

УДК 304.4

## Cultural Policy as Subject of Applied Culture Studies

Vladimir S. Luzan\*

Siberian Federal University

79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia<sup>1</sup>

Received 14.08.2009, received in revised form 21.08.2009, accepted 28.08.2009

*Culture is of more and more importance in consciousness and life activity of the modern society. And culture is comprehended not only in the true sense of the word as a result of intellectual creation, but it is understood at the level of common human sense: cultureness means decency, accomplishment, tact, and intelligence.*

*It is the author's opinion that nowadays «culture studies» are of particular importance as a scientific discipline still being in a formative stage in spite of numerous investigations on culture both in Russia and abroad. The author focuses his attention on consideration of two main approaches to the investigations on culture: Western and Russian. Culture studies are formed adjoining many sciences integrating knowledge of different sciences on culture into integral system, representing the ideas about essence, functions, structure, and dynamics of culture as such, modeling cultural configurations of different epochs, nations, confessions, classes, discovering and systemizing distinctive features of different cultural worlds.*

*Concerning realization of the creative potential of culture, the author pays a great deal of attention to the necessity for integration of various kinds of knowledge about this sphere of spiritual life in the context of integrated scientific discipline – applied culture studies as a peculiar bridge introducing an individual or the human community into the world of culture.*

*The subject of applied culture studies is specified by cultural policy as a complex dynamic system of interaction between state authorities, society, and culture (as an object of that policy) as complex of points of view and activity in thorough modernization of society based on science, structural reform of the whole system of institutions of culture, optimization of combination of state and social components in socio-cultural life, scientific and educational support of the subsequent regulation of socio-cultural processes, etc., on the whole, as conscious correction of the general content of culture.*

*The conclusion drawn in the end of the article is that cultural policy should be aimed at the achievement of harmonious development of the country based on the correct scientific organization and administration of the society; it is to eliminate inequality in cultural development of an individual and society and reduce the level of irresponsiveness to culture and cultural dilettantism of the mass.*

*It should express interests of every individual and the entire nation, guarantee human rights of free and independent development, correct balance of interests of different social groups.*

**Keywords:** *Cultural policy, applied culture studies, culture, anthropology, philosophy of culture*

### Point

Culture is of more and more importance in consciousness and life activity of the modern society. And culture is comprehended not only in

the true sense of the word as a result of intellectual and mental creation, but it is understood at the level of common human sense: cultureness means decency, accomplishment, tact, and intelligence.

\* Corresponding author E-mail address: luzan84@mail.ru

<sup>1</sup> © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

The lack or insufficiency of these qualities is strongly felt in society bringing constant tension into social life. It is possible to find these qualities only on the base of access to culture, assimilation of all the best things produced by the mankind over a period of centuries and preserved by many generations of people.

Nowadays culture is a certain level of every human activities: it is impossible to create highly developed industry without culture; it is impossible to solve vital problems of the state and society without political culture; there won't be solved social problems without cultural human relationships based on understanding of self-value of every person or a group of people (small ethnic groups, national communities, subcultures, etc.) [9].

Successful function both of the society as a whole and any of its division is impossible if a certain level of culture is not reached and the understanding that highly developed culture is the basis of civilized society is not formed. Therefore, nowadays culture studies are of particular importance still being at stage of formation as a scientific discipline in spite of abundance of investigations on culture both in Russia and abroad. Cultural, social and structural anthropology, «new culture history», semiotics, ethno-linguistics, ethno-psychology, and social studies still hold dominant positions at research on culture in the West.

In Russia of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, culture studies as an independent subject were gradually transformed into specific trend at Russian historical, philological, and philosophical science. Historians P.N. Milyukov and L.P. Krasavin played their own significant part here: they had been carrying out their research on cultural phenomena of the past and analyzing cultures being under study as system wholeness.

Study on culture from theoretical points of view was carried out within the frames of philosophy, aesthetics, semiotics, literary criticism, and art criticism. However, by the end of 1980s and beginning of 1990s, there appeared realization of the necessity for system approach to the study on culture in general and that one of turning of culture studies into a separate scientific discipline. That was promoted by the serious theoretical elaboration of the whole complex of both Russian and Western investigations on culture and analysis of ideas, conceptions, schools, and methods. Philosophy and social studies had profound effect on formation of culture studies. Culture was analyzed especially productive in the context of philosophy of culture, a discipline of philosophy oriented to comprehension of culture as the universal and integral phenomenon [10].

According to V.S. Malakhov, there can be distinguished three plans wherein philosophy of culture used to exist at the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century:

- methodological – philosophy of culture as methodology of «sciences of culture»; in contrast to «sciences of nature», this approach was developed not only within the frames of «philosophy of values» by Baden Neo-Kantianism, but also at «philosophy of life» (W. Dilthey) contemporary ontology (N. Hartmann, H. Freer);
- socio-critical – philosophy of culture as critique of the modern European civilization (O. Spengler, F. Stepun, H. Ortega y Gasset, H. Bergson);
- theoretic-and-systematic – an attempt to work out a universal theory of culture (N. Hartman, R. Croner, J. Huizinga, O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, E. Rothaker).

G. Simmel's theory about conflict between life and forms of culture, genealogical method

of analysis of the cultural tradition offered by F. Nietzsche, the idea of creative breakthrough as a basis of culture creation (H. Bergson), E. Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms, phenomenological description of structure of the basic forms of culture (from language and myth to history and science), and M. Weber's theory of ideal types, etc. – were of considerable importance in formation of the main body of ideas of philosophy of culture.

The basic features of postmodernism philosophy of culture are: denial of striving for the ideal of scientific objectivity and recognition of significance and equality of different forms of culture and sign systems expressing them; elaboration of the basic theme «knowledge is for authorities», defining constructing process of cultural reality; study on intertextuality in the context of consideration of the genesis of the modern European novel; critical variant of cultural-and-philosophical reflection.

Postmodernism philosophy of culture finds its critique on the part of A. Giddens, R. Bernstein, J. Habermas. It is blamed for oblivion of the values important for everybody and aimless deconstructive game with the texts of culture. Debates, held within the frames of different branches of contemporary philosophy of culture, had a considerable influence on the formation of theoretic and methodological tools of research on culture.

Philosophers of culture researched into the problems of vital importance for culture studies: culture as a specific human world created by a human being; culture and civilization; crisis of culture; symbolic forms of human activity – language, myth, religion, science, art; value nature of culture; interrelation of culture and history; genesis of cultures; human being and culture; the invariant structures remaining unchangeable in the course of historical transformations; forms of human cultural life; destinies of European culture

and civilization; dynamics of culture; logic of science about culture [10].

At the end of 1940s and beginning of 1950s, there was an increase of influence of «cultural anthropology», ethnology, and empirical researches on culture which E. Taylor, the English researcher of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, defined as a body of knowledge, beliefs, labor and behavioral skills common to the members of a certain group. His main aim was to reveal laws of development of culture on the whole. He considered that evolution as a natural historical process which happens according to the objective principles.

The researchers' reference to the heritage of Leslie White, whose name is associated with the idea of separation of culture studies as an independent area of knowledge, had a great effect on formation of culture studies as an independent science [45].

However, for the first time, this term was offered by German philosopher and chemist W. Ostwald in 1909 and was used in many of his subsequent works. It is important to notice that Ostwald was really the first man who defined culture as a phenomenon requiring a special science in order it could be studied [10].

He considered culture as a complex of factors serving for social progress and development of man and society. According to his point of view, science about culture is to study real processes. Ostwald distinguishes culture studies from science about society and uses the term «culture studies» for description of the specific phenomenon characteristic only of a man, defined as «culture» term, and explored by the science called «culture studies».

Leslie White referred to «culture studies» term irrespective of Ostwald in 1939 and put it into researches on anthropology, having used it in his course of lectures. L. White applied «culture studies» term to specify the sphere of knowledge E. Taylor defined as science about culture.

According to L. White, the use of «culture studies» term was to advance the transition from particular sciences to the integral research on culture.

L. White considered culture studies as an absolutely new (system) approach to research on cultural events based on discovery of general objective laws of cultural and historical process and specificity of human culture.

In L. White's book «Science about culture» [45], there was raised the question of status and character of the difference between culture studies and the other sciences investigating on culture; the researcher had made the first attempt of analytic consideration of culture and had defined the field of objects of culture studies; he substantiated the use of «culture studies» term at science of culture and defined the essence of a new system approach to the research on culture. His interpretation of culture as the integrated whole of dynamic self-organizing system of exobiological nature and as a source of support of life of a certain species *Homo sapiens* and analysis of importance of technologic sub-system as a way of interaction of a human being with the natural habitat and modeling as a method of research on culture, had a determinative effect on the development of culture studies. The turn from special researches oriented to local cultures to integral research on the world culture in its diachronic and synchronous views took place under that influence.

At the same time, there is not to be any underestimation of the meaning of the whole anthropological tradition within the frames of which there had been laid theoretic foundations of culture studies. The spectrum of disciplines positing themselves by «anthropology» term is extremely extensive. It comprises cultural (F. Boas, E. Rothacker, M. Landman), religious (R. Nibur, G. Tilich, M. Buber, P. Florensky), social (B. Malinovsky, A. Radcliffe-Brown),

biological (A. Gehlen, M. Portman), pedagogical (O.F. Bolnov), psychological (R. Benedict, M. Mead, E. Huges), structural, including cognitive (K. Levi-Strauss, S. Bruner), and interpretive (K. Giri) kinds of anthropology.

Each of these disciplines strives to solve its problems by the way of turning to a person in different spheres of his life activity. In virtue of the universalism of its nature, anthropology outlines integrating space for these sciences, allowing us to conceive the mutually opposite directions of human activity as some union.

Interpretative anthropology formed on the base of Geertz's works had considerable influence both on the general development of the researches on anthropology in the last quarter of the 20th century and on the problematics of culture studies. The core of this trend at American anthropology was made by Geertz's colleagues and students at Chicago University and Princeton Institute of high researches – D. Markus, M. Fisher, S. Ortner, R. Rosaldo and also the scientists who weren't directly connected with the trend mentioned, but agreed with its theoretic and methodological program on many aspects (anthropologists M. Stretern, E. Bruner, researchers on culture T. Maranjano, V. Krapanzano, S. Trevik, etc.)

Interpretative anthropology took the thesis stated by Geertz («anthropology is not an experimental science looking for a rule but interpretative one looking for sense»), and it became clear that its successful development is possible only on the condition of cross-disciplinary synthesis, not out of philosophy, social studies, political economics, and other spheres of human and socio-scientific knowledge. Geertz's books and lectures laid the foundation of this most dynamic and intellectually oriented branch of American anthropology at the end of 1970s and beginning of 1990s. His work «Interpretation of cultures», in which semiotic conception of culture as the «web of meanings» is presented, takes its

special place. According to Geertz, culture is a sign system, but these signs are created and read by a human being himself; they don't exist out of his activity. In any case, analysis of signs is the analysis of person's action and perception, but, firstly, it is not experimental but comprehensive and interpretative analysis, secondly, this analysis is a dialogical one – there are subject and object revealing the truth. Knowledge about cultures is always the result of a certain intercultural consensus.

According to Geertz, the system approach to culture implies it is to be analyzed as a complex phenomenon from the complementary points of view and discovery of underlying semantic structures and objective laws. His approach is interpretative and experimental in searching for the meaning and experimental in searching for the mechanism which makes that meaning possible. Having refused analysis of culture as indivisible and static model (that was specific for anthropological school of Boas), Geertz developed a concept of dynamic and interpenetrating systems of culture. He considered culture not as a complex of definite behavioral models but as a set of exogenous control mechanism – plans, prescriptions, rules, instructions (programs) – ruling emotions of a person. According to Geertz's conception, at every society, the sphere of culture consists of a number of cultural systems: religion, ideology, politics, science, art, etc. Any of these systems taken apart couldn't provide normal functioning of an individual at highly developed society [10].

Being interdisciplinary on their attitudes, methods, material under investigation, and conclusions, Geertz's works had an effect on all the spheres of human and social sciences including anthropology and culture studies often treated as a chance of return to the entire world from the state of split and alienation as the conditions of postmodernism, the intellectual movement which included human and social sciences.

The works published in the French journal called «The Annals» (nowadays it is called «The Annals. History and social sciences») representing the school of «The Annals» as one of the most influential trends at theory of historical process and culture) are of great importance for the formation of culture studies. The formation of that school was an effort to overcome the crisis of traditional kind of history oriented to positivism. The essence of «Copernican revolution» made by this trend was the replacement of classical «history as narration» with «history as problem» in order to create «total history», i.e. history describing all the connections existing in society – economic, social, and cultural ones.

The object of study of the school of «The Annals» is neither the actions of «great persons» nor description of events, but it is research on one whole society with variety of social relations and deep structures taking long periods of time.

The representatives of «The Annals» school raised a problem of investigation on culture in its entirety as a system of world outlook and complex of models of the world in consciousness of members of society keeping human existence. In substance, this kind of approach belongs to anthropology and culture studies and carries out a complex synthesizing description with the data of different sciences involved and cognition of internal historical and cultural processes through penetration into self-consciousness of the people of the period studied and conditions of their everyday life.

Starting from 1960s, there is a formation of a new type of theorizing at history which gets such names as «narrative philosophy», «Modern intellectual history», and «Modern philosophy of history». The main accent is put on the specificity of historical texts, methods of their organization, and communication within social and cultural space of human practice. Historiography becomes the main subject matter.

The turning-point at formation of the problematics was H. White's book «Metahistory: historical imagination in Europe in XIX century» and also works of T. Khun, W. Kuyain, R. Rorty; there had been accomplished relativization of classical epistemology and defended the position of individual creative freedom and independence of choice of cognitive and textual strategies. There had also pointed out the significance of cognitive features of language of historiography and concrete historical and discursive speech practice and there had been an investigation on the content of form of narrative sentences, discursive statements and systems forming a text of research on history. The works of the authors mentioned suggest some new ways of study of texts, the problem of denotation and translation of different systems of meanings is under investigation, and there is an assertion of a researcher's right to choose (freely and consciously) all the components of construction and representation of texts, combinatorics (combination of «incommensurable» things in classical science and eclecticism), and re-conceptualization of the content of the basic notions. These positions are close to the researches taking place in contemporary human knowledge at post-colonial discourse, «researches on culture», and culture studies.

The logic in formation of culture studies as self-actualization of culture of the 20th century lies in transition from sciences investigating on separate elements of culture (language, mythology, systems of thinking, art culture, and symbolic forms of human activity) to science about culture of the mankind as a whole. According to G.S. Pomerantz, its domain is interaction of the worlds of culture being under conditions of globalization process and appearance of one whole information space. In particular, quite natural formation and development of the new science is connected with the appearance of that new reality.

Culture studies are formed on the border of many sciences, integrating knowledge of different science of culture into integral system and representing ideas about the essence, functions, structure, and dynamics of culture as such, modeling cultural configurations of different epochs, nations, confessions, and classes, revealing and systematizing distinctive features of different cultural worlds. Problematics of culture studies is developed in different aspects: researches on etnolinguistics and semiotics, literary analysis of history of culture, history of mythological culture, researches from the points of view of general theory of artistic culture and social and cultural anthropology, researches on culture of mentality and every day life, and religious aspect of culture.

In reference to the same realia of culture and investigating on the same cultural objects, culture studies don't substitute cultural and historical, art historical, anthropological, and other kinds of knowledge by itself, it just considers those objects and realia from other points of view.

The tendency to the holistic point of view on culture and integration of knowledge about its different components appeared in Russia in 60-80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It promoted the formation of the trend called «theory of culture», «theory and history of culture»; and that was an indication of inclination of Russian tradition to analysis of phenomenon of culture as wholeness and exploration of the main objective laws of its development, structures, functions, and significance at social life.

There had been formed many trends of research in this tendency: general-theoretical problems of culture, methodology of research on culture, morphology and dynamics of culture, social studies of culture and art, civilization theory, typology of culture, social and cultural anthropology. As distinct from the West, «culture studies» term was firmly implanted in scientific

literature and scientific sphere in Russia in early 90s of the 20th century. First and foremost, it was connected with considerable scientific achievements made in this sphere and formation of culture studies as cross-disciplinary field of knowledge, actualizing the idea of synthetic science characteristic of the 20th century with integration of the results of research on culture as its aim. System analysis of phenomena of culture and system approach directed to integration of all the fields of knowledge investigating on culture become predominant. Culture is considered as a system; its essence, «system organization», structure, specific features, and characteristics of its function and concrete realization are under investigation in the context of that approach. General-system analysis supports logic of semantic interpretation of culture and all concrete displays and embodiments of culture. This kind of approach is carried out both at all the levels of analysis of culture (culture as a whole, culture of a certain period, culture of a concrete cultural area, society, subcultures, and that one of individual) and at the levels of its particular subsystems (science, art culture, religion, etc.).

System is usually understood as some kind of integration formed with a sum of elements closely related and connected with each other.

Besides the features of coherence, usually there is also a mention of hierarchy as the most important characteristic of system and its «system-formative factor». Y.S. Stepanov makes mention of «concept» as a system-formative factor of culture – that is a «clot of culture» in human mental world and «collective unconscious».

As L.A. Mikeshina remarks, cultural and historical approach leads Y.S. Stepanov to considerable amplification of «concept» term, and the instituted notion of conceptualized domain at language and culture supposes that not only words and mythologems, but also rites, things, and material objects as symbols and carriers of

spiritual sense are to be united in one common notion – that is «cultural concept».

The idea of phenomenon of culture as system and the need for system approach to study on culture at different levels arising from that idea has already had its own tradition. Different aspects of systems theory applied to the problematics of culture studies were developed by Belgian scientist and the Nobel prizewinner I. Prigozhin, Russian scientists R. Yakobson, Y. Tynyanov, Y. Lotman and others.

Using the system theory, scientists try to explain origin and existence of the extremely complicated order characterizing the general notion «culture studies». Reliance on the principles of system approach allows integration of knowledge about culture including various materials to be provided.

Actualization of the creative potential of culture dictates the necessity for integration of various aspects of knowledge about this sphere of spiritual life in the context of one scientific discipline – applied culture studies as a peculiar bridge leading into the world of culture of an individual or the human community.

The purpose of applied culture studies is introduction of a person into culture. The content of this process is formed by socio-cultural activity with cultural policy as one of its components. Thus, one can define culture studies as a complex of conceptions, methodological principles, methods, and cognitive procedures oriented to application at different spheres of social cooperation and achievement of certain practical effects in these spheres [41].

As far as the applied level of culture studies supposes that the results of cognition are to be applied in practice, the following trends and characteristics of analysis are of special importance: diagnostics and forecast of socio-cultural dynamics developing in conditions of spontaneous self-organization; rated change of the

aspects and elements of socio-cultural dynamics which could be transformed under influence of purposeful management activity; and also programming and planning of definite aspects of practice able to be changed in an appropriate way under influence of a many managerial steps.

Such elements of knowledge as a complex of social technologies designed for experts and practitioners at different fields of social activity become an essential component of applied culture studies. The specificity of the applied level of knowledge about culture is its integrative nature suggesting that the more difficult requirements, worked out on the basis of that kind of knowledge, are to be used for the practical solutions.

### **Example**

Socio-cultural complex and sides of practice require transition of specialists and administrators to the intersectoral interaction, and that allows the comprehension of their professional problems to be deepened and adequate solutions to be worked out. The main reasons of broadening of needs of specialists and administrative staff are knowledge of the results of analysis of culture, and that is possible to reduce to several global factors:

- the development of intercultural contacts and international tourism is intensive in the world;
- the processes of implantation of socio-cultural innovations have started being strengthened in many countries;
- modernization phenomenon has become actual for many traditional societies, and that has affected not only technologies of labor, spiritual values, and standards of behavior, but also social institutes and way of life on the whole;
- the relations between urban culture and rural culture have been changed;
- the traditional type of individuality has been transformed, and that has brought

to difficulties in the process of individual, group, and social self-identification.

The applied level of knowledge of culture studies had been developed for rather a long period of time in the context of cultural-sectoral approach in Russian scientific and social practice of the Soviet period. In its turn, that was connected with the theoretic postulates of Marxism assigning a part of secondary role at the level of superstructure to culture. That is why culture was reduced to such fields of practice as spiritual, educational, scientific, and art activities in theory of culture of the Soviet period, where was possible to use recommendations of researchers on culture.

In 60-80s the most advanced levels of applied culture studies were such branches of analysis as social studies on artistic culture and art, sociology of cultural activity [8].

In 80s there appeared the works proving the necessity for use of knowledge of culture studies as an independent cross-disciplinary branch which includes theoretical and applied levels. Nowadays it is possible to speak about the final stage of formation of theoretical culture studies while the applied level is under the process of formation.

In the conditions of modernization, the working out of integral cultural policy adequate to the contemporary demands of Russian society requires prevention of narrow-minded approach to it and its formation on the large socio-cultural basis.

Cultural policy is a complex dynamic system of interaction between state authorities, society, and culture (as the object of this policy) as a set of scientifically based points of view, events on comprehensive socio-cultural modernization of society, structural reform of all the systems of institutions of culture, optimization of combination of state and social components in socio-cultural life, scientific and educational

support of the subsequent regulation of socio-cultural processes etc., on the whole, as conscious correction of general content of culture.

Cultural processes obey the deepest laws of self-organization. That is why the administrative influence on culture on the part of the state could be perceived as the introduction of external action into the process of system self-organization, and not for submission of development of the system but for increase of its inner activity hidden in the logic of development of its creative potential.

The state cultural policy is to model mechanisms of natural civilization process, act in the context of its socio-synergetic laws and just stimulate the accelerated development of society in the direction of its own objective movement.

A.Y. Flier defines two levels of cultural administrative activity in his consideration of state policy in the sphere of culture: the very cultural policy and operative control of cultural-creative processes [16]. But this type of classification conceals the danger of separation of practice of administrative activity at the sphere of culture from theoretical conceptualization of real conditions, strategic aims, and actual problems of process in culture. Only the unity of operative actions and theoretical search for the optimal ways and models of development of culture is able to give productive abilities of function of a process of culture and to provide the strategy of self-development of culture.

On the other hand, cultural policy is a special field of political activity directly oriented to the values of life and culture and to the supreme spiritual states of consciousness or will realized by those values. The links established and maintained by cultural policy are the connections of life through co-presence and assistance at some valuable and spiritually conceived realities of culture, through reception and empathy of axiomatic state of consciousness or will, samples of presence and activity important for

an individual in valuable spaces of culture, and through free co-participation in confirmation of a chosen project and conception on life.

Some people think that cultural policy is a complex of opinions based on science and vast activity at socio-cultural modernization of society and structural reforms of the whole system of culture-formative institutions as a system of new principles of proportion of state and social components at social and cultural life, as a complex of measures on the preliminary arrangement of scientific and educational supply for those principles and purposeful training of personnel for efficient regulation of socio-cultural processes in the future, and the most important thing is conscious correction of the general content of culture.

Control over the current cultural-creative process is a complex of operative actions solving vital problems of the existing culture-formative institutions oriented to maintenance of enlarged reproduction of actual forms of culture within the bounds of financial assets, skilled workers, tools and technologies existing at the moment.

At the level of contemporary scientific ideas of the essence of culture, it is impossible to make any global approaches to its problems (in particular, statement of foreground tasks and aims of cultural policy) without correlation of culture with the main tendencies of development of civilization.

The most important principle of statement of tasks and aims of cultural policy lies in comprehension of polysemic nature of culture, its senses and content. None of the phenomena of culture is monofunctional, it has a whole complex of different social functions in itself; there is no any phenomenon of culture with only one meaning and spontaneous content, but it is a complex of different meanings and contents both of actual and memorial nature. It is connected with the special difficulty of administrative strategy and

tactics in the sphere of culture and the necessity of multilevel approach to the regulation of socio-cultural processes.

Today the state takes the most important part in development of culture, which is to make the greatest contribution to regulation of the sphere of culture in Russian society, for the development of exchange relations has been insufficiently formed [36]. Thereby cultural policy of Russia today is possible to be considered in three main aspects: theoretical aspect when cultural policy could be interpreted as an abstract ideal model of intercourse of the authorities and culture; applied aspect which reveals cultural policy as a system of priorities of agencies of State power declared in the corresponding plans of development of culture at the federal and regional levels; specifically-historical aspect when cultural policy is considered as a real system of relations between subjects of culture [46].

Nevertheless there are many contradictions of Russian character interfering with realization of the common state policy in the sphere of culture in the present situation. They are:

- between contemporary demands of the society for the value as orienting points and inability of the formed cultural system to their formation and translation;
- between the existing variety of cultures characterizing country as a conglomerate of different nations, and immature integral image of Russian culture;
- between existence of different local cultures and global processes of the contemporary life leading to levelling of cultural traditions and values;
- between the achieved level of creativity and multiplicity of the world art and condition of creative thought in artistic practice;
- between the necessity for new skilled workers possessing modern professional

skills and low social status of the branch of culture;

- between advance of exchange relations into the all spheres of life of the contemporary society and unavailability of culture to improve relations with business sector;
- between introduction of innovative technologies into life activity of the society and absence of the possibility to use them in valid institutions of culture;
- between new requirements of society in formation of a new market of cultural services and impossibility of the traditional system of culture to fulfill it with the offers adequate to the requirements.

In order to develop mechanism for the marked contradictions to be surmounted, it is necessary to form the only socio-cultural space providing with promotion of creative initiatives as the basis of stable and dynamic development of Russia.

### Results

In this connection, cultural policy as the subject of applied culture studies is to:

- be essential part of all the branches of the state policy in general without exception, reflecting its moral and normative aspects;
- become the most important component of social policy which could only be complex socio-cultural and educational program at present;
- form the very cultural policy (in a narrow sense of the word) as a special branch of state and public services on stimulating socially acceptable, spiritual valuable and socially-normative displays of a human being and forms of his social and individual being regulated by the state;

- maximally provide citizens with constitutional law of access to benefits of culture and realization of the principle of freedom of creative work regardless of residence;
- provide with state security of the objects of cultural heritage;
- promote integration of Russia into the international cultural community, and that is stipulated by the necessity for strengthening of the positive image of the country abroad and also by inclusion of the population into the available context of cultural practices of the modern civilization;
- develop professional and amateur art, and artistic education aimed at formation and development of aesthetic demands of the population, formation of aesthetically developed and interested audience of listeners and spectators, training skilled workers ready for the professional activity at the sphere of culture and art, and maintenance and transfer of the best traditions of Russian professional education to the next generations;
- maintain and develop multinational material and non material cultural heritage of the country. The very heritage is the form with the specific protective cultural functions or ideological support of formation of a new tradition [47]. It

obviously unites different cultures, and that is topical for Russia.

The specific feature of cultural policy is that culture is not only an object of this policy, but a subject as well – first of all, because it is a self-developing and self-regulating system; it doesn't matter what kind of subject of a decision in the sphere of cultural policy, it still stays in the area of a certain culture and appears to be a product of it. Properly speaking, the question is about the dialectic of administration and self-organization in the context of the system of social regulation of culture.

The optimal cultural policy puts a person with his needs and interests in centre, furthers the absolute implementation of his generic essence. The solution of such problem is provided with the reliance on science, real estimation of everything happening, professionalism, and competence of those people who develop and implement the policy.

Culture policy is to be aimed at achievement of harmonic development of the country on the basis of correct scientific organization and administration with the society; it is to encourage the removal of unequal development of a human being and society by the way of coordination and regulation; it is to reduce the level of immunity to culture and cultural dilettantism of the mass. It should defend interests of every person and the whole nation, secure human rights of free and independent development, and correct balance in interests of different social groups.

### References

1. Alternative culture: Encyclopedia. – Yekaterinburg: Ultra. Culture, 2005.
2. Arnoldov, A.I. Cultural policy: realia and tendencies. – Moscow: MSUCA, 2002.
3. Big encyclopedia. – M.: Big Russian encyclopedia – St. Petersburg: NORINT, 2001.
4. Biryukova, M.A. Globalization: integration and differentiation of cultures / M.A. Biryukova // Philosophical sciences. – 2001. – №1.
5. Bogatyreva, T.G. Contemporary culture and social development. – Moscow, 2001.
6. Culture. New philosophical encyclopedia: 4 volumes. V.2. – Moscow, 2001.

7. Culture: Theory and problematics / ed. T.F. Kuznetzova. – Moscow, 1996.
8. Culture in Soviet society. Problematics and perspective of development. – Moscow, 1988.
9. Culture Studies. College textbook / ed. B.A. Erengross. – Moscow, 2007.
10. Culture Studies. Encyclopedia / ed. S.Y. Levit. 2 volumes. V 1. – Moscow, 2007.
11. Culture Studies. XX century: dictionary. – St. Petersburg, 1997.
12. Culture Studies. XX century: encyclopedia: in 2 volumes. – St. Petersburg, 1998.
13. Culture Studies: Reading-book / ed. P.S. Gurevich. – Moscow, 2000.
14. Dragichevich-Sheshich, M. Culture: management, animation, and marketing. – Novosibirsk, 2000.
15. Evrasov, B.S. Social culture studies. – Moscow, 1996.
16. Flier, A.Y. Culture studies for researchers on culture. – Moscow: Academic project, 2000.
17. Fundamental problems of culture studies. 4 volumes. V.I. – Theory of culture. – St.Petersburg, 2008.
18. Glotov, M.B. Management at art culture / M.B. Glotov // Social studies. 2000.
19. Grushevickaya, T.G. Bases of intercultural communication. – Moscow, 2002.
20. Gurevich, P.S. Culture studies. – Moscow, 2002.
21. Ikonnikova, S.N. History of theories of culture: study guide for students of institutes of higher education. / S.N. Ikonnikova 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and enlarged. – St.Petersburg, 2005.
22. Ionin, L.G. Social studies on culture: study guide/ L.G. Ionin 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, revised and enlarged. – Moscow, 2000.
23. Kagan, M.S. Selectas in 7 volumes. Vol. 3. Works on the problematics of theory of culture. – St.Petersburg: Pertropolis, 2007.
24. Kiseleva, T.G. Socio-cultural activity: textbook/ T.G. Kiseleva, Y.D. Krasilnikov. – Moscow, 2004.
25. Komissarenko, S.S. Russian elite as a subject of Russian culture studies. // The questions of culture studies. – 2007. – №7.
26. Koptzeva, N.P. A.P. Chekhov as a Philosopher: «Game» Phenomenon and «Existence in the Face of Death» in his Dramas // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. V.1, №1. Krasnoyarsk, 2008.
27. Koptzeva, N.P. The Artistic Image as a Process and Result of Game Relations between a Work of Visual Art as an Object and its Spectator// Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. V.1, №2. Krasnoyarsk, 2008.
28. Koptzeva, N.P. The Creation Problem in Fundamental Ontology of Martin Heidegger and Modern Theory of Fine Arts// Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. V.1, №3, Krasnoyarsk, 2008.
29. Koptzeva, N.P. Truth as a Form of Modelling of Integrity at Social Being Level// Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. V.2, №1. Krasnoyarsk, 2008.
30. Kravchenko, A.I. Culture Studies: Dictionary. – Moscow: Academic project, 2000.
31. Kravchenko, A.I. Culture Studies: study guide. – Moscow: Academic project, 2001.
32. Kurbatov, V.I. Social projection: study guide. – Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 2001.
33. Mamedova, E.V. Cultural policy. / E.V. Mamedova // Philosophical sciences. – 2000.
34. National-cultural policy in the Russian Federation // Orienting points of cultural policy. Informational issue. – Moscow, 2003. – №1.

35. Orlova, E.A. Socio-cultural conditions for modernization in Russia. – Yekaterinburg, Culture studies high school, 2001.
36. Pavlovich, A.A. Contemporary culture of Russia and development of the regions // The questions of culture studies. – 2007. – №6.
37. Pashenko, V.Y. Social philosophy of Eurasian being. – Moscow, 2000.
38. Philosophy of culture. Formation and development / ed. M.S. Kagan, Y. Petrov. – St. Petersburg, 1998.
39. Razlogov, K.E. Prospects for culture and state cultural policy in Russia. – Moscow, 2000.
40. Russia at the contemporary dialogue of civilizations. – St. Petersburg: Cultural revolution, 2008.
41. Saveliev, V.V. Essays on applied culture studies: Genesis, conceptions, contemporary practice. P.1. – Moscow, 1993.
42. Sorokin, P.A. About Russian public opinion. – St. Petersburg, 2000.
43. System: philosophical encyclopedia. – Moscow, 2000.
44. System study on culture. – St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 2009.
45. White, L. Science about culture // Anthology of researches on culture. – Moscow, 1997.
46. Zagrebin, S.S. Cultural policy in Russia today // The questions of culture studies. – 2008. – №3.
47. Zamyatin, D.N. Heritage image in culture; methodological approaches to study on «heritage» concept. // Observatory of culture. – 2007. – №8.