

**THE PROBLEM OF COLLECTIVE MEMORY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN MODERN  
SOCIETY  
UNDER GLOBALIZATION CONDITIONS**

**Sevinj Nasibova\***

**ABSTRACT**

This article discusses the role of culture in the modern world undergoing dynamic transformations, the problem of collective memory and national identity, as well as the crisis of values and their underlying causes. Geopolitical tensions worldwide lead to the use of culture and national identity for various purposes among countries and regions. Advocates of the Americanized version of globalization view culture as a unifying tool that connects the spiritual worlds of people belonging to different nations and religious beliefs.

The article also analyzes some socio-psychological aspects of Azerbaijan's national identity and collective memory. Using an experimental approach, it explores the following questions: "How are patterns of collective memory, national, and religious identity related to the process of globalization?", "What patterns of national and religious self-identification are characteristic for youth of different ethnic origins?", "What features of national identity and collective memory are typical for young people from different ethnic groups?", and "To what extent are these types of collective memory compatible or contradictory to each other?" These questions are investigated within the specific cultural-historical context of Azerbaijan, based on empirical data obtained from research on Azerbaijani youth's national identity and collective memory.

The study employs qualitative methods such as historical analysis, observation, abstraction, and comparative analysis.

**Keywords:** globalization, collective memory, national identity, civilization, mass culture.

**INTRODUCTION**

The rapid development of globalization in the modern world causes profound changes in economic, political, and cultural spheres. The sovereignty of nation-states is weakening, and borders are increasingly crossed by flows of economy and information. This process not only intensifies the interaction of various cultures but also leads to serious crises in key cultural components such as national identity and collective memory. Against the backdrop of diverse ideological and political interests, the role of culture is being re-examined, and a synthesis of national and universal values is sought to respond to the new challenges posed by globalization.

Most scholars studying globalization argue that the decline of nation-states has ushered in an era of free movement of transnational corporations, capital, labor, goods, and services. Gradually, privileges are being transferred from nation-states to supranational bodies like the European Union, the Council of Europe, and other intergovernmental organizations. Moreover, the crossing of state borders is often viewed as a logical consequence of economic development. Therefore, it is not surprising that the EU invests significant resources in multinational programs aimed at cultivating a new identity among its people — European citizens. However, experience shows that local nationalism remains strong, and the vast majority of Europeans do not wish to replace their national identity simply with a "trans-European" one.

One of the main factors preventing the rapid transformation of national identity into transnational identity is perhaps the national culture, national identity, and collective memory. The globalizing world and culture do not merely push collective memory into the historical background; rather, as E. Smith emphasizes, it is accompanied by a revival of ethnonational myths, memories, and traditions (Smith, 1992, p. 57). This revival resembles a fundamental "amnesia" of global culture and is therefore temporary, tied to specific places and individuals. In many respects, the increased interest in the past and respect for ethno-national myths and traditions can be seen as a unique response of ethno-national groups to the unifying and leveling pressures created by the globalizing world.

---

\* Dr., Western Caspian University, Azerbaijan, [sevincnesibova26@gmail.com](mailto:sevincnesibova26@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5910-5593> DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54414/HHXT6987>

These pressures of globalization pose a particular problem for many young nations and nation-states struggling for nation-building. Indeed, the growing interest in local cultures and respect for ethnic myths stimulates the strengthening of national and ethnic communities, which to some extent hinders the development of a sense of national belonging. Young nation-states cannot fully utilize the proven European methods of consolidating national identity among their populations because most of these methods were directed towards ethnic assimilation and forced identity change in the name of the state and were openly violent in nature.

At the same time, while European states fought the “national question,” there were no developed international organizations or institutions defending the rights of national minorities. In the contemporary world, however, the protection of minorities has become a global issue. Therefore, there is reason to argue that in young nation-states like Azerbaijan, the development of national identity is a sensitive issue requiring the nurturing of a sense of national belonging alongside democratic values, as well as a delicate balance and assessment of methods for resolving interethnic conflicts.

As noted above, collective memory plays an important role in defining ethnic and national communities and their relations with each other, which requires more detailed theoretical investigation.

### **1. Globalization and the Problem of National Identity**

The landscape of civilizations in the world during the 20th century is presented paradoxically: on one hand, as a period of cataclysms and global upheavals that formed a new image of planet Earth, and on the other hand, as a period of significant losses. "Globalization and the intensive dialogue of cultures have led not only communities embedded in metropolises but also dominant societies defining modern development strategies to undergo substantial changes" (Zarov, 2014, p. 48). Today, the dominant civilizational processes are undoubtedly globalization processes. These processes are quite contradictory and have further intensified the problem of national identity.

According to G.V. Epifanova, globalization encompasses many characteristics of various global processes and represents a new phenomenon in human history, the modern world. It is not simply a continuation of earlier global integration trends (Epifanova, 2010, p. 69). Globalization is a worldwide process of economic, political, cultural, and religious integration and unification. K. Imanaliev defines globalization as "a process occurring at different speeds in three of the most important spheres of life: politics, culture, and economy" (Imanaliev, 2009, p. 47). The scholar argues that, first and foremost, globalization is the rapid formation of a unified global financial and information space, primarily based on new computer technologies. Globalization processes give rise to new social institutions in the new century, which must regulate social processes. Consequently, these processes challenge many established ideas.

Rapid changes at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries have intensified the problem of national identity. S. Huntington emphasizes: "People and nations try to answer one of the most important questions a human can face: Who are we?" (Huntington, 1999, p. 532). This is also linked to the growing influence and extremely contradictory nature of globalization. Several globalization processes affect the intensification of the national identity problem: economization, democratization, informatization, and cultural standardization. These processes often confront national identity as an obstacle to progress.

National identity is a kind of core that encompasses strong ideas formed by ethnonational communities about themselves (Kortunov, 2009, p. 21). In the modern world, democratization means the transition to general rules of the game both in domestic and foreign policy. The state becomes a means of protecting the interests of society and individuals. In contemporary hierarchies, the individual comes first, society second, and the state third. If a state wishes to claim a significant role on the world stage, it must adhere to this hierarchy.

The economy also has a significant impact on national identity. In conditions where a unified global economic space is forming, national security and national development cannot exist separately. The only possible way to protect national interests is integration into the global economic space. Refusing integration means refusing development. If a state is not part of the global economic space, it cannot withstand competition. However, integration can sometimes lead to the erosion of national identity and its melting in

economic processes.

A unified global information space forms through informatization. Informatization creates a global network society that provides citizens access to material and spiritual goods contributing to continuous social development. Nevertheless, informatization is not an unconditional benefit. Information technologies create new opportunities for manipulating public consciousness and new threats to national identity. Moreover, global informatization may lead to the erosion of personality.

A consequence of information openness is cultural standardization. Globalization removes barriers between different cultures and causes worldwide competition. In such conditions, only those cultures that can quickly adapt to rapidly changing circumstances without losing their identity can survive. A clear example of such mobility is Japanese culture. Unfortunately, there are more negative than positive examples. Many cultures have failed to withstand the cultural unification attack caused by globalization. Thus, in the cultures of Spain, Mexico, Argentina, and many other countries, globalization has proven stronger than national identity. In these countries, only small national features remain — bullfighting in Spanish culture, Mexican cuisine in Mexican culture, Argentine tango in Argentine culture, Brazilian football in Brazilian culture. Clearly, after Mexico, Argentina, Spain, and Brazil, almost all European countries follow. Primarily, Central and Eastern European countries such as Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Germany, France, and Great Britain resist cultural unification processes more, largely because their cultures were historically formed much earlier. China, India, and Russia have cultures that are over a thousand years old and will resist globalization processes even more. However, this does not mean that cultural unification cannot absorb these three cultures. In each of these countries, the cultural core of national identity must quickly adapt to changes occurring in the economy, politics, and social life.

Thus, globalization tries to "crush" national distinctiveness and dissolve it in the processes of global economization, democratization, informatization, cultural standardization, and the universalization of values (Kortunov, 2009, p. 21). According to R. Robertson and H. Khodker, modern globalization sets a global framework that allows civilizations, regions, nation-states, and ethnic communities to reconstruct their history and identity (Robertson and Khodker, 1999).

Since the emergence of the globalization problem, the global scientific community has been discussing the inevitable assimilation of local civilizations by a unified global super-society. In their work "Globalization and Its Discontents," H.P. Martin and H. Schumann describe the possible consequences of globalization processes. They argue that everything is moving towards the formation of a global society called "20:80" in the near future: 80% of the population will serve and entertain the 20% that benefits from globalization (Martin and Schumann, 1997).

Another prevailing version of globalization outcomes is Westernization, or Americanization. Often, globalization processes are equated with Westernization, associated with the growing influence of the United States in the second half of the 20th century. The author understands Westernization as the unification of all countries under the patronage of a world superpower — the USA. Westernization can also be viewed as the USA's new colonial policy involving cultural expansion and economic dependence, with particular impacts on public consciousness.

Recently, the unprecedented growth of national self-awareness may be a defensive reaction against globalization and the standardization of social relations. Representatives of various ethnic groups feel that their national-cultural identity is under threat today. Strengthening anti-globalist trends in the modern world also stems from the fact that people, even if united, do not want to be part of some faceless common world; they strive to be representatives of very specific ethno-cultural, national communities.

"We already live in the era of globalism: the internet, laptops, ATMs, mobile phones, satellite communications and television, electronic cards, etc. In this sense, it is fundamentally impossible to deny the increasing scale of global development" (Imanaliev, 2009, p. 46). Is it possible to preserve sovereignty and identity in this process of losing religious and moral foundations?

## **1.1. Models of Globalization**

Any civilization, society, or nation can exist only if it possesses distinctiveness, and national identity cannot exist without national customs and traditions. In conditions of globalization, the first component of national identity is the preservation of customs and traditions. The second component is participation in the globalization process, but the person's national identity must be respected. Large-scale tasks posed by global politics and economics should not blur national-cultural character. Otherwise, this would mean the dominance of a faceless mass culture.

Within the context of globalization, three models of national identity can be distinguished. The first model is Westernization. Countries adopting it (Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Bermuda Islands, Ireland) have chosen Western experience as a guide. Civil society in these countries began to be built based on the study of Western experience. All these countries are relatively recently independent former colonies (Sri Lanka in 1948, Ireland in 1922, Vietnam in 1945 but recognized by France in 1954, and Bermuda Islands still belong to Great Britain but have had internal self-government since 1968). Being a colony is more familiar to them than being a sovereign state.

The second model is modernization. India, South Korea, Malaysia, and Japan followed this model. The essence of this model lies in preserving centuries-old traditions while relying on a new technological base and innovations.

The third model is fundamentalist. This model is entirely aimed at rejecting the Western path of development. Countries choosing this model (Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, Iran, Belarus, Pakistan) strive to protect themselves from foreign disturbances and to develop in a specific way chosen by their political and religious leaders.

During the era of civilizational clashes, globalization processes characterized by increasing integration in all areas of social life increasingly affect modern society, thereby threatening the existence of nation-states.

The end of the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century were marked by turbulent and contradictory events. This period is known as the era of widespread human rights ideas, political and national-cultural pluralism, and the beginning of international integration. However, this period also brought unprecedented sufferings and countless victims to humanity. Many conflicts that caused wars and large-scale terrorism had explicit national and religious motives. It seemed this period was a war era in which the inhabitants of planet Earth did not want to understand or respect each other or see universal ideals and values, thus destroying themselves. Nevertheless, a large and healthy part of human society aspired to peace and mutual understanding. It is no coincidence that UNESCO declared the first decade of the 21st century the decade of peace and culture of non-violence.

Many peoples live in the world, and the differences in their cultures and traditions require additional adequate knowledge, new methodological principles, values, and spiritual guidelines.

## **1.2. The Crisis of Culture in World Experience**

The dynamic transformations of modernity assign a special role to culture. In the context of increasing contradictions between various countries and regions—primarily due to some nations' geopolitical ambitions and others' search for effective measures to ensure national security and sovereignty—culture is used to achieve different goals depending on the ideological positions of global actors. Western European countries, especially the United States, support the “American model” of globalization and claim that this model reflects the most progressive achievements of human consciousness, as well as being exemplary in political, economic, and social spheres. Consequently, for them, culture becomes one of the instruments for expressing the spiritual world and value orientations of various nations and religious affiliations.

Several research centers in Western countries are engaged in forming a new interethnic ideology—“netism” (or “cyberliberalism”)—which is based on the desire to disseminate a spontaneous information flow under the control of the ideologists of the “chosen” world hegemony during the information exchange process. Mass culture, originally created as an ideological system (paradigm) with the aim of spreading and promoting globalization, is essentially part of this system. In other words, this cultural form was built to become one of the main “agents” of globalization. Its spread, especially considering the functional

capabilities of the internet space, provides the opportunity to ideologically influence broad masses of people regardless of their national and socio-cultural choices.

This culture increasingly exhibits the characteristics of a “global consumer culture,” where “the criterion of success is not spiritual values but profit and mass success in the increasingly monopolized entertainment industry” (Babosov, 2011, p. 125).

The phenomenon of mass culture, its psychological impact, and the mental state of people under the powerful attack of the overwhelming information flow represent a systemic crisis primarily expressed in a crisis of values, followed by a crisis of national identity and culture.

Many thinkers saw the foundation of the theory of values in moral relations linked both to the relevant norms and traditions of the socio-cultural environment and to the ethical principles of faith and corresponding moral ideals. The ideological core of modern globalization ideology is the idea of “universal human values.” In the context of the current systemic crisis, especially the cultural crisis, there are various approaches to understanding the essence of universal values and the category of “value” itself.

Some approaches demonstrate loyalty to ideals of faith, traditional moral and ethical standards. Some globalization proponents support the weakening of the secular meaning of faith, call on people to abandon traditional moral standards, and especially urge young people to believe that traditional principles of faith are outdated, have lost their usefulness, and that new values should be directed toward modern goals.

Prominent thinkers of the 20th century, witnesses of the “system crisis” sweeping Western countries, such as F. Spengler, A. Toynbee, and K. Jaspers, expressed their concerns about humanity’s future, noting the destructive power of the coming crisis. P. A. Sorokin was the first to note the decline of Western culture and society. He saw the essence of the extraordinary crisis in the fact that humanity is between two eras: the dying culture of sensation and the emerging new culture of ideas.

The diagnosis of the historical process, understood as social and cultural dynamics and development and change of socio-cultural systems based on the idea of the change of types of culture, appears in P. A. Sorokin’s reflections as follows:

“The most important aspects of the life, lifestyle, and culture of Western society are experiencing a serious and severe spiritual crisis... It is as if we are between two eras—the dying sensual culture of our brilliant yesterday and the future culture of ideas... The rays of the setting sun still illuminate the grandeur of the past, but the light is gradually fading, and in this darkness everything seems more difficult to us. The night of this transitional period begins to descend upon us with its nightmares, terrifying shadows, and painful horrors, but beyond its limits, we can see the dawn of a new great culture of ideas, which will greet a new generation—the people of the future” (Sorokin and Man, 1992).

At the foundation of this new “great culture of the future,” P. A. Sorokin placed the value principles of faith in human creative and constructive desires and the hope for humanity’s spiritual reconstruction during the transition to a new socio-cultural supersystem. He emphasized the importance of the special mission of humanitarians called to explain the essence of the crisis, writing:

“If humanity manages to avoid the catastrophe of greater world wars, then future generations of people will have to greet the dawn of a new magnificent consciousness” (Sorokin, 2000, p. 11).

Sorokin’s idea that the inevitable replacement of the era of the culture of sensation with the new era of the culture of ideas is becoming more realistic is gaining traction. I. Wallerstein writes:

“In 2050 or 2075, we will only be certain of a few things: we will no longer live under the capitalist world economy but will develop within the framework of a new order or a certain new historical system or systems” (Wallerstein, 2003, p. 49).

However, whether the contradictions of globalization, threats to world stability, and war dangers will deepen in this new “world system” or peace will prevail depends, indeed, on world civilization represented by a diversity of national communities with different religious and philosophical foundations, customs, traditions, and innovations (Kuleshov and Medushevsky, 2001).

At the base of the American model of globalization is a human deprived of cultural identity and focused solely on consumption, including spiritual nourishment. As V. P. Dobrenkov noted, globalization

“creates a zombie-like person deprived of historical memory, detached from national roots, customs, and traditions, forgetful of kinship, and indifferent to their homeland” (Dobrenkov, 2011, p. 24).

With the increase of tendencies toward the “Westernization” of world civilization, cultural and value confrontations between peoples intensify, and many peoples’ desire to preserve their national-cultural identity grows.

The clash of two opposing tendencies in the dynamics of the globalization process reveals the essence of globalization contradictions, as the American hegemony “leads to the revival of non-Western cultures worldwide” (Huntington, 2003, p. 130).

The contradictions of cultures during the transition period in the modern world indicate that the revival and development of national cultures can be perceived not as a clash of civilizations but as harmony. Such harmony is possible only on the basis of mutual interaction, diversity, and complementarity of national cultures.

## **2. Collective Memory and Identity**

As E. Smith writes, to develop national identity, a society must “know who it is, where it comes from, and where it is going” (Smith, 1995, p. 99). To achieve this, individuals who are members of the society collect separate stories about the past and turn them into coherent narratives, which become shared common stories accepted by the inhabitants of a particular state. Through common stories unique to a specific society, which recognize themselves both in their past and present, feelings of belonging and affiliation to that particular society can arise—this forms the basis of national identity.

At the same time, these shared stories about the past, accepted by the members of any society, constitute a form of collective memory. It can also be defined as a set of concrete ideas about the past, reflecting the common sense prevailing in a given society at a particular historical moment and shared by the majority. Issues related to the formation of the nation have been partly addressed through various means such as teaching a unified national history in schools, using mass media, producing historical films, writing historical novels, holding historical exhibitions, and so on.

It is known that the past can sometimes cause confusion, and the same historical fact can be presented in a way that leads the reader to completely opposite conclusions. Everything depends on the goals set by the authors of historical works, their choice of the appropriate “perspective,” and their intellectual currents. In this sense, the choice of perspective that determines the content of such works is made by national elites—“not the lower classes, who demand fundamental principles of ‘who is the villain, who is the hero,’ but them.” The discussion concerns the “memory politics” and “identity politics” conducted by political elites within society to build the nation.

As mentioned above, achieving and preserving national distinctiveness in multinational states is an extremely complex issue—especially when ethnic groups possess contradictory collective memories and collective histories. We consider it important to empirically study the relationship between the collective memories of Azerbaijani youth from various ethnic groups and the level of development of their internal national identity.

There are heated debates in the scientific community regarding the definition of collective memory. One of the creators of the concept of collective memory, the French sociologist M. Halbwachs, viewed collective memory as the shared memory of a common past preserved by representatives of a specific group, social stratum, or nation (Halbwachs, 1992, p. 133). Some researchers who developed this idea argue that collective memory should be distinguished both from individual memory and from memory based on individual remembrance. According to the criterion of reproduction integrity, collective memory is considered a process arising from the need to recall the “lost” past and is a highly controversial and obstructed process within society (Pennebaker and others, 1997).

Since the 1980s, the term “collective memory” has become widespread and is often used together with the category “collective identity.” This is based on the belief of many researchers that social and cultural symbols (texts, images, rituals) contribute to the formation of both collective memory and collective identity (Poole, 2008, p.151). At the same time, the hierarchical and multi-level structure of

collective identity is emphasized, for example, at individual, small social group, and national levels—each having its own unique collective memory structures. These levels can exist in mutual harmony or conflict by creating contradictory structures.

It should be noted that the subject we are discussing has only been studied to a limited extent, and published research does not resolve the issue of how collective memory structures affect membership in various social groups.

In this context, studies on the characteristics of collective memory found among members of different ethnic groups within a single large social group—a nation—appear to have not only practical but also valuable scientific-theoretical results, which allow us to better understand the interrelation between collective memory structures and patterns of national identity. Our investigation of the relationship between collective memory and identity categories is based on some assumptions of H. Tajfel's social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981, p.147) and J. Tuvnev's self-classification theory (Tuvnev, 1985, p.80). Personal and social identity are formed by an individual's understanding of their position within certain social groups, the value attributed to that position, and the emotional significance attached to it.

Memory preserves or revives memories that support an individual's positive identity at both personal and social levels. In this context, the value of collective memory is measured by the extent to which it contributes to an individual's sense of belonging to a particular social group or culture and to the feeling of national identity. Therefore, understanding the content of collective memory among individuals from different ethnic groups within the national group is very important, as it allows a better comprehension of the perspectives and directions involved in the processes of national identity.

## **2.1. Experimental Methodology**

One hundred students aged 14-17, both male and female, from three different ethnic groups (Azerbaijanis, Lezgins, and Talysh) living in three different regions of the country (Baku, Qusar, and Astara) were individually surveyed using a specially prepared questionnaire. First, participants were asked to name the three most significant events that happened in their homeland over the last 100 years. The questionnaire included events from the past (represented by the names of historical figures), and participants were asked to briefly describe them. The responses reflected the characteristics of collective memory and how participants perceive history.

The questionnaire included the following questions:

1. To what extent do you feel similar to other Azerbaijani citizens?
2. How important is being an Azerbaijani citizen to you?
3. When you hear criticism of Azerbaijani residents from a non-citizen, to what extent do you feel similarity to the criticized person?
4. How strong is your sense of connection with other Azerbaijani citizens?
5. To what extent do you feel similar to other Muslims?
6. How important is being a Muslim to you?
7. When you hear criticism of Muslims from a non-Muslim, to what extent do you sympathize with the criticism?
8. How strong is your sense of connection with Muslims from other ethnic groups living in Azerbaijan?

Participants from different ethnic groups mostly gave the same or similar answers. If we consider all the events they identified as a general measure of collective memory, this list can be seen as evidence of the relative consistency of the participants' collective memory.

The most accurate answers concerned events such as "Khojaly" and "January 20." This shows that these events are firmly rooted in the participants' collective memory and this is not coincidental. These events, which had a strong traumatic impact on the population, are among the most tragic in Azerbaijan's recent history. Numerous studies show that traumatic, stressful, and emotionally intense experiences are more deeply embedded in collective memory than others. Researchers explain this by the higher likelihood that people with strong emotional experiences share their experiences with others. This broadens the circle of people who remember and retell trauma-related events, which in turn leads to the formation of collective

memory about specific events. Certainly, the impact of educational programs that include information about these events (such as annual state-level commemorations and school memorial days) is also significant. There were also quite a few incorrect answers about the “Black January” events (often confused with the subsequent Armenian occupation). This is an unfortunate indication of deficiencies in the methods of teaching history in secondary schools.

The third most accurate answer was related to Haji Zeynalabdin Taghiyev, a prominent Azerbaijani oil industrialist and philanthropist who lived at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. The fourth most correct answer was the “Contract of the Century.” It seems that the media’s constant coverage of Azerbaijan’s oil contracts contributed to the strengthening of this event in the participants’ collective memory. The ethnic factor was evident in recalling answers related to “Black January,” the “Contract of the Century,” “Azerbaijan People’s Republic,” and “Mammad Amin Rasulzadeh.” Specifically, Azerbaijani participants gave the most accurate answers about these events and figures.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the collective memory of Azerbaijan’s increasing ethnic groups contains a relative sense of “belonging” and “affiliation” regarding some significant and tragic events related to the country’s independence. Overall, participants from all three ethnic groups demonstrated a high level of national and religious identity. Interestingly, the highest levels of national identity were found among Talysh students, while the highest levels of religious identity were among Lezgin students. How can these results be explained?

As noted above, the Azerbaijani group participants were students from Baku schools, whereas Lezgin and Talysh participants attended rural schools. This factor undoubtedly affected the indicators of national and religious identity. After all, Baku, the capital and largest city of the republic, is more exposed to the influence of the globalizing world, which explains the lower levels of national and religious identity among Azerbaijani students.

The results obtained during the study are consistent with our hypothesis that groups within nations that share a “mutually consistent” collective memory exhibit similar or identical patterns of national identity.

The study results show that Azerbaijanis, Lezgins, and Talysh all demonstrated a high degree of harmony between national identity and collective memory, but the level of history education in schools is unsatisfactory and does not contribute to the development of analytical skills. Based on modern knowledge and understanding of ethnic conflicts, nationalism, national development, and nation-building, it is important to develop historical tools and concepts that allow for the scientific analysis of each historical period.

Finally, national state policy is needed to help form a qualitatively new level of Azerbaijani national identity and collective memory. This will strengthen the sense of national identity among all ethnic groups living in multicultural Azerbaijan, who are ready to identify themselves as “Azerbaijani” and take pride in it.

## **CONCLUSION**

In the modern world, globalization processes lead to serious crises in culture. These crises are mainly related to the weakening of national identity and collective memory. Certain models of globalization, especially Western and American types, seek to reduce national and cultural differences, promoting universal, sometimes “Americanized” cultural values. This leads to people distancing themselves from national affiliations and value systems, becoming disconnected from their roots and historical memory.

National identity and collective memory form the foundation of peoples’ cultures, and their weakening results in crises of values and losses in national and cultural identity. This process creates deep socio-cultural tensions at both individual and societal levels. Because the “American” model of globalization aims to weaken and homogenize national-cultural differences, it sometimes leads to cultural conflicts and even ethnic-national conflicts. The rapid development of information technologies intensifies ideological influence on national values and deepens the crisis of values further.

From a historical perspective, this situation, as emphasized by P. A. Sorokin, is an inevitable stage

in the transition from the old “sensate culture” to a new “ideational culture.” This transformation creates both great challenges and new opportunities for humanity. Overcoming the cultural crisis is possible not only by preserving national traditions and values but also through dialogue and mutual respect among different cultures. Accepting cultural diversity as a rich and complementary element is the main perspective toward the harmony, rather than clash, of civilizations.

In this regard, the protection of national sovereignty and cultural identity, as well as developing strategic approaches to benefit from the positive aspects of globalization, are of great importance. An inclusive cultural model open to innovations and based on universal values is the guarantee of peace, justice, and sustainable development.

In conclusion, resolving the cultural crisis requires systematic work on global cooperation, harmonious interaction among different cultures, and protection of national values. This is a fundamental condition not only for preserving the cultural and ethnic richness of different peoples but also for humanity’s universal development and a more stable, just future.

## REFERENCES:

- Babosov, E. M. (2011). Structural Models of World Order in the 21st Century. Moscow University Herald. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science, (2), 118-128.
- Concept of National Identity: Theory and Practice. (2019). Geostrategy, Monthly Socio-Political, Scientific Popular Journal, 03(51), 41-44.
- Dobrenkov, V. P. (2011). The World in the 21st Century and Russia: Trends, Prospects. Moscow University Herald. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science. (3), 22-36.
- Epifanova, G. V. (2010) The Spiritual Makeup of the Russian People as a Factor in Civilizational Processes in Society. Saratov: E3S Web of Conferences.
- Halbwashs, M. (1992). On Collective Memory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heydar Aliyev and the Philosophy of National Self-Awareness. (2017). Materials of the Fifth International Conference, Shamakhi, 403-407.
- Heydar Aliyev’s Concept of National Identity. (2018). Materials of the Republican Scientific Conference Dedicated to the 95th Anniversary of the Birth of the National Leader of the Azerbaijani People, Heydar Aliyev, on the Topic “Heydar Aliyev is the Architect of Azerbaijan’s Statehood”. Azerbaijan State University of Architecture and Construction, 443-446.
- Huntington, S. (1999). The Clash of Civilizations and the Transformation of the World Order. **Moscow**: The New Post-Industrial Wave in the West: An Anthology.
- Huntington, S. (2003). The Clash of Civilizations. Moscow: AST, 2003.
- Imanaliev, K. (2009). Globalization and National Identity. Bulletin of the KRSU, 9 (1).
- Kortunov, S. V. (2009). National Identity: Understanding the Meaning. Moscow: Changing Societies & Personalities.
- Kuleshov, S. V., Medushevsky, A.N. (2001) Russia in the System of World Civilization: A Textbook for University Students. Moscow: Marketing, Russian World.
- Martin, H. P., Schumann, H. (1997). Globalization and Its Discontents. London: The New Press.
- Multiculturalism as a Fundamental Philosophical Concept of Social-Political Development in Modern Society. (2022). Metaphysics, 4 (20), 77-87.
- National Idea and National Identity. (2022). “Reconstruction and Restoration in Post-Conflict Situations” II International Conference. News of Azerbaijan High ER Technical, (02), 217-222.
- Pennebakev, J. W., Paez D., Rime B. (1997). Collective Memory of Political Events. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Poole, R. (2008). Memory, history and the claims of the past. *Memory studies*, 1(2), 149-166.

- Robertson, R., Khodker, H. (1999). Discourses of Globalization. Preliminary Considerations. London: International Sociology, **13** (1).
- Smith, A. D. (1992). National identity and the idea of European unity. *International affairs*, **68**(1), 55-76.
- Smith, A. (1995). Nations & Nationalism in Global Era. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Socio-Economic Aspects of Multiculturalism in Europe. (2016). LXII-LXIII International Scientific- Practical Conference. Collection of Articles from the Conference Materials, **6-7**(57), 75-81.
- Sorokin, P. A. (2000) Social and Cultural Dynamics. Saint Petersburg: Publishing House of the Russian Christian Humanities Institute.
- Sorokin, P. (1992). Man, civilization, society. Moscow.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories* (Vol. 255). UK: Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Tuvnev, J. (1985). Social Categorisation and the Self-Concept: A Social Cognitive Theory of Group Behavior. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 77—121.
- Wallerstein, I. (2003). Posle liberalizma [After liberalism]. Moskva: Editorial URSS.
- Zarov, D. I. (2014) Civilizational Risks in the Strategies of the Dialogue of Civilizations. Saratov: Collection of Scientific Works.