

**THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE NATURAL MODERNIZATION OF
ARMENIAN CIVIL IDENTITY: PROSPECTS FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN
GLOBAL AND LOCAL CIVILIZATIONS**

Mariam MARGARYAN

Doctor of Political Science, Professor

Mamikon MARGARYAN

Doctor of Political Science candidate, associate professor

Key words: political economy, civilization, network management, crises of development, natural modernization, civilizational challenge, culture of cooperation

Introduction

In the structure of modern political science, it is customary to study changes in the domain of theories of political modernization and development. This approach began to circulate actively after the collapse of the USSR, when the newly independent countries, including the Republic of Armenia, had to answer the challenges they faced with the objective question “Where is the world going, and where are we going?” In order to value-based self-determination in an accelerated time, it was first necessary to master (learn) political science, since within the framework of the USSR’s concept of “developed socialism,” that science was declared “false” and “capitalist.” That is why Z. Brzezinski claimed that the most fundamental reasons for the epochal collapse “... are philosophical, since history and concepts of human nature were fatally incompletely interpreted. Thus, the failure of communism is an intellectual failure” [Brzezinski, 1989, 226]. Agreeing with Brzezinski, one should note that even after the collapse of the USSR, social scientists of the newly independent countries did not develop new paradigms to adequately respond to the existing challenges, unconditionally trusting the modernization models proposed by experts. Meanwhile, the demand of the time was to systematically analyze and study the playful nature of transformations taking place in multidimensional time, with its cause-and-effect relationships, through the prism of a scientific-analytical paradigm. In fact, a new socio-economic and spiritual-cultural value space of modern Armenian society emerged in the logic of radically dismantling the Shiite, emotional, and Sovietism. This was followed by the fact that the sociologists of the “Homo Sovieticus” group, who were engaged in the analysis of socio-political transformations after independence, not only failed to predict the outcome of the process of political development called the “democratic transition” of linear liberalization and “voucher” privatization, but also did not attach importance to the game logic of the model of democratic “transition to consolidation” political development based on the (neoliberal) ideological basis.

Hence, politeconomic modernization and development in the post-Soviet countries took place in the 50s of the 20th century according to the rigid dichotomy of “traditional-modern” values of African and Latin American countries. The fact that already in the late

1960s, considering the ineffectiveness of the changes that had taken place, political scientist J. Alexander had recorded the “irreversible end” of the theory of modernization was ignored” [Alexander, 1994, 175]. The basis of such a harsh opinion was the destructive experience of the newly established democratic value orientations of political development in Latin American and African states, which had settled the socio-ethno-cultural chaos on the basis of “running/catching up” modernization. This forced these societies to re-evaluate the traditional and question who they were, what their prototypical values were: myths, symbols, rituals, language, religion, historical memory, customs and public institutions. Hence, the interest in political modernization was interpreted in a new way when the newly independent post-Soviet countries, as new centers of modernity, were involved in this complex process [Tiryakian, 1991, 165-180]. Meanwhile, already in the 70s of the 20th century, summing up the crises of political development that arose in African and Latin American countries, it was proven that political modernization has a civilizational dimension. In addition, since the 90s of the 20th century, transition scholars have admitted that the transformations carried out for the purpose of democratic transition have not yielded the desired results [Bauman, 2008, 240], since they were based on a mechanical model of flowing modernity and political modernization, not on the application of civilizational dimensions [Margaryan, 2017, 21].

Therefore, the question of “Where is the world and us going?” remains relevant for the Republic of Armenia and the post-Soviet countries to this day. The emergence of Gorbachev’s perestroika in the newly independent countries, fueled by the opportunities of “voucher privatization” of accelerated and mechanical socio-political changes, and the revolutionary changes carried out by the first generation of “new rich” elites, were followed by crises of political development (distribution, mobility, participation, identity, legitimacy). The alienation, poverty, emigration, and marginalization created as a result of these crises more than revealed the vulnerability of the linear liberalization model of “democratic transition”. Hence, the elites and political analysts of the newly independent countries were forced to reassess the network nature of the mechanical transformations of local civilizations, saturated with uncertainty and economic turbulence [Margaryan & Margaryan, 2024, 3-20]. Based on the above, it is possible to substantiate the approach that this process of establishing a new world order, saturated with multi-level uncertainties, turbulence, post-truth, neo-Malthusianism, neo-Machiavellianism and manipulative technologies, has put forward new imperatives for theories of political modernization and development. Therefore, it is necessary to harmonize future-oriented, possible development approaches to the processes of modernization of humanity (formational, anthropological, hermeneutic, cultural, environmental, scientific and technical) into a single theoretical and applied whole. Hence, the natural modernization of local civilizations must be considered as a unit ensuring stable balance and viable diversity, a spiritual beginning. Moreover, we are convinced that such an approach is the imperative of the time. In other

words, the approaches substantiated in the theoretical plane should become a basis for revealing not only the civilizational reasons for the periodic manifestation of crises in the political development of the Republic of Armenia, but also for ensuring strategic cooperation between the state, church and diaspora in order to prevent it. Otherwise, it is possible that the crises of public coexistence, alienation, marginalization and political development of ensuring security, manifested in a new quality as a result of the “velvet revolution”, will not be overcome. At the same time, it should not be ignored that the crisis of public coexistence was initially manifested in Armenia, since in parallel with the process of the dissolution of the USSR, political modernization and development were implemented by circulating several vectors promising democratization: the elimination of the consequences of the tragic earthquake in Spitak (December 7, 1988), the solution of the Karabakh issue with the “Union” demand, and the active internationalization of the “Hay Dat”. In other words, the transformation process was initially multi-vector, while the voucher privatization process that began was linearly liberal, which aimed to dismantle the Soviet state wealth considered national, but the state established norms of social responsibility towards the newly formed “first generation of the rich” and foreign investors. As a result, today, the study of the issues of natural modernization of civilizational identity in the process of establishing a new world order is dictated by the new quality of socio-economic relations being formed between the “power poles” striving for dominance and the political-economic ruptures of “center-periphery” state power and power relations. Periodic wars, revolutions, ethnic cleansing, emigration, poverty testify that the global process of political modernization and development, with all its components, stages game scenarios that destabilize the humanization of global and national capital, the idea of tolerance, the rescue mission, and intercultural ties.

In this regard, the axis of the civilizational challenge is essentially twofold. First, political economy, engaged in the study of the distribution, consumption, and accumulation of production results existing at different stages of society's development, presents certain requirements to modern societies in order to maintain biopolitics and the ability to naturally modernize: to ensure social responsibility, management of results, public coexistence, and security with an expanded agenda. Second, these are requirements posed to modern societies, which, adapting to sharply changing conditions, are obliged to ensure economic development and human relations in the process of productive work, income distribution, and capital accumulation. Therefore, natural modernization is the basis of the value system of civilizational dimensions of socio-economic, moral-psychological and political development of society. This multidimensional process assumes that there should be an integration of global and local civilizations without a mechanical equalization of the civilizational order, without considering local spaces as a source of cheap labor and raw materials, without losing resources for self-realization and self-presentation, without encouraging the interests of countries with unfounded ambitions and imperialistic

tendencies. The multi-level list of civilizational challenges of our time aimed at the Armenian society, the Armenian Species, and the RA - Diaspora relations suggest that after the ethnic cleansing of the Republic of Artsakh, which has the status of an “unrecognized state”, it is necessary to implement strategic forecasts within the framework of a scientific-analytical paradigm aimed at the strategic future of the country. This will provide an opportunity to ensure rational competitiveness, emphasizing cooperation with the dominant forms of civilization and not encouraging the decline of the Species, alienation, and emigration through self-rejection and self-destruction. Thus, in order to systematically present, interpret, and predict the theoretical and methodological analysis of the problems of the natural modernization of civilizational identity, we emphasize the imperatives of political and economic cooperation of global and local civilizations.

Research methodology

Considering the multi-layered nature of the problem, we have applied structural-functional and synergistic methods. From the perspective of the structural-functional method, we have considered that we can offer the prospects for institutionalizing the future toolkit of the civilization of change. By paralleling the structural-functional and synergistic methods, we have substantiated the possibilities of overcoming the current problems of local (in other words, Armenian) civilization and its natural modernization. And by applying the synergistic method, we have proven that society, as a complex system, includes such characteristics as nonlinearity, imbalance, bifurcation transition, the possibility of random fluctuations (fluctuations), etc. In this case, the factors determining mirror, reflected, mechanical modernization sharply increase. According to O. Toffler: "...the Prigogineian paradigm is particularly important in that it focuses attention on those aspects of reality that are characteristic of modern accelerated social changes: instability, disruption of the existing order, imbalance, nonlinear relationships, where the smallest signal at the input can have a strong response at the output, and frequency can increase sensitivity over time" [Toffler, 1986, 16-17]. And as a result of such interaction, the system passes to its new, stable state through self-organization and self-development. We are convinced that the use of structural-functional and synergistic methods is promising, as it reveals the peculiarities of the modern stage of development of cognitive science. From this point of view, we have tried to reveal the dangers of the mechanical selection of universal civilizational values presented to local civilization (in our opinion, Armenian) in a metaphorical sense and to develop specific aspects of natural modernization.

Literature Review

The research problems in this work are dictated by the logic that from a metaphysical point of view it is necessary to assess and value not only the evolution of global civilization, but also the ontology of one's own coexistence (people, nation, state) in this sphere. In this regard, we have emphasized the approaches of the English thinker D. Hume (1711–1776). Taking the consequences of the English bourgeois revolution as a basis, he

interpreted civilization in the realm of "liberalism, nation, civil society" as a means of overcoming the problems that have arisen through purposeful, silent and persistent work, self-government and the conclusion of a "pact" of cooperation. This model was adopted by the Scottish enlightener, professor of moral philosophy at the University of Edinburgh A. Ferguson (1723–1816). Being a representative of English classical political economy, A. Smith's (1723-1790) friend A. Ferguson presented civilization as a certain level of self-government, where the dominant social classes develop cities, literature, and culture through their purposeful, silent, and persistent work, and society, maintaining the norms of coexistence, experiences progress. Placing the establishment of citizenship at the basis of the development of civilization, A. Ferguson developed his model of social progress as an ideal of coexistence, morality, and responsibility. In this way, he substantiated the laws of economic development and accumulation of national wealth developed by A. Smith, as well as the relationships between people, the process of productive labor, income distribution, division of labor, and capital accumulation as a certain result of political and economic development, and not a consequence of revolution [Smith, 2007, 960]. The scheme of the three stages of human development: savagery, barbarism, civilization, developed by A. Ferguson [Ferguson, 2000, 138-139], was used in their works by L. Morgan ("Ancient Society", 1877) and F. Engels ("The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", 1884).

Based on today's revolutionized realities and consequences, it can be said that A. Ferguson's approach remains topical in a philosophical sense, since it has stood the test of time: civilization means gaining power and wealth as a result of thrift and hard work, and not through revolution. Thus, the ideas of A. Ferguson and K. Marx's ideas are radically different. Marx substantiated the formational approach to the development of civilization, proving the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the inevitability of world revolution. And Ferguson, emphasizing the communal form of self-organization of society, painted humanity's transition to civilization as a political-economic basis for the creation, accumulation and maintenance of good in groups whose members were ontologically useful to each other [Ferguson, 2000, 391]. Following the approaches of A. Ferguson and A. Smith, the issues related to the unique use of the concept of "civilization" were divided into two directions: anthropological, which studies the transition of primitive societies to civilization, and sociological, which focuses on the processes of historical experience: self-development and self-modernization of society, nation, state, and individual [Abramov, 2008, 195]. On such a theoretical basis, by systematizing the literature we have studied, we have considered the process of political modernization as a rejection of the rigid dichotomy of "traditional-modern" values in favor of emphasizing the strategy of measuring civilization. From this perspective, we have substantiated the strategic, apocryphal and ontological significance of the civilizational dimension of political modernization and the culture of power implemented by the ruling elite. We are convinced that without

the implementation of the civilizational dimension by the strategic elite (according to A. Toynbee, the creative minority), it is impossible to overcome the uncertainties, turbulence and crises of political development in the Republic of Armenia [Margaryan, 2004, 312; Margaryan, 2005, 303].

Analysis

The dominant discourse in modern Armenian reality is the a priori emphasis on the leading role of humanistic demands on the ruling or power-seeking forces. The existing discourse lacks the critique of postmodernism, the postmodern perspectives of metamodernism, and the ineffectiveness of the problems of overcoming the crises of current political development, uniting the dispersed, fragmented, and postmodern society, subjecting the consequences of the decline of the Armenian SSR to scientific analysis, and increasing the social responsibility of capital. The socio-economic structural-functional, systemic, and phenomenological analysis of the “center-periphery” of the newly independent countries proves that it is impossible to objectively analyze the trajectory of their chronic crisis situations (alienation, poverty, unemployment, emigration) if the imperative of the natural modernization of civilizational identity is ignored. All this implies a new quality of knowledge, a new language for revealing, to describe and explain different events, styles, and lifestyles. Naturally, the cognitive aspects of modernization must crystallize either as completely new or as newly developed within the domains of previous discourse, on the basis of which the forms that have preserved the vitality of the originality of civilization are emphasized. We present the discursive construction of these qualities and forms as a convergence of two interconnected processes: first, the degree of kaleidoscopic theatricalization of rapid changes in events in reality, and then, considering deliberative communication in all social dimensions as a strategy for the natural modernization of the political project of civilizational identity. Hence, it is impossible to analyze the essence of maintaining public order, the nature of power, cultural practices without its political economic foundations. Why, because the civilizational structure is determined by the value-based resources that structure the political economic foundations of personal and social practices - through the responsibility of capital, the level of income management, the introduction of technologies, the value saturation of free time, and not through mechanical imitation (Imitation).

Thus, the problems of civilizational dynamics have increased: Armenian society without the civilization of capital, the humanization of state administration may periodically encounter not only the socio-cultural, but also existential. Moreover, the topic of modernization of the economic market and capital of the Republic of Armenia remains imperative, as a rupture has arisen between the natural modernization of Armenian civilization and the political modernization of the Republic of Armenia [Margaryan, 2019, 312]. It is urgent for Armenian society to raise the issue of the place and role of social responsibility

and public coexistence in ensuring spiritual security by the economic and political market, in parallel with its integration into global civilization. This, of course, is not a mechanical identification and acceptance of the modernization (Westernization) model through linear liberalization, but the ability to present oneself with one's own identity in the modern civilizational structure, to cooperate. The pivotal moment of change, in our opinion, was 2008, first with the tragic events that unfolded on March 1, and then with the brutal manifestations of the general economic crisis in Armenia. Paradoxically, this flow of fears, threats and dangers quite organically fit into the general trend of development and harmonized with the monotonous rhythm of public life. The national financial and banking business, which had previously been in a "shadow" or "establishment" status and "oscillating" between political forces and "power poles", clarified its global connections, which emphasized not only its speculative nature, but also the fact that it enjoyed state support. Hence, the 2008 crisis in Armenia created a two-level "mutually agreed oligarchy" between different generations of the new rich, the new rich and the state, as well as the high-ranking state bureaucracy. Meanwhile, the state, as the supreme institution of the political system, was supposed to take on the role of the initiator of new national projects, the organizer of the main spheres of public life, the guarantor of social justice, the maintenance of the norms of coexistence, and the provider of spiritual security. But the state of Armenia first of all protected the interests of big capital, and the threats of movements pregnant with social rebellion forced it to stage a new, "velvet" version of the "color revolution" [Margaryan & Margaryan, 2021, 342]. The inefficiency of the state, more precisely, its assumption of the status of a group power in agreement with capital, was accompanied by the activation of "soft power" in the structure of civil society. Hence, the Armenian person, alienated from his historically formed civilizational territory, either became a network actor importing foreign civilizational values, or emigrated.

The establishment of a new world order is accompanied by powerful civilizational transformations, which has attracted the maximum number of participants from all over the world into the orbit of global economic turbulence. Those who have been attracted by the illusory temptations of the values of mass society and the pleasures of insatiable consumption have appeared in the new civilizational vortex and continue to actively assume roles. This complex process is presented as a progressive phenomenon, but the fact that progress implies ensuring the competitiveness and increasing the efficiency of one's own resources (natural, human) through self-control and self-realization is ignored. All those who accept progress as a kind of opportunity to admire the power of transnational economic and cultural networks, as well as to fanatically believe in their magical equality and freedom, are in for disappointment [Margaryan & Margaryan, 2024, 179-192]. This is evidenced by the politics of the "Arab Spring", color revolutions, the collapse of Syria, the Russian-Ukrainian war, the decline of the Republic of Artsakh. These are the troubled nodes of civilization, which can both become active and multiply due to the ongoing

rearrangements between the “power poles”. In this regard, the decline of the Republic of Artsakh, which was subjected to ethnic cleansing after a year of blockade and had the status of an “unrecognized state” for 30 years, is very noteworthy. The question that the issue has not been resolved, which is voiced by both Armenians, Artsakh residents, and international structures, is fraught with uncertainties and political risk. In fact, the ethnically cleansed Armenians of Artsakh can be drawn into games with an uncertain outcome staged by the “power poles”. It is obvious from the above that in the process of natural modernization in the Republic of Armenia, the main thing is to be the quality of the functioning of the political order and institutions of the political market management is conditioned by the nature of the actions of "continuous reforms from above". In other words, the process of natural modernization is not carried out in the conditions of a social tabula rasa, on which any political program can be "written". It is primarily influenced by the cultural traditions of the exercise of power and the quality of social responsibility of the capital owned by the "new rich".

In fact, natural modernization is conditioned by factors of ensuring national and state-building, socio-economic, cultural-value and spiritual security. Summing up the process of democratic transition of the Republic of Armenia, in relation to the mentioned factors, the political elite can be accused of choosing a destructive path of "mutually agreed group-government" development. Therefore, there is reason to conclude that marginal (protest bearer, insurgent) individuals who have appeared in a divided social space, as the standard-bearers of "color revolutions" who have assumed the sacred duty of making just changes, question their group interests the ontological features of historically crystallized civilizational key components. This also gives rise to insurmountable uncertainties, since natural modernization implies many scenarios of political consolidation, the choice of which requires an objective analysis of the crises of political development from the elites of the Republic of Armenia and the Armenian society. Such an approach will allow us to substantiate that the main characteristic of natural modernization in the Republic of Armenia is the active application of the “reforms from above” or “revolution from above” scenario, as well as the rejection of the “winner takes all” principle of governance. In this regard, the democratic “transition-consolidation” process in the Republic of Armenia has certain parallels with all transitional countries, whose political systems are formed, established, and transformed under the conditions of both mechanical and natural modernization of civilizational identity. Which condition is dominant depends on the quality of cooperation between the political and economic forces generating the value system of the political agenda, the level of government responsibility, as well as the political and economic convergences of civilizations. It follows from this that political and economic changes in society clearly affect the mentality, normative value systems, behavioral stereotypes, and concepts of ensuring security. A radical shift is taking place in the moral-value-normative center of gravity formed in historical time: a dispersed polynormative

decentralized cultural environment is actively created and developing in parallel with mononormative cultural environment [Bauman & Donskis, 2019]. The universal networking of the social environment of the quality of culture, moral norms, and religion that ensures common coexistence reaches an extreme: on the one hand, the devaluation (neutralization) of national culture, on the other hand, the fulfillment of the dream of becoming a participant in a life saturated with irresponsible consumption. In this uncertain process of socio-economic and cultural-civilizational network changes, a theatricalization of the “rejection” of the identity of Armenian civilization has taken place, conditioned by the presentation of alternative democracy by “soft power”.

Discussion of the results

Human resource management in business, politics, science, and education (migration, outsourcing, transnational networks) testifies to the rapid civilizational movement of the Armenian people in the new socio-cultural map of the global civilizational space. The need to provide effective responses to the various civilizational challenges of our time requires cooperation between civil society, government and business operating in the homeland-diaspora-host state network dimension. As a systemic whole, cooperation includes appropriate knowledge, skills, merits, goal-setting based on self-discipline, self-actualization and self-realization. As a result, the Armenian “I”, adopting the principle of “cooperation is the basis of security”, gets the opportunity to cooperate with various “I”. In this process, the issue of modernization of national identity and cooperation cannot be separated from the politics of the state, a state whose main duty is not to reject public coexistence by calling its citizens to irresponsible freedom, but to make them virtuous through education and moral discipline, enlightening their minds, purifying their hearts and teaching them their rights and responsibilities. Education anchored on the logic of cooperation is a process that ensures the fundamental values of security, where the value of a person's socialization is determined by the ability of the ruling elite to modernize the political and economic market. Accordingly, it will provide an opportunity to ensure national security through the development of a civic stance and an expanded agenda [Margaryan, 2018, 193-200]. From this perspective, it is necessary to combine the best Armenian national traditions formed in the course of history - the creative essence, diligence, spirituality - with the scientific and educational innovations of the West, which will enable the Armenian person to establish himself as a person and respond to challenges. In this context, the following observation by A. Meneghetti is noteworthy: "Freedom from the Lord does not yet imply the achievement of freedom. Physical obstacles are eliminated, but the problems of becoming a person, realizing oneself and building one's own "I" remain as before [Manegetti, 2007, 80]. By emphasizing the rational management of human resources, it is imperative that national competitive education be considered a network process of self-realization of cooperation and purposeful participation, which includes planned learning of ideas of apocalyptic significance for strategic reasons.

The value system of purposeful participation, creating a strategic environment for civilizational contacts, allows not only to naturally modernize the identity of Armenian civilization with the help of the culture of RA – Diaspora - Church cooperation, but also to make it viable, ensuring a place and role in the network domain of global politics.

The approach proposed by us is based on the approach of “civilization as a zone of authority and network communication” developed by R. Collins. R. Collins defines civilization as a zone of self-expression of authority, which has one or more centers where symbolic objects of various types that attract people’s attention are produced. According to R. Collins's zone of civilizational attraction always has two social aspects or spheres of action: a) civilization as a zone of loyalty and social identification of people living on the periphery of civilization and representing it; b) civilization as a network of attraction that penetrates over a large area from one civilizational zone to another. Any civilization is characterized by territorial flows of people in two directions. One is directed inward - to centers of civilizational authority, which attract students, tourists and other visitors temporarily from the periphery of the given zone and from other civilizational zones. The second is in the opposite direction - the flow of teachers and missionaries from the centers of civilization to the peripheral regions of the civilizational zone and beyond its borders [Collins, 2001, 421–437]. The sphere of influence of a civilization is a network structure of social contacts, flows of people and their attention. For this reason, civilizations are always larger than societies or states, that is, social systems that have borders. Centers of civilization can be located within states and depend on them, but the authority of centers of civilization can go beyond the borders of the state. Criticizing the idea of civilization as a static, monolithic and fixed entity in one territory, R. Collins substantiates the approach that civilization is a sphere of influence, not just a cultural code. The acceptance of civilization as a zone of authority allows intellectual groups to be active in the representation of cultural diversity. It thus creates a common space of attention, where the main components of civilizational creativity are competing positions or schools of thought, which intersect at a common center or are connected to each other at several centers (these can be cities, monasteries, universities). Even if there is only one center, it is creative, because it is the point of intersection of competing positions. It is at this point that the introduction of civilization takes place. Here R. Collins makes several generalizations. First, not only ideas or even religions, but also entire forms of social structure can be imported through these networks of cultural contacts. The frequency of this importation varies historically and depends on the balance of economic and political power between the exporting and importing civilizations. Second, importation can occur repeatedly, over centuries, and through various channels of influence from a neighboring civilization of high prestige (for example, Chinese civilization was not only Buddhist or Confucian, but also a combination of these and other elements). Third, in some historical periods, a new civilization is created from the combination of imported and local

elements, which deliberately breaks or at least significantly weakens its ties with the civilization on which it depends. But even in this case, movements of civilizational autonomy owe their formation to the interaction or the inter-civilizational intolerance they confront. According to Collins, the network manifestation of civilizational autonomy is not a simple reflection of geopolitical and economic relations, but has its own specific cultural dynamics. It is based on social networks of intellectuals and organizations, which provide a material basis for cultural production. Therefore, when an organization of the intellectual world is created in the territory of the peripheral zone, which develops its own local creativity, then new groupings appear in the area of intellectual attention, which are no longer directly dependent on import chains. R. Collins especially emphasizes that no civilizational zone of authority has ever been isolated: each of them, through network dynamics of both attraction and repulsion, has been shaped by others, and has itself shaped others. Hence, the autonomy of civilizational authority depends on geopolitical and economic hegemony. As R. notes Collins, politically and economically focused sociological models, such as world-system theory, adhere to the approach that hegemonic position in geopolitics or the world economy leads to cultural dominance. But in reality, neither geopolitical nor economic hegemony automatically creates a center of civilizational authority. This can be proven by historical examples, when a people enclosed in a politically weak, conquered or economically backward region nevertheless creates a center of civilizational authority, where, in parallel with the flows of representatives of geopolitical or economic hegemony, there is a desire to fill time with cultural flows. Thus, although the Roman military organization conquered Greece, Greek civilization retained its authority and achieved cultural absorption by Rome. From this point of view, the presence of Armenian culture in the global space at all times is very remarkable. In this sense, the example of the Mekhitarist Order, founded in Venice on September 8, 1717 by the abbot of the Benedictine Order of the Armenian Catholic Church, Mkhitar Sebastatsi, and still in operation, is valuable. During their activities, the monks have published numerous Armenological, religious, and scientific works [Pztikean, 2003]. Theoretically, the conditions that foster civilizational creativity (at least in the intellectual sphere) and, consequently, prestige are different from those that ensure the achievement of geopolitical and economic dominance.

To become a zone of civilizational prestige that attracts foreigners, Armenia must not only develop its existing social and spiritual structures, but also create new ones. They will create organizational conditions to support the intellectual creativity of a small number of competing schools. Such networks have been built in Armenia since the time of city-states and institutionalized in the higher education system, which has supported creative competition for centuries. Such structures were created in Armenia in different centuries under the auspices of the Armenian Apostolic Holy Church. Of particular importance is the University of Gladzor, which operated in the 13th-14th centuries, which

contemporaries called the “Second Glorious Athens”, “Capital of Wisdom”, “Famous University” [Encyclopedia, 2002, 215]. The role of the University of Tatev, which operated in the 14th century (1375), is also great, which, according to Hravard Hakobyan, "The 10th century university of Tatev was the first in the Christian world [Hakopyan, 2009, 180]." In these and other educational centers, the idea of Spiritual Armenia was formed and developed. Guided by this basic knowledge, we consider it necessary to consider the idea of Spiritual Armenia, formed in the course of history, in the context of the natural modernization of the Republic of Armenia and ensuring its security, emphasizing the issues of spiritual, socio-economic and individual development of the Republic of Armenia and the Diaspora.

The idea of “Spiritual Armenia” is a special value phenomenon for overcoming the uncertainties of our times, the basis of the spiritual vitality of Armenian civilization, the existence of which not only gives us the opportunity to restore the connection between phenomena and clearly answer the question “Who are we?”, but also to find out how to have a worthy PLACE and ROLE in the global governance system. As such, the Armenian community, with its readiness to respond to the challenges thrown at it, and why not, also to throw challenges, is obliged to overcome the crises of political development through vitality, solidarity and consolidation, as well as to naturally modernize itself in line with the imperatives of our time. Therefore, the natural modernization of “Spiritual Armenia” implies is the implementation of biopolitics in line with the essence and nature of our time, based on new information and communication technologies, with the aim of truly humanizing the culture of public coexistence and the exercise of power. The idea of "Spiritual Armenia" has a profound political and civilizational significance, we propose to consider it from now on as a systemic whole that naturally modernizes Armenian reality through the adoption of the values of our time: competitive education, social responsibility, public coexistence, lasting socialization of the individual, ensuring security with an expanded agenda, civic culture, results and future management policies [Margaryan, 2004; Margaryan, 2023]. At the same time, the idea of Spiritual Armenia can serve as the basis for a new network-institutional cooperation between the Homeland - the Diaspora and the Church, increasing the level of responsibility of secular and spiritual classes. In essence, R. Collins's approach clearly demonstrates how challenges to local civilization can be overcome through a network approach. In this regard, the network manifestation of Armenian civilization, due to its wide spatial coverage, can provide representation in many layers of global civilization, increasing the possibilities of presenting Armenianness through the functionality of the Armenian Network. The development of the Armenian Network is primarily aimed at presenting its own political culture in the midst of the multi-civilizational relations of time. In this regard, the crystallization of the spirituality of Armenian civilization in the sphere of multidimensional relations is of great importance, the continuous implementation of which will lead to its equal partici-

pation alongside major civilizations. In fact, the development of the Armenian Network is an attempt to present the unique Armenian political culture to the world, which will create the conditions for full participation in the work of the global political society, as well as prerequisites for occupying more advantageous positions in the implementation of a new international division of labor. This trend, within the framework of the scientific-analytical paradigm, by giving a multi-vector nature to RA – Diaspora - Church relations, will increase the possibility of real use of the resources of the Armenian network. It follows from this that the network actors of the Armenian civilization, by expanding cooperation, will have the opportunity to influence the balanced development of the administrative-territorial units of the RA and the development of deliberative communication through their manifestations of interaction. At the same time, in accordance with the imperative of the time, the Armenian civilizational network can create an opportunity to cooperate with the world community in various dimensions.

The culture of cooperation, as a value system providing ideological, normative and role incentives, assumes that the most important resource of the civilizational political project in the process of social transformations is competitive education, political, national, civic consciousness, responsible participation and is a person who has the opportunity to freely express his or her civilized identity. All these incentives play a decisive role in the formation of the middle class and the openly recruited ruling elite as carriers and creators of deliberative communication. In this case, the task of governance is the transition from a marginal-populist model of participation to a liberal model. It is undeniable that populism “simplifies” the political space, replacing the complex multiplicity of “differences” with a clear dichotomy, both poles of which are not certain [Laclau, 2005, 18].

As a result of the value simplification, dispersion, and also the oscillation of the political space, the marginal populist participation model in the Republic of Armenia is implemented on the basis of the non-institutionalized principles of the “iron law of group rule” and pursues the preservation of the role monopoly. Ultimately, the actors of the marginal-populist model revolutionize the behavior of society. With this logic, we consider it necessary to emphasize the transition from postmodernism to metamodernism as a mechanism for increasing the viability of Armenian civilization by responding to challenges.

The experience of political development accumulated in the course of history proves that political subjects constantly strive to include new actors in the field of political project design of their civilization. These actors, as “soft forces” belonging to alternative civilizational centers, invade the spatiotemporal space of other states and societies with their value system, becoming “centers of gravity.” This phenomenon often causes the reevaluation of archetypes in the structure of civilizational political projects and the emergence of conflicting value contradictions. In order to explain the essence of such conflicts and obtain balanced answers, it is necessary to define the concept of a “civilizational political

project” as a hierarchical and networked self-governing system that synthesizes the ideas and resources necessary for natural modernization, creates its institutional foundations [Margaryan & Margaryan, 2024, 79-95]. In order to consider it as a basis for natural modernization and ensuring security, it is necessary to take its historically formed socio-cultural energy as a starting point. It is a phenomenon formed and transformed in the historical context on the basis of a cultural text (culture as a text) - symbolic capital transmitted with semantic nuances, religious, ritual, customary, as well as a form of institutional memory of the state and other structures, and social codes of conduct [Klifford, 2004, 560]. Being a comprehensive description of the potential and vitality of social communities (state, nation, society, individual) formed and developing in the historical context, it has the ability to both adapt to global challenges and silently, naturally modernize its own identity. At the same time, the mechanisms for activating “sociocultural energy” are directly related to its “energy sources” (government, state, army, writing, literature, educational system, symbols, religion, church, translation art, archetypes, etc.) [Eisenstadt, 2000, 21]. It should be noted that in the course of historical development, not only the models of transformation of civilizational political projects change, but also the "sources of energy" - as well as the "multiple fields of transformation (cyclic, linear, impulse, segmental models) that nourish them and are full of conflict tensions" [Eisenstadt, 2004, 48-66]. In order to reduce the conflict nature of the transformations of civilizational political projects, it is necessary to converge the mechanical and natural processes of modernization. This duality is our formula for ensuring intra-civilizational dialogue, a defensible state and citizen security, which will enable Armenian civilization to maintain its fidelity to its cultural text through the quantitative and qualitative growth of public institutions, creating a strategic development model of “a smart society, a responsible state, a citizen with political, civil, national identity”. In fact, by emphasizing the development and implementation of the principle of a scientific-analytical paradigm implemented at the institutional level, we clearly substantiate the goal of our work: the civilizational political project is the basis for natural modernization. And this guarantees the provision of both deliberative communication and an expanded security agenda in the Republic of Armenia at the same time. Such an approach, with its game logic, definitely implies strategic thinking, which “...is based on fundamental skills and helps to understand how to get the most out of them” [Diksit & Nejlbaff, 2015, 15]. It follows from this that the strategic development model of “smart society, responsible state, citizen with national, civilizational, political, civic identity” has a spatiotemporal comprehensive nature, since its structural multi-layering ensures the process of natural modernization of the military-political, geopolitical, socio-cultural and human resources of the civilizational political project. In other words, only with the presence of strategic thinking is it possible to resist the main component of cognitive wars in Armenia - cyber wars. With such a confrontation, a creative minority will be created for the self-presentation of the Armenian

civilizational “I”, a “smart force”, which with its strategic thinking (“think tanks”, creative individuals) will authentically represent the domains of public coexistence, social responsibility, as well as solidarity and the intersection of conflicts in the conditions of the establishment of a new world order. This should be accompanied by building guidelines for a civilizational political project in the Republic of Armenia, by the natural modernization of historically formed national public institutions: the family, the educational system, the defense army, the national church. In this context, ensuring spiritual security is not only a response to new challenges, but also a new quality of cooperation culture can be formed through the long-term socialization of the main bearer of natural modernization, youth. This multidimensional process is effective if the following factors necessary for the natural modernization of a civilizational political project are taken into account: First, the “power poles” implement numerous regional and local political projects through the “soft forces” included in their sphere of interests. They cannot claim the status of civilizational political projects, since they pursue the goal of ensuring their influence. Therefore, the functional clarification of the lines of convergence between political projects and civilizational political projects is crucial for natural modernization and security.

Secondly, the civilizational political project is a system of values, meanings, symbols, archetypes that have been historically formed and ensure the viability of a social unit. It is apogographically relevant if it is implemented by both the establishment and the “creative minority” with a harmonious analysis of the peculiarities of “sociocultural codes”. In this context, a multi-level study of natural modernization in terms of ensuring an expanded security agenda has become mandatory.

Third, the establishment of a new world order is taking place in the conditions of flowing modernity. Therefore, it should be borne in mind that states and societies with unfounded imperial ambitions, as allies of the “power poles”, erasing their historical past and ignoring the crises of the political development of their countries, transform their “I” with multi-level developed game technologies. This is accompanied by the activation of actors carrying alternative values, who, by creating a conflict between the old and new centers of civilizational political design, can deepen uncertainties and introduce images of fear, inferiority complex, the poor, the alienated, the victim into socio-cultural texts. In this sense, in the Republic of Armenia, the development of political, civilizational, national, civic identity, as well as the establishment of universal values, through the long-term socialization of youth, is paramount. necessity. Only if guided by the awareness of public, state and national interests can the Armenian people overcome external and internal challenges filled with uncertainties, ensuring their viable and secure ontological paradigm in the past-present-future.

Conclusion

The process of political modernization and development is a challenge to the identity of civilization, to which each society responds in accordance with its value system and

political consciousness. The theory of modernization needs to be revised in line with new challenges, in parallel with the studies of multidimensional changes created in the conditions of the continuous development of information and communication technologies, the widespread use of artificial intelligence.

On the one hand, it is conditioned by the inefficiency of linear development in the modern era, on the other hand, by the new appreciation of the provisions of the value theory of security policy, and on the other hand, by overcoming the uncertainties arising during network management. Hence, the theory of modernization, with its game logic, does not exclude that, as a complex whole, it includes several systems of values, each of which is endowed with its own logic of problem solving and scientific substantiation. With this in mind, it is appropriate to consider political modernization as a prerequisite for economic progress, politics characteristic of postmodern societies, but also a process of change from postmodernism to metamodernism, hierarchical and network activity of the nation-state, implementation of security with an expanded agenda, civic participation, and the involvement of a polyarchic elite.

In this context, the apocalyptic imperative is that not only political actors, but also the creative minority are responsible for the natural introduction of both democratic values and a civilizational political project. This approach, first of all, allows us to consider natural modernization as a combination of traditional and modern values, as a third generation The phenomenon of indigenization. If the first generation of “democrats” was attracted by linear liberalization and the mechanical adoption of the “winner takes all” game, and the second did not formally break the connection with its national values, then the third generation is obliged to develop a civilizational political project, legitimizing and humanizing not only power relations, but also national spiritual capital. In fact, in the current conditions of the development of information and communication technologies, political modernization and development is a challenge, the coherent response to which definitely implies the indigenization of both secular and spiritual elites as their functional mission. It should be noted that since the 1990s, indigenization has become a key component of the competitive strategic management agenda: in Islamic societies, the key ideas were the revival of Islam and re-Islamization, in India, a selective attitude towards Western values and the return of Hindu values to public policy, in East Asian states, the propaganda of Confucianism, which was accompanied by active discussions by elites about the idea of strengthening their states, and Turkish modernization is also statist.

It is noteworthy that the need for institutionalization of the globalization process as a factor in ensuring public viability was emphasized on the international stage as early as 1971, within the framework of the 5th international report presented by the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Currently, globalization is considered not only in the socio-psychological, but also in the institutional domain, as a three-level process.

They are: 1) transmission - the linear and mechanical introduction of the Western model in developing countries, 2) indigenization - this stage begins with a reaction caused by the inconsistency of the theoretical and practical application of the introduced model, 3) authentication - the stage of "real compliance", when the signals received from the bottom up are also taken into account. In this context, Ibrahim A. Ragab's departure from Authentication as a "return to the roots in search of direction":

From the above, it is clearly seen that only through the civilized dimension of natural modernization is it possible to simultaneously solve the problems of the legitimacy of property, the modernization of national identity, the open recruitment of the political elite, the employment of the creative minority, the culture of cooperation, social dialogue, and political discourse, and overcome the crises of political development.

Natural modernization is a complex political-economic mosaic of institutional interactions between political actors, bearers of new values, and the culture of exercising power. It operates according to the role-playing operations that dictate the management of the value system of capital management, traditions, religious environment, mentality, the specific features of ensuring security, and the hierarchical and network manifestation of national interests. Accordingly, the following features are characteristic of the political modernization of the Republic of Armenia:

First, political marginal, revolutionized, and theatricalized forces operating stably in the Republic of Armenia perceive the values of democracy differently, since in reforms, personal (individual group) interests prevail over public, national, and state interests.

Second, the diversity of participants in political life in the Republic of Armenia is apparent, since their role functions are limited, conditioned by mutually agreed oligarchic interests or the goals of appearing in the zone of influence of these interests.

Third, the crises of political development that underlie political modernization in the Republic of Armenia, with their various manifestations, have included in the public consciousness justified and unjustified aspirations to position themselves advantageously. Thus, the processes of political participants in the Republic of Armenia are uncertain and unpredictable. For this reason, "mutually agreed oligarchic" relations are periodically formed between the political and economic elites, and the discourse that has developed is theatricalized on a symbolic basis.

From the above, it is obvious that Armenian society has faced the eternal problem of "mirror modernization". Moreover, political modernization is reduced to the reproduction of the image of a "marginal Armenian" with a high level of revolutionization, striving for "fair democracy".

Let us summarize: As a result of the mechanical introduction of political modernization in the Republic of Armenia, the culture of self-determined and competitive development of the civilizational political project has been and is being rejected. Due to the absence of

the latter, the self-expression of separate “soft forces” has taken place in the form of so-called revolutionary groups striving for marginalized modernization. As a result, “elite” isolated groups have periodically formed and are being formed in the Republic of Armenia, which, manipulating the Armenian civilizational political project, question the possibilities of natural modernization and feverishly absolutize the processes leading to mechanical cooperation.

We are convinced that the prospects for the civilizational dimension of political modernization are determined by the fact that in the conditions of current uncertain and turbulent development, as well as diverse and unpredictable migration flows, it is necessary to design a new level of both hierarchical and network consolidation of the RA state - the Armenian Diaspora and the Church. They can confidently It should be emphasized that global challenges require consistent implementation of a civilizational political project from all states with different levels of power, since traditional domestic and global security programs are not able to effectively predict and prevent threats. Therefore, only through the development of a cooperative culture, mutual assistance, and the design and implementation of joint programs in the virtual and multidimensional space of the RA - Diaspora - Church, it is possible to ensure both the national security of the RA, and solve the priority problems of preserving the Armenian identity in the Diaspora, and ensure spiritual security. In the context of globalization and transnational processes, in parallel with geopolitical, economic and cultural transformations, the discourse of identity in all national Diasporas at the global level has been and will be activated. in response to the processes of reshaping ethnic community value boundaries. Taking the above into account, we propose to emphasize the scientifically substantiated presentation of practical mechanisms for the development of cooperation between all segments of Armenians in the sphere of RA – Diaspora - Church cooperation. This will allow not only to identify the ways of integration of RA – Diaspora - Church in other civilizational spaces by modernizing their own values, but also to rethink the key issues of natural modernization in terms of preserving Armenian identity. Hence, it is necessary to emphasize the importance of the RA – DIASPORA - CHURCH cooperation in the context of global political transformations. It is a guarantee of preventing new threats to the national security of the RA and the preservation of the Armenian identity, a process of mutual assistance and mutual trust formation through the combination of virtual and real space management mechanisms. In the context of the above conclusions, it is necessary to abandon those factors that, hindering the overcoming of political development crises, contribute to the revolutionization and marginalization of the country and enable the mutually agreed-upon group government to manipulate the issues of natural modernization of public interest, public consciousness, identity, coexistence and security from the positions of absolutization of its interests, both globally and locally.

References:

1. Alexander J. C., Modern, Anti, Post and Neo: How social theories have tried to understand the "New world" of "Our time", *Zetschrift für Soziologie*, 23, Heft 3, 1994, p. 175
2. Collins R., *Civilizations as Zones of Prestige and Social Contact* // *International Sociology*. 2001. № 3. P. 421–437.
3. Eisenstadt S. N., *The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis* // *Thesis Eleven*, 2000, Vol.62,p.21(1-29)
4. Eisenstadt S. N., *The Civilizational Dimension of Modernity*// *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis*. S.A. Arjomand, E.A. Tiryakian. Sags Publication Ltd., 2004, P. 48-66.
5. Laclau E., *On Populist Reason*. London. New York. Verso 2005 , p. 18.
6. Tiryakian E., *Modernisation: Exhumetur in Pace (Rethinking Macrosociology in the 1990)*, // *International Sociology* vol. 6, № 2, 1991, 6 (2), p. 165-180.
7. Mariam Margaryan Mamikon Margaryan *The problem of original modernization of civil identity in the conditions of economic turbulence*, "Alternative", July - September, 2024 p.p. 3-20
8. Abramov, M.A. *Dva Adama: Klassiki politicheskoy my`сли [Tekst] /M.A. Abramov ; Ros. akad.nauk, In-t filosofii, M.: IF RAN, 2008,195 s.*
9. Bauman Z., Donskis L., *Moral'naya slepota: Utrata chuvstvitel`nosti v e`poxu tekuchej sovremennosti / Per. s angl. A. I. Samarinoj, SPb.: Izdatel`stvo Ivana Limbaxa, 2019. s*
10. Bauman Z., *Tekuchaya sovremennost`*, SPb.:Piter, 2008, 240 s.
11. Bzhezinskij 3., *Velikij proval. N`yu-Jork, 1989, s. 226.*
12. Diksit A. i Nejlbaff B., *Teoriya igr. Iskusstvo strategicheskogo my`shleniya v biznese i zhizni, per. s angl. N. Yaczyuk, M.: Mann, Ivanov i Ferber, 2015, s. 15.*
13. Fergyson A., *Opy`t istorii grazhdanskogo obshhestva. M., 2000. s. 138-139.*
14. Fergyson A., *Opy`t istorii grazhdanskogo obshhestva. M.: ROSSPE`N, 2000. 391 s.*
15. Hakobyan Hravard, *Hay arvesti patmowt'yown, Er&an, 2009, e`j 180, na& A. Gzoyan, Tat'&i hamalsaran, Er&an, 2003:*
16. H . *Yarowt'iwn vrd. Pztikean, «Mxit'ar vrd. Sebastacii & Mxit'areannerow npasty' hay mshakoyt'in»*, Er, 2003:
17. Klifford Gircz, *Interpretaciya kul`tur / Per. s angl. O. V. Barsukova, A. A. Borzunov, G.M. Dashevskij, E. M. Lazareva, V.G.Nikolaev, poslesl. A. L. Elfimov; nauch. red. A. L. Elfimov, A. V. Mateshuk, M.:ROSSPE`N, 2004. 560 s.*
18. Margaryan M. M., *Qaghaqakan ardiakanacman qaghaqakrt'akan chap'owmy` orpes r'aznavarakan kar'avarman apahovman himq, HH PN «Haykakan banak» r'azmagitakan handes, N 4 (94), 2017, e`j 21-33:*
19. Margaryan M. M., *Qaghaqakan ardiakanacman & zargacman himnaharcer, patasxanatow xmbagir` G. H. Safaryan, Er., «Petakan c'ar'ayowt'yown»*, 2004, 312 e`j: Margaryan M. M., *Qaghaqakan y'ntranin & jhoghovrdavaranan ancman himnaxndirneriy'*, Er., «Petakan c'ar'ayowt'yown», 2005, 303 e`j:
20. Margaryan M. M., *Qaghaqakan ardiakanacman hramayakannery' Hayastani Hanrapetowt'yownowm, Er&an, «Petakan c'ar'ayowt'yown»*, 2019, 312 e`j:
21. Margaryan M. M., Margaryan M. G., Nikoghosyan L. G., *Gownavor heghap'oxowt'yown. tesowt'yown & texnologianer, Er&an, «Petakan c'ar'ayowt'yown»*, 2021, 342 e`j:
22. Margaryan M.M., Margaryan M.G., *Qaghaqakrt'akan inqnowt'yan progresivistakan kerpap'oxman himnaxndirneriy' (tesamet'odabanakan verlowc'owt'yown), «Hanrayin kar'avarowm»*, HH PKA gitakan handes, N 2, 2024, e`j 179-192:
23. Margaryan Mamikon, *Hamagorc'akcowt'yan mshakowyt'y` orpes azgayin anvtangowt'yan apahovman gorc'y'nt'ac, Gitakan Arcax, 2018, N 1, e`j 193-200:*
24. Margaryan M. M., *Hogewor Hayastani gaxap'araxo'sowt'iwny' ardiakanacman gorc'y'nt'acowm, BAZMAVE'P, Hayagitakan-banasirakan hande's, TwKB (2004) tari, t'iw 1-4,*

R'NC'G, R'NC'D, VENETIK – S. GhAZAR, e'j 195, Margaryan M. M., Grigor Narekacin & mer jhamanaky', Er., 2023:

25. Margaryan M.M., Margaryan M.G., Qaghaqakrt'owt'yan qaghaqakan naxagic'y' orpes y'ndard'akvac' o'rakargov anvtangowt'yan apahovman himq, «HAYKAKAN BANAK» HH PN PAHH r'azmagitakan handes, N 1, 2024, e'j 79-95:

26. Menegetti A., Sistema i lichnost' / Per. S ital'yanskogo NNBF «Ontopsixologiya». – Izd. 2-e, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. M.: NNBF «Ontopsixologiya», 2007, s. 80.

27. «Qristonya Hayastan» hanragitaran, Er., «Haykakan hanragitaran» hratarakchowt'youn POAK, 2002, e'j 215, 1072 e'j:

28. Smit A., Issledovanie o prirode i prichinax bogatstva narodov., M.:E'ksmo, 2007, 960 s.

29. Toffler O., Nauka i izmenenie. Predislovie k knige Prigozhin I., Stengers I. Poryadok iz xaosa: Novy`j dialog cheloveka s pri-rodoj: Per. s angl./ Obshh. red. V. I. Arshinova, Yu. L. Klimontovicha i Yu. V. Sachkova, M.: Progress, 1986, s. 16-17.

Mariam MARGARYAN, Mamikon MARGARYAN

The political economy of the natural modernization of Armenian civil identity: prospects for cooperation between global and local civilizations

Key words: political economy, civilization, network management, crises of development, natural modernization, civilizational challenge, culture of cooperation

From the standpoint of objective analysis and forecasting of current uncertainties and multi-level turbulent network realities, the need to study the process of natural modernization of civilizational identity is justified. The authors are convinced that the crises of political development (distribution, mobility, participation, identity, legitimacy) can be overcome if the actors of transformation, especially all types of elites, act as carriers and creators of the management of a culture of deliberative communication and cooperation. The position is formulated that the topic of modernization of the economic market and capital of the Republic of Armenia remains imperative, since it breaks emerged between the natural modernization of Armenian civilization and the political modernization of the Republic of Armenia. In other words, it has become urgent for Armenian society to ensure the processes of spiritual security, social responsibility and natural modernization of public coexistence by the economic and political market, in parallel with the integration into modern civilization and increasing the viability of Armenian civilization. According to the authors, such an approach allows us to reveal not only the interdependence of overcoming the "identity crisis" of global and local civilizations, but also to outline the political and economic foundations of their solution through the development of a culture of cooperation, rejecting neo-Malthusianism and neo-Machiavelianism. With these considerations in mind, in order to ensure the viability of Armenian civilization, it is proposed to implement the value convergences of local and global civilizations by institutionalizing the level of state-church-diaspora responsibility and the foundations for the functioning of indigenous (native) elites. From this perspective, modern The basis for responding to civilizational challenges is the convergence of rational and irrational in the socio-political life of the Republic of Armenia, as well as the issues of social responsibility of economic and political markets, result management, public coexistence, objective analysis of archetypes and the development of a political project for a competitive (viable, dignified) future policy.