Traditionalist aspect of sociocultural practices: historical memory in the conditions of information war

Hryhorii Kovalskyi (ORCID 0000-0002-3352-4754)
State University of Infrastructure and Technologies (Ukraine)

ABSTRACT

The article aims to study the role of philosophical traditionalist concepts in sociocultural practices and the development of historical memory. Historical memory is proven to be a tool for transferring social experience, as well as scientific and non-scientific knowledge about the shared past and an entire system of self-identification of society. At the same time, historical memory is a dimension of the individual and collective memory of the historical past, representing it from a symbolic perspective. As a sociocultural phenomenon, historical memory accumulates a set of images and collective perceptions, reproducing the community's cultural and historical experience. The nature of society implies that previous socio-historical stages are causally related to the present. The current historical period forms the basis of the future. The connection of the present with the past is the basis of tradition. Cognition of traditional symbols is performed with the help of a particular "symbolic method" of analogies. The superhuman in tradition is revealed in the direct experience of the sacred, after which the transcendental realm begins. Attributing to tradition a metaphysical, not just socio-cultural status, traditionalists are guided by the existential integrity of human existence in the system of the tradition, the interconnection of all its manifestations, and the connection between the revealed and unrevealed levels of reality.

Introduction

Historical memory is a tool for transmitting social experience, scientific and non-scientific knowledge about the shared past, and an entire system of self-identification of society. It is also a dimension of the individual and collective memory of the historical past, representing it in a symbolic sense. Finally, as a sociocultural phenomenon, historical memory accumulates a set of traditional images and mass perceptions and reproduces the cultural and historical experience of the community.

Domestic and foreign scientists have studied the problems of the philosophical ideas of Ukrainian and European traditionalists. The role of tradition and culture in the discourse of identity is discussed in the works of Y. Assman, Y. Hnatyuk, E. Hobsbawm, H. Kovalskyi, T. Ranger, O. Sheyko, E. Shils, P. Sztompka and others. The aspect of historical memory in the context of information warfare nowadays is gaining new significance and emphasis, which requires the formulation of the problem field and the updating agenda of the identification and consolidation of the nation in the context of external threats and internal challenges.

The purpose of the article is to highlight the role of the philosophical concept of traditionalism in the shaping of the historical memory of the Ukrainian nation in the XXI century.

Research methods

The specific nature of the research topic determined the use of general scientific and purely philosophical methods. The general scientific methods include a systematic approach, structural-functional and genetic-historical methods, and methods of comparative studies. The philosophical methods include the methods of phenomenology and hermeneutics, which allow to comprehensively analyse of the phenomenon of tradition and traditionalism in the historical and evolutionary context and provide its philosophical interpretation as a prerequisite for building the author's concept (*Kovalskyi, 2015a*).

Results and Discussion

The processes of defining the foundations of historical memory in Ukrainian society require a clear interpretation of the concept of "Ukrainian national culture", national identity. New models of identity as ideological paradigms relate to the problem of the dominant approach - to the community or the individual. The first model is based on the principle of unconditional loyalty to their authority, with the community as the primary source of identification with a weak individual identity. The opposite can arise when the principle of autonomy prevails, defining individuality as a form of authenticity that establishes a critical distance from the demands or expectations of the group, assessed through the prism of individual needs, rights, and freedoms. Difficulties with the definition of national and cultural identity arise not only because of the ambigu-

ity of the concepts of "nation", "culture," and "identity", but also because these concepts have different definitions in social sciences.

Such features define culture as a concept of language, tradition, customs, rituals, symbols, art, folklore, literature, philosophy, and religion. According to E. Gellner, the existence of high culture is a condition for the nation's emergence. National culture can be understood conventionally as a historical tradition manifested in texts, meanings, values, and life forms common to a nation. A broader definition is given to the term "culture" by S. Gol, according to whom national culture is a discourse - a way of creating meanings that influence the nation and organising actions and ideas related to it. The Polish culturologist O. Hnatyuk expands this notion with such elements as memory and distinction (*Hnatyuk, 2005: 43*). In this sense, the temporal dimension is necessary since national culture is a symbolic link with ancestors and their heritage and cannot exist without collective memory (historical or national memory).

German scientist J. Assmann distinguishes between the concepts of "memory" and "tradition" in the sense of communicative and cultural memory. Like the French philosopher M. Halbwachs, he studies the transition of living memory into various forms of written record, "history" and "tradition". In addition to the critical analysis and impartial archiving of the areas abandoned by the memory ("history"), J. Assmann emphasises the interest and preservation by any means of the imprint of the past, which is constantly receding. In this case, instead of a new, a stable tradition emerges. It is freed from the context of live communication and becomes a canonical repository that perpetuates memories (*Assman, 2004: 68*).

In general, representatives of the philosophical direction of the "history of memory" (H. Hutton, P. Ricoeur, M. Foucault, and others) in relation to social and historical heritage distinguish several types of memory: individual and collective, and historical memory. Individual and collective memory are complementary and interpenetrating, which belong to an individual and various social groups. Memory, individual and collective, is filled with the historical past, which enriches society and is part of the personal dimension.

Historical memory covers essential and incidental events, including systematised information through education and unsystematised information according to the individual's interest. Historical memory is a focused consciousness that reflects the special significance and relevance of information from the past in close contact with the present and future. Historical memory is not only up-to-date but also selective and often focuses on specific historical events, ignoring others. This is mainly due to the importance of historical knowledge and experience for the present and its possible impact on the future. Historical memory, despite some partiality, has the peculiarity of keeping in people's minds the main historical events of the past up to the transformation of historical knowledge into various forms of worldview perception of experience, keeping it in the tradition. Sometimes in people's mindset, there is a hyperpolarisation of certain moments of the historical past, which only to some extent reflects the perception and assessment of past events.

The way of broadcasting cultural heritage largely depends not on the content of traditions but on the features of communication technologies. Nowadays, the transition to new information communication technologies is the main driving force of cultural change. However, tradition is more than experience that is simply stored in memory. A French philosopher M. Halbwachs distinguishes between collective memory in its sense and tradition. Namely, the first corresponds to communicative and spontaneous memory, and the second to culturally meaningful and conceptualised memory. Tradition becomes the memory of an already interpreted experience. M. Halbwachs showed that the collective living memory, being fixed, takes the form of history (objective analytical memory) and tradition. At this stage, tradition's structure and social dynamics change and turn into society's cultural heritage, which unites traditional information into a general collection where cultural memory is a common heritage. Cultural communities are diverse. One can trace the specifics of intergenerational communication based on the possession of written language and the place it occupies in acquiring skills and transmitting beliefs, knowledge, and values. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between non-written cultures where oral tradition functions and cultures that preserve and communicate ethno-socio-cultural heritage based on oral tradition and writing. In addition, there are cultures where intergenerational communication is based on paper and modern communication interaction. Rituals and customs are archaic forms of tradition adopted to ensure social connection (*Kovalskyi, 2015b*).

The practical essence of tradition is reflected in its expression in social practice and consciousness at different conditional levels, social and interpersonal interaction, social and individual consciousness, and symbolic manifestation of tradition, according to Ukrainian scientist O. Sheyko. The level of social interaction covers the central, most important elements of tradition, i.e., activity and system of social relations (political, social, ideological). This level is essential and initially crucial for the self-development of society in the interaction of productive forces and production relations in the features of distribution, consumption, exchange, and ownership of goods. Moreover, it reflects the most general, typical patterns of tradition without considering the subjective factor. Thus, there is a degree of interpersonal interaction that involves direct contact with individuals in the system of proposed patterns of communication and behaviour. In addition, O. Sheiko defines the level of cognition as a gnoseological form of tradition displayed in the development and transformation of the surrounding reality by society or personality, which is reflected in particular thinking patterns (*Sheyko, 2001: 8*).

Tradition as an activity of social and interpersonal interaction through cognition is reflected at the social and individual consciousness levels. The consciousness is guided by the orientation of society, the individual to engage in traditions to meet their needs and interests. Guidelines are shaped based on ideas, beliefs, and notions about traditions. The ideals of traditions exist in consciousness as postulates and patterns of activity of material and spiritual content. At the level of consciousness, values and norms are established as regulators of activity through the action of abstract ideal representations.

The theoretical concept of national memory, where the national heritage uniting the community is permanent and unchanging, does not cover the practice of updating specific forgotten components of the historical tradition. This practice is usually employed when trying to consolidate society using a homogeneous concept of national

Traditionalist aspect of sociocultural practices: historical memory in the conditions of information war
Традиціоналістський аспект соціокультурних практик: історична пам'ять в умовах інформаційної війни

37

identity. One of the ways to achieve this is to influence the tradition formation, that is, the choice of certain elements and appeal to specific symbols. Traditions based on the principle of historical continuity and resistance to change may seem to be the most stable element of national culture, which is difficult to change and cannot be manipulated. Tradition is seen as an element that ensures the integrity of the national community in discussions about identity. The desire for independence necessarily appeals to tradition. The definition of "traditional" has long been used to explain the difference between conservative rural areas and progressive urbanised regions. In anthropology, in particular, Western societies have been defined as changing and evolving to highlight the differences between developed European countries and the rest of the world. In contrast, all others have been described as "traditional societies". This implies that they are static and dependent on established, entrenched, and traditionally sanctified patterns.

Opposing innovation and tradition, this understanding of traditional society is contrasted with modernity and is shaped by deeply rooted clichés. Modern philosophy has rejected this understanding of traditionalism and its opposition to modernity as an undeniably positive value. Instead, they admit that the relevance of tradition plays a crucial role in social transformations and development processes. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that views on modernisation and tradition have a clear tendency to become ideological. The ideological approach to development or modernity, on the one hand, and to tradition, on the other hand, leads to their value opposition. Any ideologies that directly give legitimacy to modernisation are "cults of cargo". Otherwise, there are ideologies of counter-modernisation referred to as nativists. A common feature of nativists is the defensive reaffirmation of traditional symbols.

Russian propaganda in the information war against the Ukrainian people uses ideological models from the cult of cargo to counter-modernisation. The imposition of pseudo-traditional narratives is taking place at all levels, creating a model of the social and cultural life of the Ukrainian people necessary for the aggressor, imposing ideological and historical narratives to form the required invasive processes in Ukrainian society. Replacing the traditional for Ukrainians semantic meanings of historical memory with manipulative concepts helps to legitimise the aggressor's actions on the battlefield and occupation of Russification in the captured cities of Ukraine. The occupiers are actively replacing the visual and semantic space – toponymy and commemorative practices of the Soviet era are returning.

A tradition is a form of recording and a mechanism for conveying cultural meanings. Having passed the process of rationalisation within the professionally created culture, tradition returns to the actual implementation and can be consciously supported and transformed by the actors (*Abushenko, 2003: 1047*). A broad understanding of tradition can be considered a universal form, a mechanism of ordering and structuring. Linking with the past, closing the possibility of retrospective arbitrariness, tradition opens the prospect of freedom in the present and future based on history.

Being a genetically primary form of ordering and structuring of socio-cultural experience and activity of social objects, tradition is the basis for the emergence of socio-cultural norms. However, tradition can be considered a particular type of normative regulation in developed social systems. On the other hand, criteria, stereotyped in the activity of subjects, lose the need for constant institutional support and can evolve into tradition. Regulation of social systems mainly based on tradition, or innovative norms, is one of the criteria for distinguishing between traditional and modern societies. In modern industrial and post-industrial societies, the sphere of tradition is narrowing, and the weight of "secondary" traditions is growing among the traditions. It becomes the subject of intellectual operations to justify behaviour through reference to the authority of the past. However, even in these societies, the role of tradition as an unchanging mechanism of cultural development is retained.

The philosophy of modernisation, modernity, and now globalisation is accompanied by whether these processes will lead to the abandonment of one's cultural, national, and even political identity. However, in defining their own cultural identity, nations must recognise that the coexistence of the old with the new is incomparably positive. Appealing to tradition, in particular, the reaffirmation of traditional symbols plays a unique role in community building and attempts at independence. However, after independence, traditional symbols often lose their meaning and power to unite society. Therefore, they are replaced by introducing a cultural policy that selectively appeals to old symbols and creates new ones, filling historical and social education with new content. The social processes are essential in this process, as they reassess the forms of identity and traditions that society relies on. As a result, one part of the tradition is made more relevant, and the other is de-actualised (*Kovalskyi, 2015a*).

Manipulative practices of desacralisation of the people's profound traditions and deactualisation of the Ukrainian national identity are widely used by the Russian aggressor in the information war against Ukraine. As a result, the Ukrainian social structure complicates the perception of authentic traditions, which are appealed to by certain parts of society. Furthermore, they become a set of mutually contradictory values rather than a monolithic system of values identified by society as a whole. Authentic traditions are those that meet the objective conditions and goals of social development, which reflect the priority interests of its current state. The emergence of authentic traditions is due to the social need to create a sustainable primary base of activity necessary to preserve the essential characteristics of the social system, with a view to its further qualitative improvement. Authenticity is determined by the prerequisites for establishing tradition within the society, resulting from the regularities of the development stages. Therefore, they play a decisive role in social self-development.

E. Hobsbawm introduced a new point of view on the understanding of tradition, which allows clarifying attempts to construct homogeneous concepts of collective identity (*Hobsbawm, Ranger, 2005*). Invented traditions are practices of a symbolic nature, directly or indirectly conditioned by official rules that try to impart definite values and norms of behaviour through recurrence, which automatically implies a connection with the past (*Hobsbawm, Ranger, 2005: 47*). In the conditions of information war based on the change of cultural meanings,

the invented traditions become a weapon of influence on the socio-cultural practices of the Ukrainian people. Invented (inauthentic) traditions are those that contradict the objective conditions of social development but continue to function, according to O. Sheyko (*2001: 10*). They are created artificially and act as declared norms that have not yet confirmed their value nature in the course of social practice. Such traditions are made consciously, based on social order, and are caused by dominant social groups' ideological needs or interests. In social practice, it acts as an "axiomatic" dominant and is aimed at managing and manipulating the activities and consciousness of people in order to achieve specific goals. The "invention" of traditions is most often observed in societies undergoing transformation periods or military actions during which there is a need for new methods of governance and means of uniting the community. The aggressor uses invented traditions to fill semantic gaps and the necessity of its legitimation in the occupied society. Invented traditions are divided into established (symbolising social unity or group membership) and founding traditions (based on the establishment or legitimisation of institutions, their status, and authority). Besides, there are also those that aim to involve the group in a particular system of values, beliefs, codes, and conventions.

This concept helps to understand the essence of "social engineering". The construction and reproduction of traditions and national myths are part of forming a collective community. In Europe, this way of changing traditions and simultaneously modifying identity has been known for a long time. The interest in the tradition that is taking place in Central and Eastern Europe is a reaction to the Soviet processes of modernisation, the introduction of new modernity elements, and the replacement of traditional social ties with new ties that also create a sense of community. The opposition to such modernisation and the search for or revival of own traditions is an attempt to bring back the past but, most importantly, to create a competitive, attractive model of identity that could replace the existing model (*Hnatyuk, 2005: 48*). The Polish culturologist O. Hnatyuk refers to the formation of a certain ideological model (national idea) of society transformation through tradition. The invented tradition is never a new, original creation. Rather, it emerges due to processes that effectively change the existing social reality.

Of unique social nature are negative traditions, based not on the affirmation of any cultural achievements but on the denial of unacceptable for a given culture or subjects of values. Negative tradition is built on the example of what one should not be guided by. Thus, it depends on its "opponent" and unconsciously contributes to the consolidation, preservation, and transmission of the values it is attempting to fight. Only the explicitly or implicitly unappreciated - the value-neutral, which is not relevant, is silenced and dies - does not fall into the field of tradition. The loss of value in a tradition leads to the termination of its action and the impossibility of development in this direction. The phenomena related to this value fall out of the system of transmission and cease to exist, according to the Belarusian scientist V. Abushenko (*2003: 1047*).

Society is influenced by a living tradition combining authentic and inauthentic traditions. The direction of social processes is determined by the balance of functioning of these types of traditions and society's priorities towards them. When choosing a policy supporting authentic societal traditions, a stable basis for its further progressive

development is formed. Authentic traditions correspond to objective conditions, and the inclusion of innovations in their composition does not contradict current social trends and interests.

Attempts to forcibly restore inauthentic traditions can lead to the retardation of social development - non-compliance with the objective conditions inherent in a particular society generates contradictions in the process of creating innovations, which is typical in the period of social transformation. Social ideology often uses inauthentic conservative traditions to establish a certain order level (*Kovalskyi, 2015b*). The unification of social interests relying on the "inanimate" images of the past can reduce the collective potential of innovation that works for the future and deepens the state of general crisis.

The value-normative load of inauthentic traditions contradicts the changes in objective conditions: it was lost in an earlier period, or its normative introduction has not yet been tested in practice. In such situations, the leading role of the tradition of maintaining stability and order in society is not fulfilled. Therefore, forcible stimulation of the inauthentic traditions functioning, based on the interests of certain social groups, without considering current trends and prospects for society, can lead to negative consequences (*Sheyko, 2001: 16*).

The social function of tradition, manifested in various forms of social behaviour, involves the accepted experience, transmitted through "ideas that preserve continuity with the past" as "consensus maintained over time". The structure of continuity of traditional ideas and activities can become a symbolic representation and a legitimate basis for its preservation. It is accepted through the invocation of its presence in the past. The American scholar E. Shils says that the statistical criterion of recurrence alone is insufficient, even if an acceptable critical minimum of reproduction is established to determine a tradition (*Shils, 1998: 240*). The frequency of repetition is a determining element, but it is insufficient for adopting a traditional belief or action. Thus, acceptance in the present is not a function of biological structure or genetic inheritance but rather a perception of the past that has a causal link to the present.

Some ideas are reproduced for generations due to the need to solve everyday tasks. It is justified not to consider such concepts as traditional. Tradition is established through the inter-temporal continuity of ideas, which means the transfer of heritage. Not actions are subject to transfer, but only their patterns, norms, and principles of legitimacy. However, continuity implies not only the transmission but also the perception of this heritage. Transmission and perception may be due to different motives. However, there is a distinct tendency to motivate the perception by the legitimacy of the authority accepted as a transmitter, the connection of this legitimacy with the traditional nature of the authority and the norms it supports or approves. Traditional can be considered a representation accepted employing a criterion that has functioned before (*Kovalskyi, 2015a*).

Perceptions can also be accepted because of the charismatic properties of their bearers. Structurally, ideas about the sacred are partly traditional, rational, and charismatic, related to the unique properties of those who "introduce" them. However, this charisma is shared mainly through tradition, based on accepting these ideas in the past. In many cases, charisma stems from the back-

Traditionalist aspect of sociocultural practices: historical memory in the conditions of information war
Традиціоналістський аспект соціокультурних практик: історична пам'ять в умовах інформаційної війни

39

ground, that is, from the fact that certain events took place in the past.

It is not the frequency of repetition, not the connection with the past, that explains the attachment to traditions. A particular attitude to one's past is considered essential. The idea of connecting with the past is a prerequisite for turning to tradition and accepting it as a binding behaviour model. The "past" seems to be a source of authority, independent of the opinion of contemporaries. Traditional ideas and actions are a matter of passively accepting the already established. There is an active search for traditions to connect with the past if the established traditional ideas are unacceptable. Sometimes "the past is created" to legitimise actions by those who do not find such a foundation in the present (*Kovalskyi, 2015a*).

Traditional are the ideas that affirm attachment to the past, to a certain time in the past, to the whole social system, and to a certain institution that existed in the past. These beliefs assert the ethical justification or superiority of past institutions or society as a whole and the necessity of following past patterns in ideas or behaviour. Change is an inevitable part of traditional beliefs. Society cannot remain unchanged for several generations. Changes may be accidental, leading to visible transformations over time. The accumulation of new elements may not be apparent or intentional. Nevertheless, modifications may be intentional, although the individuals undertaking such modifications may regard them as being in keeping with the "spirit" of tradition (*Shils, 1998: 244*).

Hence, the term "traditional" is used to describe societies that are relatively slow to change or societies that tend to legitimise activities by reference to what has happened in the past. In general, the importance of traditions' social functions had several features: traditions' content is determined by the socio-economic conditions of a particular era and the type of production relations. In the process of social development, the functions of traditions changed. If traditions were a universal form of consolidation of social structure and cultural development in the early stages of historical development, then with the evolution of society and the complexity of its composition, their previous significance is narrowing. In modern society, traditions preserve and transmit spiritual culture to the next generations, an essential element of people's education. Therefore, the ideological aspect of tradition is gaining importance. However, it is not only a way to implement ideological relations. It also provides a way to reproduce these relations over several generations. The embodiment of a social attitude, included in the system of custom or tradition, is the activity that develops the spiritual and physical traits required by a certain mindset. Hence, acquiring personality qualities (ideas, beliefs, habits, values) during the activity becomes necessary for implementing ideological relations in the appropriate direction.

The process of the historical development of the means of ideological and social relations, which led to the emergence of a system of people's traditions along with customs, is a movement from simple, stereotypically repeated to more complex ones. In their individual development, like the part of humankind's historical evolution, the man goes from simple to more complex social relations. Similarly to how in the history of society people assimilated the accumulated experience of social behaviour through the perception of traditions, a person in individual development consistently goes from incorporating simple customs of society, and later – a system of traditions. Thus, a person enters a complex system of social relations.

Conclusions

Historical memory and tradition are vital in modern society's social structure. During the historical process, the content of traditions was determined by socio-economic conditions. In the early stages of historical development, traditions were a universal form of consolidation of social order and cultural development. With society's development and structure's complexity, its significance is narrowing. Modern society is distinguished by a tradition that combines authentic and inauthentic traditions and socio-historical heritage to ensure the continuity of social development with its previous stages.

REFERENCES

Abushenko, V.L. (2003). Traditsiya. In: *Noveyshiy filosofskiy slovar'*: Issue 3. Minsk, Knizhnyy Dom, P. 1047 (In Russian).

Assman, Y. (2004). *Kulturnaja pamjat: Pismo, pamjat o proshlom i politicheskaja identichnost v vysokih kulturah drevnosti. [Cultural memory: a letter, a memory of the past and political identity in the high cultures of antiquity]*. Moscow, 368 p. (In Russian).

Foucault, M. (1997). Istoriya bezumiya v klassicheskuyu epokhu. St.Petersburg, 576 p.

Hnatyuk, O. (2005). *Proshchannya z imperiyeyu: Ukrayinski dyskusiyi pro identychnist*. Kyiv, Krytyka, 528 p. (In Ukrainian)

Hobsbawm, Eric (ed.) and Ranger, Terence (ed.) (2005). *Vynaydennya tradytsiyi [The Invention of Tradition]* (Transl.from Engl.). Kyiv, Nika-Centr, 448 p. (In Ukrainian)

Kovalskyi, H.Ye. (2015a). *Tradytsionalistskyy konstrukt ukrayinskoho sotsiumu*. Donetsk-Vinnytsya, 147 p. (In Ukrainian)

Kovalskyi, H.Ye. (2015b). Tradytsionalistychna kontseptsiya Yu.Lypy. *Nauka. Relihiya. Suspilstvo*, # 1, 36–39 (In Ukrainian).

Sheyko, O.S. (2001). *Tradytsiya yak faktor samorozvytku suspilstva*. Zaporizhzhya (In Ukrainian)

Shils, Edward Albert (1998). O soderzhanii termina "traditsiya" (pp. 240-245). In: *B.S. Yerasov (comp.and ed.). Sravnitelnoye izucheniye tsivilizatsiy. Khrestomatiya*. Moscow, Aspekt Press. (In Russian)

Sztompka, P. (1996). Sotsiologiya sotsialnykh izmeneniy. Moscow, Aspekt Press, 416 p. (In Russian)

Традиціоналістський аспект соціокультурних практик: історична пам'ять в умовах інформаційної війни

Григорій Ковальський (ORCID 0000-0002-3352-4754)
Державний університет інфраструктури та технологій (Україна)

    Статтю присвячено визначенню ролі філософських традиціоналістських концепцій у соціокультурних практиках та формуванні історичної пам'яті. Доведено, що історична пам'ять виступає інструментом передачі соціального досвіду, наукових і позанаукових знань про спільне минуле, фундаментальною системою самоідентифікації соціуму. Одночасно історична пам'ять є виміром індивідуальної та колективної пам'яті про історичне минуле, репрезентуючи його у символічній площині. Як соціокультурний феномен історична пам'ять акумулює сукупність образів та масових уявлень, відтворює культурно-історичний досвід спільноти. Природа суспільства є такою, що попередні соціально-історичні етапи причинно пов'язані з сьогоденням. Нинішній історичний період формує основу майбутнього. Зв'язок сьогодення з минулим складає основу традиції. Пізнання символів традиції здійснюється за допомогою особливого «символічного методу» аналогій. Надлюдське у традиції розкривається у безпосередньому досвіді сакрального, за яким починається сфера трансцендентного. Приписуючи традиції метафізичний, а не просто соціокультурний статус, традиціоналісти орієнтуються на екзистенціальну цілісність людського буття в системі традиції, взаємозв'язок всіх його проявів, зв'язок між виявленим і невиявленим рівнями реальності.

    Ключові слова: соціальні практики, комеморація, експертне опитування, історична пам'ять, політика пам'яті.