization, highlighting how they complement each other in shaping the world we live in. Table of Contents Culture can be described as the collective identity of a group, shaped by shared beliefs, values, practices, traditions, language, and arts. It is the foundation upon which a society builds its emotional and intellectual connections. Culture is intangible but immensely powerful, influencing everything from religion and philosophy to everyday social interactions. The essence of culture lies in its ability to define what a society holds dear and how individuals within that society view the world around them. The Core Elements include Language: Language is not just a tool for communication; it carries a society's worldview, values, and history. Through language, cultural knowledge is passed down through generations. Beliefs and Religion and belief systems are central to many cultures, offering moral frameworks and explaining the universe's mysteries. These systems shape rituals, customs, and ethical values. Art and Aesthetics: Art forms such as music, painting, literature, and dance reflect the soul of a culture are critical to its functioning. Customs can include everything from marriage rituals to how individuals greet one another. Values and Ethics: A society's values dictate what is considered right or wrong, moral or immoral. These values influence everything from laws to social expectations. Culture and Its Connection to Identity At its core, culture is about identity—both collective and individual. For example, a person who belongs to a specific ethnic group or nation is influenced by the cultural traditions, language, and beliefs that define that group. The rituals, music, and art forms that are passed down through generations serve to reinforce a shared sense of belonging. and place within the world. What is Civilization? While culture deals with the spiritual, intellectual, and moral side of a society, civilization focuses on the material and technological advancements that enable a society to function in the modern world. economy, politics, and infrastructure. Unlike culture, which often evolves slowly over time, civilization tends to undergo rapid transformations, especially in response to technological innovation and external factors. The Core Components of Civilization involves the creation of complex systems and institutions that govern how people interact with each other and with their environment. Some of the key elements include: Technology: Technology: Technology: Technology: Technology is perhaps the most defining feature of civilization. From the invention of the wheel to the creation of the creat structures that make up a society, such as cities, roads, and bridges, are part of its civilization. These physical structures support daily life and commerce. Political institutions, such as governments, laws, and organizations, is a hallmark of civilization. These systems provide the framework for governance and social order. Economy: The economic systems that societies develop are key to their functioning. This includes trade, production, and distribution of goods, as well as the creation of wealth and resources. Social Organization: Civilizations rely on complex social structures, including classes, castes, or hierarchies, to organize the people within them and maintain social stability. Technological Innovation and Its Impact on Civilization to the industrial revolution, technological innovations have allowed civilizations to thrive and expand. These innovations not only support the material needs of a society but also shape its culture. For instance, the invention of the printing press led to the spread of literacy, which in turn had a profound impact on culturel and civilization are interconnected, they differ in terms of their focus and the way they manifest in society. To better understand these distinctions, let's explore some of the key differences between the two: 1. Focus: Spiritual vs. Material The most significant differences between the two: beliefs, values, language, and art. It shapes how people think, feel, and interact with one another on an emotional and intellectual level. Civilization, on the other hand, is focused on material advancements and the creation of systems that support human society—technology, infrastructure, politics, and economics. 2. Expression: Ideas vs. Physical Structures Culture expresses itself through ideas and creative forms of expression, such as literature, music, and rituals. Civilization, in contrast, is expressed through physical structures and institutions—such as buildings, roads, and governments—that organize and sustain the material aspects of life. 3. Development: Gradual vs. Rapid Change Culture evolves slowly, often shaped by generations of beliefs, practices, and traditions. Civilization, however, is often marked by rapid changes, particularly in response to technological innovations or societal shifts. For instance, the rise of the digital age has transformed civilization at an unprecedented speed, while cultural shifts in language or art tend to unfold more gradually. 4. Interdependence: Culture Shapes Civilization, and Vice Versa Despite their differences, culture and civilization are deeply intertwined. The development of civilization, and Vice Versa Despite their differences, culture and civilization are deeply intertwined. and transformed cultural exchanges across the world. On the other hand, culture influences how civilization develops; a society's values, ethics, and beliefs shape its political systems, economy, and social structures. In this way, the relationship between culture and civilization is symbiotic—they evolve together, each influencing the other in profound ways. Historical Examples: How Culture and Civilization Evolved Together Throughout history, we can see the ways in which culture and civilization The Ancient Greek are a prime example of how culture and civilization develop together. Greek civilization, with its remarkable advances in democracy, philosophy, and science, was built upon a foundation of deep cultural traditions in art, mythology, and religious practices. Greek philosophers like Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle shaped not only Greek civilization but also the cultural ideas that influenced the Western world for centuries. The Greco-Roman civilization combined technological advancements—such as architecture, engineering, and governance—with a rich cultural tradition that continues to influence Western culture today. The Industrial Revolution In the development in the development of civilization. It brought about groundbreaking technological innovations, such as the steam engine, mass production, and urbanization. These material advancements drastically changed the way people lived and worked. However, alongside these changes, cultural shifts also occurred, including the rise of new social movements, changes in family structures, and the birth of new forms of art and literature that reflected the challenges and opportunities of industrialized society. Conclusion, while culture and civilization are distinct in their focus—one dealing with the spiritual and intellectual aspects of society, the other with material and technological progress—they are inextricably linked. The evolution of one influences the development of the other, and together they shape the world we live in. Understanding the relationship between culture and civilization allows us to appreciate not just the technological advancements that have defined modern life, but also the rich, intellectual, and moral traditions that give meaning to our existence. What do you think? How do you think technological advancements in the 21st century will affect cultural roots? The earliest civilizations developed in river valleys because the land there was good for farming. One of the earliest civilizations formed in Mesopotamia. This land was between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in what is now Iraq. People first started settling there in about 2500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 2500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce. It is now known as ancient Egypt. By about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce a civilization had formed in the valley of the Indus River in about 4500 bce a civil This was located around what is now the border between India and Pakistan. Ancient Chinese civilization developed by about the 1700s bce along the banks of the Huang He, or Yellow River. Download chapter PDF This article aims to show the differences between social engineering and socio-cultural design both in their purposes and in their cognitive tools. The differences in the philosophical principles underlying these two forms of design are analysed. It is argued that the differences here are the following: technology is not a simple means to achieve people's goals, but a form of world outlook and a way of organizing life activity; the new is not an improved old, but a fundamentally different socio-cultural design uses schemes for analyzing situations, for constructive, for constructive and cons qualities of social objects. The key idea of the theses is that design always takes place in a specific socio-cultural environment, so successful social transformation and construction of the very subjects of design. The success of the project depends on the common intentions of the designer and the project user developed in the process of communication.Keywords: Social engineering first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changesing first appeared in the 1920s (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changes (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changes (S. and B. Webb, R. Pound, K. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changes (S. and B. Webb, R. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changes (S. and B. Webb, R. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changes (S. and B. Webb, R. Popper) and back then, denoted gradual, step-by-step changes (S. and B. Webb, R. Popper) approximate (S. and B. Webb, R. and S. Web Social engineering is aimed at the search for technological means and ways of implementing ideals and goals. Popper emphasised the active and rationalistic nature of human action, that man is the master of his own destiny and that any goal can be set and, most importantly, implemented (Popper, 1992). Social engineering seeks to link social ideals and the rationalistic thinking, to find ways to harmonise science and morality. However, the XXth century saw increasing failures in the implementation of a viable project is the concurrence of the intention and the plan of both the designer and the user of this design, which requires an inter-subjective understanding of the situation. Therefore, socio-cultural design, along with the technical and morphological patterns of a different type: situation analysis patterns of the object design, develops patterns of the object design. between a social engineering construct and a socio-cultural project consists in the fact that the latter contains the semantic component of the project, development of a device to implement sense. Socio-cultural design is based on a different sense is only an infrastructure component of the project, development of the model of the future. In a socio-cultural project, a technical construct is only an infrastructure component of the project, development of a device to implement sense. design philosophy, the main principles of which are: 1) reflection on the value bases and impacts of the project, 2) the doctrine of public involvement: public particular, in the rejection of the project solutions. This new design philosophy manifested itself, in particular, in the rejection of the project solutions. idea that there exists a "rational" city. City design saw a transition from a functional to environmental approach. The Russian theory and practice have developed two most advanced approaches to socio-cultural design: problem-oriented (Dridze, 1994) and subject-oriented (thesaurus) (Lukov, 2003). The problem-oriented approach is based on the postulate that different actors of socio-cultural design understand a situation in different ways, and social projects should aim to develop diverse samples of solutions for both current and future social projects should aim to develop diverse samples of solutions for both current and future social projects should aim to develop diverse samples of solutions for both current actors are not identical, yet when making a decision both should be considered. It is about the role of sociologists in the implementation of the so-called doctrine of social participation, i.e. "participation, i.e. "participation, i.e." and gradually involving more people with their "different motivations" for criteria for assessing social situations and socially significant decisions" (Dridze, 1994). It seems that the internal policy based on the doctrine of social participation is the only possible way to social integration in our society today. In the context of this methodology, a socio-cultural project can be an engineering urban development project, a company or a territory development program, a plan to reorganize the administrative and management structure of an enterprise, modification of the old or development of new legal acts. The difference between socio-cultural and engineering projects here is that socio-cultural projects do not have a local institutional value; they significantly change the habitat of people, affect their dignity and interests, impact the quality and way of life. Accordingly, the theoretical object of socio-cultural design is the multi-dimensional socio-cultural space-time", or the "chronotope". The content of the concept is based on the ideas of Einstein, Minkowski, Ukhtomsky, Bakhtin, Florensky. In socio-cultural design, the chronotope is the unity of the spatial and temporal parameters organized by the sense of the perceiver, simultaneously a spiritual and material reality, the center of which is the person organizing this reality according to their semantic perspective. image of the future is sensitive to semantic means of its construction, and the source of the project is the value system and the thesaurus of its developer. Thesaurus is a semiotically structured idea, image of the surrounding reality expressed by a certain language. "Be it a more advanced architecture of living environment in the neighborhood or a tour for wheelchair users, a new educational project has an initial understanding of the meaning and purpose of the proposed innovation (spontaneously occurring innovations are not social projects); thus, it is based on certain philosophical and sociological concepts of the world and man, even if it is not reflected in documents on the project" (Lukov, 2003). Based on the problem-oriented methodology, an algorithm of problem diagnostics was developed; it includes the following questions: How do different participants of a specific social situation see it? What is the subject area of the problem diagnostics was developed; it includes the following questions: How do different participants of a specific social situation see it? etc.? What will happen (which processes can take place) if the problem is not resolved? What are sample solutions to the problem and how do they differ? What are the possible social and environmental costs and positive results (consequences) of the proposed method of solving the problem? Based on the subject-oriented (thesaurus) approach the phenomenological analysis of projects is used as a method; it includes the following questions: What is the purpose of the project? How can it improve the environment and lifestyles? Who questions the need in the project in its current form, here and now, and why? Whose interests and fates will the project affect and how? Who is the project affect and how? Who is the investor, the executor of the project, and what are their resources? What are the project participants' responsibilities? What negative consequences are possible? How will they be compensated for? Specific differences between social engineering and socio-cultural design can be summarised in ten theses. Thesis 1. Technology is a condition for innovation, but it is more than just a means to achieve human goals: the "technical" is a form of life philosophy and a way of life philosophy and organisation that contains both positive and negative aspects. Existentialist philosophers Martin Heidegger and José Ortega y Gasset elaborated this thesis. Heidegger developed the idea that the essence of technology is not something technical; it does not exist in an artefact, but in the way of reasoning and in the image of the world that emerged in the modern era. According to Heidegger, hypertrophied rationality, confidence in the possibility of implementing any sci-tech project means not only the increased instrumental power of man, but also the weakening of the axiological content of projects. Projects may lack the "call of being", i.e. desire for creative self-fulfilment, self-development, for transcendence as rising above utilitarian needs. This is where man is in danger, for in the awareness of his domination over the world around man, in fact, does not see himself in himself as he is in the power of Gestell, a "supplying production» that makes man risk to reject his free nature. There is a loss of the axiological component of the project This is evident when projects clearly show the predominance of the rational-technical component and the weakening of the axiological one, when calculating representation blocks the horizon of the impact of built environment on the life of man and especially on his definitions of sense and goals. The thing is not limited to its functional utility; it always has a plan as a project of social relations and as sense of a human action. Technology construction begins with the development of an ideal project, a plan for a life form – a form of attitude to the world and man. Control over technology is control over a form of life, over projects of transformation of life; it is a form, method and means of implementing power. Heidegger noted the ability of technical rationality to transform means into goals, to standardise human behaviour and, as a consequence, make man the object of "calculations" (Heidegger, 1993). Ortega y Gasset showed that every human project, every life has its own technology (Ortega y Gasset, 2000). If a man is a creature whose being is something non-existing yet, i.e. a pure project, plan, programme of one's own being, technology is the variable function of the human project, every life has its own technology. times so radically that the so-called "technological advances" were ignored and forgotten. Technology is extremely changeable and unstable as it depends entirely on the representations of prosperity that each historical epoch has. The mission of technology is the liberation of man, granting him an opportunity to fully be himself, but technology is not able to determine the content of life. Thesis 2. Social engineering is the extrapolation of the principles of logic and technical engineering, it is necessary to briefly explain the essence of technical engineering. The idea of engineering is the idea of the embeddedness of natural processes in a technical device (artefact), which allows man to include devices in his own activities and to increase his power immeasurably. The purpose of engineering is to design an artefact that allows the use (application) of a certain objective (natural) process (Gorokhov, 1987). The content of engineering is to find (create) optimal structural and morphological parameters of an artefact (technical construction) for a natural process to occur (Cheshev, 1981). Thus, the methodological parameters of an artefact (technical construction) for a natural process to occur (Cheshev, 1981). prototypes, by samples. Methodological principles of social engineering as an extrapolation of the principles and logic of technical engineering are the following postulates. Firstly, there exist objective phenomena and processes and, therefore, the true and universal laws of building (construction) of new objects. In relation to social actions and objects, there exists the unchanging human nature (man's qualities, needs and goals). Secondly, the scientific and engineer, the demiurge, and social life is a passive object of the demiurge's activities. Thirdly, the new is the improved old. The basis of design innovations in social engineering are: 1) new knowledge (scientific development), 2) new goals (change of ideology). "The scientistic approach to innovation is based on the theses that since things were made, and they can, if you know how they were made, be remade. It is this social engineering idea that inspired Marx, and continues to guide many of today's reformers. But the whole historical experience of social reforms shows that the idea is not correct. Actions of the reformer may be completely paralysed if he does not know and does not understand where to society is moving and how social action participants can behave. conception and implementation of projects" (Rozin, 2002). The belief that major social problems can be solved on the basis of technology is becoming an increasingly destructive moment. Fedotova shows the crucial importance of the definition of the substantive aspect of modernisation transformations, i.e. the discussion of the sense of transformations, of the experience of successful and unsuccessful reforms, their resources, the price of the changes, of the civilisational and cultural restrictions and conditions that allow acting in concert, etc. (Fedotova, 2002). Thesis 3. Methodological shortcomings of social engineering are: the elimination of the population from the design process; attitude to the population as one of the elements of the social system (professional and demographic); administrative (theoretical) designer determines the whole structure of life for the user. Thesis 4. A successful social transformation and new social technology development are essentially impossible without self-consciousness, self-determination and constituting of the subjects of social action. A social action is different from an engineering one as it primarily includes goal-setting based on the determination of the current situation. not concur with the situation, and the objectives and results do not coincide. Thesis 5. Socio-cultural design is designing a new quality of social life rather than a retional construct of an optimal state from the point of view of an expert in any field. In the process of communication, socio-cultural design aims at creating a vision of the future, common to people living together, as a project of a desired and acceptable state of life. A socio-cultural project is not a scientific and rational construct of an optimal state from experts' points of view, but rationalisation of the dream of a better life, reflection on how to translate it into reality with the help of other people. A socio-cultural design. There is a completely new reality no one has ever thought of. It is the idea that the design process as the process of modelling, making of the future state , not the object, is only possible in the dialogue mode. There is a colossal paradigmatic shift in the mindset from "I know best, I can do the best" to "of course, I know something, but I can do something, but I can do the best" to "of course, I know something, but I can do something, but I can do something, but I can do the best" to "of course, I know something, I can do the best" to "of course, I know something, but I can do the best" to "of course, I know something, but I can do something 6. A feature of the space organisation of socio-cultural design is the introduction of the ideology of participation: designing involves the user and other stakeholders. In this, "portraits" of potential users are modelled. In socio-cultural design, the project addresses an equal designing participant. The difference between social engineering and sociocultural projects is in the difference between the difference between the different types of discourses - prescriptive and communicative. Thesis 7. The object of social impact does not look like a natural one. He is active, reflexive, can formulate his own goals, try to implement them; on occasion, he can assimilate the "reformer". The role of the reformer is that he triggers, initiates some processes of changes in their immanent logic. Almost all modern social changes in the world went out of constructing a new reality, of applying new ideas rather than knowledge of the features and structural properties of social objects. Social engineering involves humanitarian ideas and artistic constructions, creates ontological pictures. Thesis 9. Socio-cultural design is based on the situation analysis that is the study and diagnosis of processes occurring in specific socio-cultural situations. Each field of socio-cultural environment consists of three components: the system of relations prevailing in the given socio-cultural environment; the value-oriented components: the elements of the environment. "The socio-cultural situation is a multi-dimensional socio-cultural space in which man lives and which reflects the totality of his living conditions. It includes: 1) cultural and moral environment; 3) social and psychological environment; 3) social and psychological environment; 4) spiritual and moral environment; 5) political environment; 6) ecological environment" (Markov, & Birzhenyuk, 1997). Thesis 10. Communication is the condition and mode of socio-cultural design. A common mechanism of innovation, i.e. emergence of new projects of joint life, lifestyles, behaviour patterns, etc. is communication as a process of harmonisation of values of objects intentional activity and meanings of situations. For example, in urban environment, the new results from a spontaneous, unexpected, unplanned collision and a subsequent interaction of different elements. The object and semantic chaos of urban environment is a direct synergistic mechanism of city development. The chaos of city life here is the generator of randomness and diversity that constructs a new unity, generates a new structure. "The most important condition for balanced urban development, as the experience of European and American cities shows, is the consensus is possible with the solution of priority tasks aimed at the development and maintenance of public self-government, change of the intra-city management system, so that the governing bodies are maximally close and accountable to the people and controlled by them, which ensures the transparency of local self-government, change of the intra-city management system. article is that design always takes place in a specific socio-cultural environment, so successful social transformations and new social technologies are impossible without self-consciousness, self-determination and construction of the very subjects of design. user developed in the process of communication.