

УДК 323.2 (=47+57-81)

Cultural Policy in Northern Territories: Specifics, Problems and Prospects

Vladimir S. Luzan*

*Siberian Federal University
79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041, Russia*

Received 18.06.2014, received in revised form 07.07.2014, accepted 14.08.2014

This paper attempts to uncover relevant methodological and practical approaches to the implementation of state cultural policy in the Russian Federation, bearing in mind its regional context and a task of preserving original habitat and sustainable socio-cultural development of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East.

The author notes that the analysis of contemporary studies in cultural policy and existing practice reveals insufficient attention of scientists to ethno-cultural aspects, characterized by internal contradictions: on the one hand, there is integration into regional and global socio-cultural space, on the other, there is a desire to preserve ethnic and cultural unique identity.

In conclusion, the author indicates promising directions of development of regional cultural policy in the northern territories, the implementation of which will help preserve the original habitat of the indigenous peoples and develop their self-identification.

Keywords: culture; indigenous small-numbered peoples; regional cultural policy; self-identification; culture development; culture processes.

Introduction

Russian society is gradually coming to understanding that the further development of the Russian Federation as one of the leading states and equal member of the world community is possible only provided that one of the priorities of national development is not just saving fundamental Russian culture, but also keeping the cultural diversity of peoples inhabiting Russia, including the indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East. This understanding is due to the fact that culture in its semiotic and symbolic forms preserves, multiplies and translates the

entire collective human experience, created in various fields. In addition, the culture reflects the specifics of a mixture of socio-cultural groups. If people understand this specific feature, this will facilitate greatly the comprehension of state building of a society able to respond to current challenges. In this regard, scientists have to conduct study of state cultural policy in its regional context, since further social and cultural development of the indigenous peoples largely depends on this very kind of domestic policy.

However, the internal problems of Russian modernization are exacerbated by the fact that global processes make changes to all the traditional

ways of social and individual existence of the indigenous peoples. No other era has not been characterized by such a high social dynamics as the present one. At the same time, the indigenous peoples are in constant interaction with various social groups, classes, and with each other. The indigenous peoples move within geographic space, their migration and assimilation increase. As a result of constant change, both at the global and local levels, there has appeared a particularly acute problem of the preservation of national identity and self-identification of indigenous peoples. Their future depends on success of the process of preserving original habitat of the indigenous peoples.

Meanwhile, the indigenous peoples can not lock themselves up into geo-cultural space and are trying to overcome their isolation via engaging in cross-cultural interaction, not only with neighboring Russian regions, but also with foreign states. In this regard, there is a need to create such regional cultural policy that would satisfy the most ethno-cultural needs, and not only of the individual but also of the ethnic group. This policy shall take into account the fact that Russia throughout its history has always been a poly-ethnic state.

It is worth emphasizing that in the context of this paper the terms “regional cultural policy” and “cultural policy in the northern territories” are used as synonyms.

Conceptual research base. Interdisciplinary study of the problem of cultural policy in the traditional territories of the indigenous peoples’ dwelling causes appeal to scientific papers in several scientific and theoretical directions. In particular, contemporary research practice effectively covers issues of creating cultural policy at the state level. Among the authors there are P.S. Gurevich, V.K. Iegorov, V.J. Kelle, L.N. Kogan, D.S. Likhachev, V.M. Mezhuiev, A.K. Uledov, etc.

Wide range of issues relating to culture functioning in modern society is illuminated by the authors, who are forming the modern idea of culture as a factor in social and cultural regulation of social life. Some of researchers are M.B. Gnedovskii, N.G. Denisov, B.S. Ierasov, L.G. Ionin, M.S. Kagan, V.A. Kurennyi, B.K. Markov, E.A. Orlova, M. Pakhter, A.J. Flier, N.A. Khrenov, I.G. Iakovenko, etc.

The European experience of formation and implementation of culture policies and importance of culture in the regional context are revealed in the works of foreign authors, such as M. Bassan, F. Bianchini, E. Grosjean, M. Dragicevic-Sheshich, M. Pike, J. Tommani, as well as in materials of various state institutions and publications of local authors – S.E. Zuev, O.V. Khlopina, P.G. Shchedrovitskii, etc.

At the same time, the analysis of cultural policy research unravels insufficient attention of authors to ethno-cultural aspects, characterized by internal contradictions. On the one hand, these aspects imply integration into the regional and global socio-cultural space, on the other – the desire to preserve ethnic and cultural identity.

The study of the problems identified is of importance especially during implementation of state cultural policy in its regional context, as conceptual development of federal cultural policy has virtually ignored spatial factor in culture. This fact creates serious problems for conservation of local ethnic cultures.

There is a particularly interesting culture studies’ examination of state cultural policy in Russia, the author of which – S.S. Zagrebina notes that “culture study’s definition of cultural policy is somewhat ideal model based on the principle of deep abstraction from the topical historical realities” [Zagrebina, 2008: 54-58]. Applied aspect is limited to “only departmental understanding of culture, when cultural policy

is treated as activities of regional culture offices in relation to cultural and art institutions” [Zagrebin, 2008: 56].

Traditionally, the empirical concept of culture in Russia has been associated with the practice of enlightenment (including artistic and artistic-educational activities), as well as with “gathering” and study of historical and cultural materials of folklore and ethnographic character. This, in particular, was described by Iu.V. Osokin, who wrote that such empirical understanding of culture “was reflected in the profile orientation of a number of specialized research, training and cultural institutions. The first developed methodology concerning primarily activities in clubs and libraries, as well as amateur art; the second engaged in training of specialists in the field of cultural, educational and entertaining activities – mainly in librarians and clubs)” [Osokin, 2007: 1072].

Thus, it is possible to fix a gap between the empirical understanding of culture in industrial way and theoretical understanding of culture as the most important sphere of human activity, which aims at creation, transmission and preservation of the ideals having dual economic and spiritual nature. This gap has its own form at the level of real cultural policy when created concepts, strategies, targeted programs, state-supported projects affect only the content that is associated with amateur performances, folklore and ethnographic movements, historical and cultural monuments, artistic and educational events and so on and so forth.

As Ie.V. Vinokurova, another researcher of cultural policy making in the northern territories, rightly pointed out, culture studies’ isolation from real cultural processes occur for two main reasons: lack of scientific validity of state cultural policy, objectives of which are formulated very declaratively, and lack of regional application of culture studies in the field of cultural policy,

lack of studies able to enrich theoretical science [Vinokurova, 2011: 206].

However, despite the gaps, the relevance of understanding the specifics of state cultural policy is confirmed by the fact that in recent years this subject was described in numerous doctoral research papers. The authors include A.S. Balakshin, P.L. Volk, L.Ie. Vostriakov, Iu.Ie. Ziatdinov, M.I. Krivosheev, Ie.V. Kuznetsov, N.N. Kurnaia, O.P. Ponomarenko, G.A. Smirnov and others.

Stating the problem. One of the fundamental conceptual foundations of state cultural policy in Russia at the present stage, including its regional aspect, is decentralization, which on the one hand makes it possible to implement regional cultural policy in the local context, on the other hand it significantly complicates the formation process of a common cultural space within a particular region and the country as a whole.

Absence of ideological constraints have opened up possibilities for increasing the role of the Russian Federation’s regions in the development of the world cultural diversity. Experience of long-term coexistence, conservation and development of the cultural identity of many peoples in Russia has become popular with the world community because of the need of saving cultural diversity.

Incidentally, the new content of state cultural policy actualized scientific justification of, on the one hand, the preservation of ethnic and cultural identity of the Russian peoples under influence of globalization processes, on the other hand, the axiological approach to the contribution of ethnic cultures in the global cultural space.

In circumstances, where threat of breaking a single cultural space of the Russian Federation is visibly growing, when discrepancy between federal and national-regional aspects of the implementation of state cultural policy arises, it is the regional and local level which is in charge of practical solution of problems of reforming

the social sphere and provision of existing social standards.

Any region, as a subject of the Russian Federation, is a multipart socio-economic complex, a political formation in which there is a certain coherence and interdependence between production, commercial, social and cultural spheres, between the structures of regional and local authorities. These connections promote the fullest use of natural and productive resources, scientific and cultural potential, and satisfaction of diverse needs.

Regional culture is a multi-valued concept. It has a special world and is characterized by solitude, insularity, fixation on everyday life, the desire to preserve a certain degree of immunity to innovation. It is sometimes poorly receptive of innovation, other values, tends to a peculiar refraction of an idea in value system. On the other hand, this is an open culture, reaching outwards to dialogue with other cultures, to a constant increment of value wealth.

A look at the possibility of updating Russian culture through values of regional cultures may be accompanied by the fear that for many years the exclusive approach to the regional culture has deprived it of many inherent values. We must not forget that the region can serve as a cultural reservoir of the country, but among other things it can adversely affect the culture.

As the G.M. Kazakova says, “regional culture incorporates both ethnic and national dimension. But compared to the “ethnic”, the regional culture has, first, a higher degree of abstraction, since a regional community sometimes represents a mix of ethnic groups. Within the region, as it was already noted, the ethnic groups live in direct contact with each other, acquiring in the process of joint sociocultural adaptation and common economic activities some similarities and symptoms, which often differ notably from those traditionally attributed to them. Culture

of ethnic groups is always “supplemented” by such features, which are caused by the specific circumstances of their existence. Regional culture becomes an indicator of ethnically heterogeneous elements, providing within the local area the opportunity of intercultural and interethnic cooperation and also implementing the model of multicultural unity in practice. Secondly, regional culture is different from ethnic in more mobile configuration of cultural properties and characteristics of a particular region. Regional culture changes with every change in conditions of its existence” [Kazakova, 2009: 12].

Structurally, regional culture is complex and polybasic. According to G.M. Kazakova, the fundamental bases of regional culture and, as a consequence, regional cultural policy, are the following [Kazakova, 2009: 12-15]:

- generic structure levels (material, spiritual, artistic, folk, professional, traditional, innovative culture, etc.);
- subcultures with different criteria (social class, professional, ethnic, national, religious and other);
- utilitarian practice sphere;
- set of institutional and non-institutional forms of creation, storage and dissemination of cultural values (the first forms include institutions that were designed to implement the spiritual production, spiritual consumption, as well as to manage cultural process, the second forms refer to the consumer behavioral culture of the inhabitants in the region);
- levels of culture consumption and art perception.

Functionally, regional culture is intended to encode, store and transfer local human experience in all areas of activity done by the population of the regional community. This culture is meant to ensure the reproduction of the cultural life of the region, continuity of the regional cultural process, as well as

the completeness of individual experience. Regional culture is polyfunctional. A list of functions includes adaptation, socializing, transformative, educational, informational and communicative, creative, regulatory, artistic, aesthetic, axiological, symbolic and other activities.

In the light of regional cultural policy the outlined above specific features are often overlooked, not only due to a lack of conceptual understanding of the culture managers, but also due to the existing legal conditions under which the main purpose of government is to ensure people's access to cultural institutions of all types. As an example, one may consider the experience of cultural design for original habitat of the indigenous peoples in culture "sector" in Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets), Evenkiysky and Turukhansky Municipal Districts of the Krasnoyarsk Territory.

In the structure of the executive power, the majority of the Russian Federation's regions have special structure divisions for the indigenous peoples' problems. These divisions coordinate relevant regional programs and issues of socio-economic development of these peoples. However, even if such divisions exist, usually the main authority on culture projects is assigned to specialized bodies in the field of culture. For example, in the Krasnoyarsk Territory such authority is given to the Ministry of Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory (hereinafter – the Ministry of Culture). As part of efforts to design and implement culture projects and introduce ethnic cultural indicators of quality of life by the Ministry of Culture has developed Program on realization of main strategies of cultural policy in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020 (hereinafter referred to as the Program). The Program has been specified for each municipality.

During making the Program its creators applied program-target method, aimed at

addressing the priorities of culture sector development. These priorities were set by the decree of the Government of Krasnoyarsk Territory of 20.01.2009 № 24-p "On approval of main cultural policy strategy in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020" [Reference legal system "ConsultantPlus"]. The program identified the structuring development blocks of the cultural space of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in the unity of its historical, cultural and socio-economic characteristics elicited by the main strategies for the cultural policy of the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020.

Implementation of the Program focuses on the following tasks, which are extremely important for designing cultural original habitat of the indigenous peoples [Official Site of the Krasnoyarsk Territory]:

- development and introduction of systematic actions positioning the region in Russia and abroad as the region with a high cultural potential;
- modernization of material and technical equipment of state regional and municipal culture institutions;
- creation of new culture infrastructure objects;
- preservation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and its integration into social and economic development of the region;
- development of human resources industry;
- increasing accessibility for residents of the region of cultural activities and cultural values;
- modernization of providing services in the field of culture, introduction of information technologies into this sphere;
- introduction of incentive mechanisms in local government and nonprofit

organizations to implement projects in various cultural activities;

- development and introduction of a system to identify and support the leaders of the cultural process in the region;
- formation of a system of unique recognizable events in the Krasnoyarsk Territory.

To understand how to create state mechanisms of cultural design in the original habitat of the indigenous peoples the most appropriate way is to focus on specific program activities on the example of Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets), Evenkiysky, Turukhansky Municipal Districts.

The program of implementation in Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets) Municipal District of main cultural policy strategies in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020 was designed to meet the following criteria [Official Site of the Krasnoyarsk Territory]:

- Permanent population is 34.1 thousand people as of 01.01.2013.
- Number of settlements is 27, including four settlements with a population of less than 70 people.
- Network of culture and education institutions in the field of culture and art in Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets) Municipal District includes 26 libraries; 22 Houses of Culture; 4 institutions of additional education of children in the sphere of culture and art; 3 centers of folk art; local culture institution “Cinema and leisure center Arctic”; local culture institution “Cultural and recreation center” in Dikson; vocal and dance ensemble “Chokurkan” in culture department administration in the rural settlement of Khatanga; information centre “Khatanga” in culture department administration in Khatanga.

Besides municipal cultural institutions there are the following state regional budgetary culture institutions: “Taimyr House of Folklore” and “Taimyr Regional Museum”.

The cultural and educational services in institutions in the field of culture and art, which the regional residents have access to, do not fully conform to the standards recommended by the Federal Government decree of 03.07.1996 № 1063-p. In this area there are no intra-settlement cultural institutions. In the district center of Dudinka there is no showroom, in Kayak settlement there is no library. Number of seats in the House of Culture in Tukhard settlement is 53.3 %, in the House of Culture in Nosok settlement is 30.8 % and in the Municipal House of Culture in Dudinka – only 25.4 % of the corresponding standard.

Calculation of the financing measures aimed at ensuring the regulatory requirements of the Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets) Municipal District in cultural and art objects shows that by 2020 the total amount of funds raised for the implementation of all planned activities should be 1,146,007.0 thousand rubles. By the way, from the government standpoint it is intended to achieve the following ethnic and cultural indicators of life quality of the indigenous small-numbered peoples:

- 1) Construction of 6 cultural and leisure institutions in Dudinka, Nosok, Novaia, Potapovo, Tukhard, Khatanga;
- 2) Construction of a district showroom in Dudinka;
- 3) Major repairs and reconstruction of 19 cultural and educational institutions;
- 4) Educating 93 people various specialties in the field of culture for free;
- 5) As a part of the organization of events contributing to the creation of a unique image of the territory to hold the International Cultural Forum of the indigenous small-numbered peoples every two years.

Analysis of existing funding in culture sector in Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets) Municipal District shows that the share of expenditure in culture sector in the budget of the municipality was 334,688.93 thousand rubles in 2011, and in 2012 – 386,653.62 thousand rubles (116% growth) [Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in figures for 2011-2012, 2013]. Actual expenditures in “culture” industry for 2012 exceeded 11,000.0 rubles per 1 inhabitant.

The program of implementation in Turukhansky Municipal District of main cultural policy strategies in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020 was designed to meet the following criteria [Official Site of the Krasnoyarsk Territory]:

- Permanent population is 17.9 thousand people as of 01.01.2013.
- Number of settlements is 34, including 11 settlements with a population of less than 70 people, 4 settlements are not currently inhabited.
- Network of culture and education institutions in the field of culture and art include 26 libraries; 20 culture and leisure institutions; 2 museums; 3 institutions of additional education in the field of culture, including 2 children music schools and children art school.

The cultural and educational services in institutions in the field of culture and art, which the regional residents have access to, do not fully conform to the standards recommended by the Federal Government decree of 03.07.1996 № 1063-p. The area has no organized film showing process. There is no any culture and leisure institution in the village of Staroturukhansk. A building of club in Sovetskaia Rechka settlement does not meet fire safety requirements. Number of seats in the rural House of Culture in Farkovo is 58.6 %, and in the House of Culture and Leisure in Igarka is 0 % of the corresponding standard.

Calculation of the financing measures aimed at ensuring the regulatory requirements of the Turukhansky Municipal District in cultural and art objects shows that by 2020 the total amount of funds raised for the implementation of all planned activities should be 563,953.0 thousand rubles. By the way, from the government standpoint it is intended to achieve the following ethnic and cultural indicators of life quality of the indigenous small-numbered peoples:

- 1) Building culture and leisure 3 institutions in Igarka, Sovetskaia Rechka, Farkovo;
- 2) Construction of an exhibition hall for Turukhansky Regional Museum;
- 3) Building a branch of Centralized Information Library System number 11 in Sovetskaia Rechka;
- 4) Construction of an art school in Igarka;
- 5) Major repairs and reconstruction of 39 cultural and educational institutions;
- 6) Educating 40 people various specialties in the field of culture for free;
- 7) As a part of the organization of events contributing to the creation of a unique image of the territory to hold the ethnographic festival “Astygan kiarenii” (the Kets celebrate) every two years and annual holidays Reindeer Herders Day, River Day, Fisherman Day.

Analysis of existing funding in culture sector in Turukhansky Municipal District shows that the share of expenditure in culture sector in the budget of the municipality was 165,786.40 thousand rubles in 2011, and in 2012 – 193,096.18 thousand rubles (11 6% growth) [Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in figures for 2011-2012, 2013]. Actual expenditures in “culture” industry for 2012 exceeded 10,000.0 rubles per 1 inhabitant.

The program of implementation in Evenkiysky Municipal District of main cultural policy strategies in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020 was designed to meet the following

criteria [Official Site of the Krasnoyarsk Territory]:

- Permanent population is 15.9 thousand people as of 01.01.2013.
- Number of settlements is 23, including 2 villages with a population of less than 70 people.
- Network of institutions of culture and education in the field of culture and arts includes 25 libraries; 20 culture and leisure institutions; 3 children art schools; Evenkiysky Regional Museum with two branches.

The cultural and educational services in institutions in the field of culture and art, which the regional residents have access to, do not fully conform to the standards recommended by the Federal Government decree of 03.07.1996 № 1063-p. In this area there are no intra-settlement cultural institutions. In Kuz'movka settlement there is no library, in Oskoba – House of Culture.

In the village of Tura, administrative center of Evenkia, there is a regional ethno-pedagogical centre of retraining, the purpose of which is to preserve the language and culture of the indigenous population. The center publishes books on the Evenki language, folklore, flora and fauna, sewing beads, traditional musical instruments and other occupations.

The main cultural institution engaged in activities to preserve and promote the culture, traditions, crafts and fine arts of the indigenous peoples of the North, their folklore and national holidays is the Centre of Folk Art. But because of the remoteness of the territory the performers face the problem how to organize concerts and tour activities both in the municipality and out of it.

Calculation of the financing measures aimed at ensuring the regulatory requirements of the Evenkiysky Municipal District in cultural and art objects shows that by 2020 the total amount of

funds raised for the implementation of all planned activities should be 489,063.0 thousand rubles. By the way, from the government standpoint it is intended to achieve the following ethnic and cultural indicators of life quality of the indigenous small-numbered peoples:

- 1) Construction of 4 culture and leisure institutions in the townships of Kuz'movka, Essey, Kuiumba, Mutorai;
- 2) Construction of Evenkiysky Regional Museum in Tura;
- 3) Construction of a rural library in Tutonchany township;
- 4) Major repairs and reconstruction of 21 cultural and educational institutions;
- 5) Educating 40 people various specialties in the field of culture for free;
- 6) As a part of the organization of events contributing to the creation of a unique image of the territory to hold the annual International Forum "Tunguska phenomenon".

Analysis of existing funding in culture sector in Evenkiysky Municipal District shows that the share of expenditure in culture sector in the budget of the municipality was 160,424.60 thousand rubles in 2011, and in 2012 – 213,976.64 thousand rubles (133% growth) [Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in figures for 2011-2012, 2013]. Actual expenditures in "culture" industry for 2012 exceeded 13,000.0 rubles per 1 inhabitant.

In general, the total amount of financing required to achieve all stated ethno-cultural indicators of the life quality in the Taimyrsky (Dolgano-Nenets), Evenkiysky and Turukhansky Municipal Districts in the Krasnoyarsk Territory by 2020 is more than 2.2 billion rubles, excluding funding for the ongoing activities of existing culture and education institutions in the field of culture.

Conclusion. In the current situation there are such state mechanisms concerning

cultural design of the original habitat of the indigenous small-numbered peoples, which are less attuned to the specifics of national culture preservation, but aimed at achieving average for Russia availability in a number of formal attributes (for example, in presence of cultural centers, libraries, seats in the rooms, etc.). Moreover, 100% achievement of these indicators in the case of the indigenous small-numbered peoples may not always mean their actual cultural development. We can also admit a lack of ethno-cultural indicators of the life quality of the indigenous small-numbered peoples in the legal framework, while there is a large quantity of different economic, social indicators, achievement of which is estimated as the efficiency of public administration. In this respect, we can identify the following areas of regional cultural policy, without which the full development of the indigenous small-numbered peoples can significantly slow down:

A) Introduction of a system of ethnological expertise and applied research in the field of cultural design for the original habitat of the indigenous small-numbered peoples;

B) Development of special programs to improve self-identification of the indigenous small-numbered peoples via PR-actions, creating a sense of national pride, as well as helping to form an idea of ethnic involvement in multinational

space of Russia and the world, perceiving the ethnos as a unique and equal entity;

C) Approval by the executive bodies of the Russian Federation of a list of the most necessary cultural and entertaining events, promoting the development of ethnic and cultural indicators of the life quality for the indigenous small-numbered peoples;

D) Development of regional programs for the preservation of national indigenous peoples' languages. It is indispensable to create conditions for the possibility of the national languages' usage not only in everyday life, but also in public sphere, at conferences, symposia, seminars, etc.;

E) Adoption of regional laws relating to the protection and preservation of epic heritage of the indigenous small-numbered peoples;

F) Development of a set of regional programs in support of traditional types and forms of artistic creativity for the indigenous small-numbered peoples, namely creation of workshops, art classes, art schools, art studios with special areas and subjects;

G) Multilateral agreements between the indigenous small-numbered peoples and already existing scientific innovative centers – universities, laboratories, small businesses in all major development directions, which enlist economy, business, education, science, medicine, art, etc.

References

1. Abramova, N.T., Voronin, A.A., Mikhailov, F.T. *Samosoznanie i kul'tura [Self-consciousness and culture]*. Moscow. Nauka, 2009, 208p.
2. Aleksander, D., Smith, F. (2010). Sil'naia programma v kul'tursotsiologii [Strong program in cultural sociology]. *Sotsiologicheskoe obozrenie (Sociological review)*. Vol. 9, 2, pp. 11-30.
3. Amosov, A.Ie., Koptseva, N.P., Libakova, N.M., Reznikova, K.V., Sertakova, K.V., Pimenova, N.N., Kistova, A.V. et al. *Korennyye malochislennyye narody Severa i Sibiri v usloviakh global'nykh transformatsii (na primere Krasnoyarskogo Kraia). Chast' 1. Kontseptual'nye i metodologicheskie bazy issledovaniia. Etnokul'turnaya dinamika korennykh malochislennykh narodov Krasnoyarskogo Kraia [The indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North and Siberia under the global transformations (on the basis of the Krasnoyarsk Territory). Part 1. Conceptual and methodological bases of research.*

Ethno-cultural dynamics of the indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Krasnoyarsk Territory. Ed. by Koptseva, N.P. Krasnoyarsk, Siberian Federal University, 2012, 640 p.

4. Andrichenko, L.V., Postnikov, A.Ie. (2008). Problemy razgranicheniia zakonodatel'nykh polnomochii v sfere zashchity iskonnoi sredy obitaniia i traditsionnogo obraza zhizni korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossii [Problem of disseminating legislative powers in the defense of original habitat and traditional lifestyle of the indigenous small-numbered peoples of Russia]. *Zhurnal Rossiiskogo prava (Journal of Russian law)*, 5, pp. 28-37.

5. Arnol'dov, A.I. *Kul'turnaia politika: realii i tendetsii [Cultural policy: realities and trends]*. Moscow, MGUKI, 2004, 64 p.

6. Artem'ieva, T.I. *Filosofia i psikhologiya kul'tury: izbrannoe [Philosophy and psychology culture: selection]*. M.: Nauka, 2007, 478 p.

7. Arutiunov, S.A. *Kul'turnaia antropologiya [Cultural anthropology]*. Moscow: Publishing House "Ves' mir", 2004, 216 p.

8. Astafyeva, O.N. *Kul'turnaia politika: teoreticheskoe poniatie i upravlencheskaia deiatel'nost' [Cultural policy: theoretical concept and management activities]*. Moscow: Publishing House of RAGS, 2010, 228 p.

9. Avanesova, G.A., Astafyeva, O.N. *Sotsiokul'turnoe razvitie rossiiskikh regionov: mekhanizmy samoorganizatsii i regional'naiia politika [Social and cultural development of the Russian regions: self-organization mechanisms and regional policy]*. Moscow: Publishing House of RAGS, 2001, 314 p.

10. Balakshin, A.S. *Kul'turnaia politika: teoriia i metodologiya [Cultural policy: theory and research methodology]*. Thesis for Candidate of Philosophical Sciences. Nizny Novgorod, 2006, 358 p.

11. Belik, A.A. *Kul'turnaia (sotsial'naiia) antropologiya [Cultural (social) anthropology]*. Moscow: Russian State Humanitarian University, 2009, 624 p.

12. Berger, P., Huntington, S. *Mnogolikaia globalizatsiia. Kul'turnoeraznoobrazie v sovremennoi mire [Many faces of globalization. Cultural diversity in the contemporary world]*. Moscow, 2004, 382 p.

13. Bogatyreva, T.G. *Globalizatsiia i imperativy kul'turnoi politiki sovremennoi Rossii: monografiia [Globalization and cultural policy imperatives in modern Russia: monograph]*. Moscow, TEIN, 2002, 179 p.

14. Cassidy, F.Kh. (2003). *Globalizatsiia i kul'turnaia identichnost' [Globalization and cultural identity]*. *Voprosy filosofii (Problems of philosophy)*, 1, pp. 76-87.

15. Chartrand H. H. *Funding the Fine Arts: An International Political Economic Assessment II Nordic Theatre Studies*. Vol. 14. 2002.

16. *Chelovecheskii kapital Krasnoiarskogo kraia: foresait-issledovanie-2030 [Human capital of the Krasnoyarsk Territory: Foresight Study – 2030]*. Krasnoyarsk: Siberian Federal University, 2010, 126 p.

17. Chistiakova, S. *Globalizatsiia kul'tury: genesis, tipologiya, sovremennye smysly [Globalization of culture: genesis, typology, modern meanings]*. Summary of Thesis for Candidate of Philosophical Sciences. Belgorod, 2007, 22 p.

18. Chumakov, A.N. *Globalizatsiia: kontury tselostnogo mira [Globalization: contours of the holistic world]*. Moscow: Publishing House "Prospekt", 2005, 432 p.

19. Cowan, T. (2005). Pokhvala kommercheskoi kul'ture: kul'turnyi pessimizm i kul'turnyi optimizm [Praise to commercial culture: cultural pessimism and cultural optimism]. *Otechestvennye zapiski (Domestic notes)*, 4 (25), pp. 60-73.
20. Deviatko, I.F. *Sotsiologicheskie teorii deiatel'nosti i prakticheskoi ratsional'nosti [Sociological theory of activity and practical rationality]*. Moscow, 2003, 336 p.
21. Evans-Pritchard, E. *Istoriia antropologicheskoi mysli [History of anthropological thought]*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences, Eastern Literature, 2003, 358 p.
22. *Evolutsiia kul'turnoi deiatel'nosti v novom stoletii: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie aspekty kul'turnoi politiki: v 3 tomakh. T. 2. Kul'tura v global'nom mire [Evolution of cultural activities in the new century: socio-economic aspects of cultural policy: in 2 volumes. Vol.2. Culture in the global world]*. St. Petersburg.: Aletea, 2005. 525 p.
23. *Fundamental'nye problemy kul'turologii: v 4 tomakh. T.1. Teoriia kul'tury [Fundamental problems of culture studies: in 4 volumes. Vol. 1: theory of culture]*. St. Petersburg: Aletea, 2008, 432 p.
24. *Fundamental'nye problemy kul'turologii: v 4 tomakh. T.4. Kul'turnaia politika [Fundamental problems of culture studies: in 4 volumes. Vol. 4: cultural policy]*. St. Petersburg: Aletea, 2008, 424 p.
25. Geertz, C. *Interpretatsiia kul'tur [Interpretation of cultures]*. Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2004, 560 p.
26. Genisaretskii, O.I. *Kul'turnaia politika; ne segodnia, skoree, zavtra [Cultural policy: not today, probably, tomorrow]*. Available at: <http://www.rusrev.org/content/review/default.asp?shmode=8&ids=157&ida>
27. Genisaretskii, O.I. *Kul'turnaia situatsiia i tseli kul'turnoi politiki [Culture situation and objectives of cultural policy]*. Available at: http://www.archipelag.ru/geoculture/cultural_policy
28. Gnedovskii, M. (2005). Tvorchekie industrii: politicheskii vyzov Rossii [Creative industries: a political challenge to Russia]. *Otechestvennye zapiski (Domestic notes)*, 4 (25), pp. 168-181.
29. Gromov, M.N. *Kul'turnoe nasledie kak osnova natsional'noi identichnosti [Culture heritage as the basis of national identity]*. Moscow: GASK, 2005, 141 p.
30. Guseinov, A.I. (2008). Sotsionormativnaia sfera kul'tury [Socionormative culture sphere]. *Voprosy filosofii (Problems of philosophy)*, 8, p. 39.
31. Ionin, L.G. *Sotsiologiia kul'tury [Sociology of culture]*. Moscow, HSE, 2004, 427 p.
32. Itunina, N.B. *Sotsial'naia antropologiia [Social anthropology]*. Smolensk: SGPU, 2003, 147 p.
33. Kazakova, G.M. (2009). Regional'naia kul'tura: rodovidovye priznaki i strukturno-funktsional'nye kharakteristiki [Regional culture: generic features, structural and functional characteristics]. *Voprosy kul'turologii (Problems of culture studies)*, 5, p. 12.
34. Khangel'dieva, I.G. *Kul'turnaia politika [Cultural policy]*. Available at: <http://www.lomonosov-fund.ru/enc/ru/encyclopedia:01302:article>
35. Kil'keev, V.N. *Teoretiko-metodologicheskie printsipy kul'turnoi antropologii Klifforda Girtsa [Theoretical and methodological principles of cultural anthropology of Clifford Geertz]* Thesis for Candidate of Philosophical Sciences. Belgorod, 2009, 142 p.
36. Kiseleva, T.G. (2003). Globalizatsiia obshchestva i sovremennaia kul'turnaia politika [Globalization of society and modern cultural policy]. *Bulletin of MGUKI*, 1, pp. 19-26.

37. Koptseva N.P., Luzan, V.S. (2012). Modelirovanie kul'tury i kul'turnoi politiki v russkoi filosofii kontsa XIX – pervoi treti XX vv. [Modelling culture and cultural policy in the Russian philosophy from the late 19th century to the first third of the 20th century]. *Filosofia i kul'tura (Philosophy and culture)*, 4 (52), pp. 105–116.

38. Koptseva, N.P. (2013). Provedenie eksperimental'nogo prikladnogo issledovaniia mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii: focus-gruppy, lichnoe interviiu, anketirovanie, poluchenie ekspertnogo mneniia (na material issledovaniia Krasnoarskogo kraia) [An experimental applied culture study of intercultural communication: focus groups, personal interviews, questionnaires, obtaining expert opinion (based on the study of the Krasnoyarsk Territory)]. *Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniia (Modern problems of science and education)*, (3), 410.

39. Koptseva, N.P. (2007). Integratsiia gumanitarnogo obrazovaniia v Sibirskom Federal'nom Universitete [Integration of humanitarian education in Siberian Federal University]. *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnia (Higher education today)*, (4), 6-8.

40. Koptseva, N.P. (2007). Teoriia i praktika innovatsionnoi obrazovatel'noi programmy po estetieskomu tsiklu distsiplin [Theory and practice of innovative educational program for the aesthetic disciplines]. *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnia (Higher education today)*, (12), 9-13.

41. Koptseva, N.P. (2012). Kul'turologicheskaia baza formirovaniia obshcherossiiskoi natsional'noi identichnosti v Sibirskikh regionakh Rossiiskoi Federatsii [Cultural base of all-Russian national identity in the Siberian region of the Russian Federation]. *Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Series 7. Philosophy, sociology and social technologies*, (3), 11-15.

42. Koptseva, N.P. (2012). Metodologicheskie vozmozhnosti sotsial'noi (kul'turnoi) antropologii dlia sovremennykh kul'turnykh issledovaniia [Methodological possibilities of social (cultural) anthropology in contemporary cultural studies]. *Filosofia i kul'tura (Philosophy and culture)*, (10), 9-18.

43. Koptseva, N.P. (2012). Problema metodologii sovremennykh kul'turnykh issledovaniia: vozmozhnosti klassicheskoi britanskoi sotsial'noi antropologii [Problem of methodology for contemporary cultural studies: possibilities of classic British social anthropology]. *Gumanitarnye i sotsial'nye nauki (Humanities and social sciences)*, (4), 89-104.

44. Koptseva, N.P. *Filosofia i iskusstvo: edinstvo myslitel'nogo prostranstva* [Philosophy and art: unity of the thinking space]. *Uchenye zapiski fakul'teta iskusstvovedeniia i kul'turologii (Memoirs of Faculty of Arts and Culture Studies)*, Krasnoyarsk, 2000.

45. Koptseva, N.P., Libakova, N.M. (2013). Produktivnost' gendernogo podkhoda dlia gumanitarnykh issledovaniia [Productivity of gender approach for humanitarian studies]. *Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniia (Modern problems of science and education)*, (1).

46. Koptseva, N.P., Luzan, V.S. *Gosudarstvennaia kul'turnaia politika v Sibirskom federal'nom okruge: kontseptsii, problem, issledovaniia: monografiia* [State cultural policy in the Siberian Federal District: concepts, issues, research: monograph]. Krasnoyarsk, Siberian Federal University, 2012, 383 p.

47. Koptseva, N.P., Nevol'ko N.N. (2012). Vizualizatsiia etnicheskikh traditsii v zhivopisnykh i graficheskikh proizvedeniakh khakasskikh masterov [Visualization of ethnic traditions in painting and graphic works of Khakassian masters]. *Iskusstvo i obrazovanie (Art and education)*, (1), 27.

48. Korovitsyna, N.V. (2005). Dukhovnaia kul'tura sovremennogo rossiiskogo obshchestva. Sostoianie i tendentsii formirovaniia [Spiritual culture of modern Russian society. Status and modelling trends]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia (Sociological research)*, 10, pp. 145-146.

49. Kozin, N.G. (2008). Universalistskii proekt tsivilizatsionnoi identichnosti Rossii [Universalist project of civilizational identity in Russia]. *Filosofia i obshchestvo (Philosophy and society)*, 4, p. 75.

50. *Kul'tura Krasnoyarskogo kraia v tsifrakh za 2011-2012: statisticheskii spravochnik [Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in figures for the years 2011-2012: statistical handbook]*. Ministry of Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory, 2013, 126 p.

51. Kuropiatnik, M.S. Korennye narody v protsesse sotsiokul'turnykh izmenenii [Indigenous peoples in the process of socio-cultural changes]. Thesis for Doctor of Sociological Sciences. St. Petersburg, 2006, 360 p.

52. Lavrinova, N.N. *Sushchnost' kul'turnoi politiki [Essence of cultural policy]*. Available at: <http://analiculturolog.ru/archive/itemlist/category/34-issue-17.html?start=40>

53. Luzan, V.S. (2013). Konteksty ponimaniia intellektual'nogo dosuga v sovremennykh rossiiskikh issledovaniiax [Contexts of intellectual leisure interpretation in modern Russian studies]. *Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University named after V.P. Astafyev*, 4 (26), 175-178.

54. Luzan, V.S. Sotsial'no-filosofskii analiz dinamiki gosudarstvennoi kul'turnoi politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii [Socio-philosophical analysis of the dynamics of state cultural policy of the Russian Federation]. Thesis for Candidate of Philosophical Sciences. Specialty: 09.00.11. Krasnoyarsk, 2011, 170 p.

55. Luzan, V.S. Spetsifika zakonodatel'stva, reguliruiushchego zhizneobespechenie i kul'turu KMNS Severa [Specifics of the legislation regulating livelihood and culture of the indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North]. *Third Russian Congress in Culture Studies with international participation "Creativity in space of tradition and innovation": Abstracts of reports*. St. Petersburg.: Eidos, 2010. Pp. 91-92.

56. Maksimov, A.A. Ryalizatsiia interesov narodov Severa v usloviiax promyshlennogo razvitiia: ot zarubezhnogo opyta k rossiiskoi modeli [Realization of interests of the peoples of the North in terms of industrial development: from foreign experience to Russian model]. Thesis for Candidate of Economical Sciences. Syktyvkar, 2007, 136 p.

57. Malinovskii, B. *Magiia, nauka i religiia [Magic, science and religion]*. M.: Refl-buk, 1998, 290p.

58. Malinovskii, B. *Nauchnaia teoriia kul'tury [Scientific theory of culture]*. Moscow: OGI, 2000, 206 p.

59. Marshall, M. (2004). Mezhdunarodnye modeli i tekushchie finansirovaniia [International models and current funding]. *Gosudarstvennaia sluzhba za rubezhom. Upravlenie kul'turoi. Referativnyi biulleten' (Public service abroad. Culture management. Abstract bulletin)*, 5 (55). M.: Russian Academy of Public Service, Pp. 69-78.

60. Matveenko, V. (2009). Modeli gosudarstvennoi kul'turnoi politiki v sovremennom mire [Models of state cultural policy in the modern world]. *Voprosy kul'turologii (Issues of Culture Studies)*, 11. Pp. 52-55.

61. Mercer C. *Towards Cultural Citizenship: Tools for Cultural Policy and Development*. – Stockholm: Sodertathe Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation and Gidlunds Forlag. 2002.

62. Merton, R. *Sotsial'naia teoriia i sotsial'naia struktura [Social theory and social structure]*. M.: AST, Khranitel', 2006, 873 p.

63. Mezhuiev, V.M. (2004). Filosofia kul'tury v sisteme sovremennogo znaniia [Philosophy of culture in the system of modern knowledge]. *Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshchestvo. (Personality. Culture. Society)*. Vol. 6, Issue 2 (22). Pp. 135-156.

64. Motroshilova, N.V. *Mysliteli Rossi i filosofii Zapada [Russian thinkers and philosophy of the West]*. M.: Respublika, 2006, 477 p.

65. Mozheiko, M.A. *Stanovlenie teorii nelineinykh dinamik v sovremennoi kul'ture: sravnitel'nyi analiz sinergeticheskoi i postmodernistskikh paradigm [Formation of the theory of nonlinear dynamics in contemporary culture: a comparative analysis of synergetic and postmodern paradigms]*. Smolensk: SSPU, 2004, 238 p.

66. Murzina, I.Ia. *Fenomen regional'noi kul'tury: poisk kachestvennykh granits i iazyka opisaniia: monografiia [Regional culture phenomenon: the search of quality limits and description language: monograph]*. Ekaterinburg, 2003. P. 29.

67. *Osnovnye napravleniia strategii kul'turnoi politiki v Krasnoiarskom krae na 2009-2020 gody [Main directions of cultural policy strategy in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020]*. Available at: <http://www.krskstate.ru/culture>

68. Osokin, Iu.V. *Kul'turologiia [Culture studies]*. Encyclopedia in 2 volumes. Vol.1. M. ROSSPEN, 2007. P. 1072.

69. *Ot strategii kul'turnoi politiki k taktike upravlencheskogo vzaimodeistviia: materialy kraevykh publichnykh slushanii 11-12 marta 2009 [From cultural policy strategy to tactics of administrative interaction: materials of the regional public hearings on 11-12 March 2009]*. Krasnoyarsk, Ministry of Culture of the Krasnoyarsk Territory, 2009, 128 p.

70. Porus, V.N. *U kraia kul'tury (filosofskie ocherki) [At the edge of culture (philosophical essays)]*. M.: Kanon+, 2008, 463 p.

71. *Programma realizatsii Osnovnykh napravlenii strategii kul'turnoi politiki Krasnoiarskogo kraia na 2009-2020 gody [Program of implementation of main cultural policy strategies in the Krasnoyarsk Territory for 2009-2020]*. Available at: <http://www.krskstate.ru/culture/develop/0/id/4090>

72. Razlogov, K., Orlova, E. Kuzmin, E. (2005). Rossiiskaia kul'turnaia politika v kontekste globalizatsii [Russian cultural policy in the context of globalization]. *Otechestvennye zapiski (Domestic notes)*, 4 (25). Pp. 44-51.

73. Reference legal system "ConsultantPlus".

74. Reznik, Iu.I. (2001). Kul'tura kak predmet izucheniia [Culture as a subject of study]. *Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshchestvo. (Personality. Culture. Society)*. Vol. 3, 2 (8). Pp. 198-217.

75. Savel'iev, V.V. Regionalizatsiia kak uslovie povysheniia effektivnosti kul'turnoi politiki [Regionalization as a condition for improving the effectiveness of cultural policy]. *Orientiry kul'turnoi politiki. Inf. Vypusk (Reference points of cultural policy. Inf. Issue)*, 11. M.: MICC of MK, 2003. Pp. 46-61.

76. Semenova, A.A. Metodologicheskie vozmozhnosti teorii kul'tury dlia analiza modifikatsii drevnerusskogo kontsepta "gosudarstvo" v rossiiskoi kul'ture XXI veka [Methodological possibilities of culture theory for analysis of modifications in ancient concept of "state" in Russian culture of the 21st century]. Summary of Thesis for Candidate of Philosophical Sciences. Specialty: 24.00.01. Novgorod, 2009, 26 p.

77. Shchedrovitskii, P.G. (2006). Kul'turnaia politika: predposylki peremen [Cultural policy: background for change]. *Rossiiskoe ekspertnoe obozrenie (Russian expert review)*, 3 (17). Pp. 31-33.

78. Shcherbina, V.V. (2000). Raspad kul'tury i stsenarii vozmozhnogo razvitiia Rossii [Disintegration of culture and a possible scenario for Russia's development]. *Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshchestvo. (Personality. Culture. Society)*. Vol. 2. M. RAS, Pp. 10-23.

79. Shemanov, A.Iu. *Samoidentifikatsiia cheloveka i kul'tury* [Self-identification of man and culture]. M.: Academicheskii proiect, 2007, 479 p.
80. Sorokin, P.A. *Sotsial'naiia i kul'turnaia dinamika* [Social and cultural dynamics]. Moscow: Astrel, 2006. 1176 p.
81. Tul'chinsky, G.L. *Management v sfere kul'tury* [Culture management]. St. Petersburg. Publishing House "Lan", 2001, 384 p.
82. Ustinova, Ie.N. (2005). Globalizatsiia i kul'tura: istoricheskii kontekst [Globalization and culture: historical context]. *Filosofskie nauki (Philosophical sciences)*, 12. Pp. 55-67.
83. Vinokurova, Ie.P. Kul'turnaia politika v Respublike Sakha (Iakutia): etnokul'turnye i geokul'turnye osobennosti [Cultural policy in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia): ethno-cultural and geo-cultural features]. Thesis for Candidate of Culture Studies. Moscow, 2011, 206 p.
84. Vostriakov, L.Ie. (2004). Kul'turnaia politika: osnovnye kontseptsii i modeli [Cultural policy: basic concepts and models]. *Ekologiia kul'tury: inf. Biulleten'* (Ecology of culture: inf. Newsletter). Arkhangelsk, 1, pp. 79-108.
85. Vostriakov, L.Ie. (2004). Modeli kul'turnoi politiki (kross-kul'turnyi analiz) [Cultural policy model (cross-cultural analysis)]. *Obshchestvo i ekonomika (Society and economy)* Moscow, 1, pp. 139-178.
86. Vostriakov, L.Ie. *Kul'turnaia politika: kontseptsii, poniatiia, modeli* [Cultural policy: concepts, notions, models]. Available at: <http://www.cpolicy.ru/analytics>.
87. Vostriakov, L.Ie. *Regional'naiia kul'turnaia politika poreformennoi Rossii: sub'ektnoi izmerenie* [Regional cultural policy of post-Reform Russia: subjective dimension]. St. Petersburg., Publishing House SZAGS, 2005, 344 p.
88. Zagrebin, S.S. (2008). Kul'turologicheskaia ekspertiza v sisteme kul'turnoi politiki sovremennogo rossiiskogo gosudarstva [Cultural expertise in cultural policy system in modern Russian state]. *Fundamental'nye problem kul'turologii (Fundamental problems of cultural studies)*. Vol. 4. M.: Aleteia. Pp. 54-58.

Культурная политика в северных территориях: специфика, проблемы, перспективы

В.С. Лузан

*Сибирский федеральный университет
Россия, 660041, Красноярск, пр. Свободный, 79*

В статье предпринята попытка раскрыть актуальные методологические и практические подходы к реализации государственной культурной политики Российской Федерации в ее региональном аспекте в контексте сохранения исконной среды обитания и устойчивого социально-культурного развития коренных малочисленных народов Севера, Сибири и Дальнего Востока.

В статье отмечается, что анализ современных исследований культурной политики и существующей практики выявляет недостаточное внимание авторов к ее этнокультурным аспектам, характеризующихся внутренней противоречивостью: с одной стороны, интеграцией в региональное и мировое социально-культурное пространство, с другой – стремлением сохранить этнокультурную самобытность.

В заключение автором сформированы перспективные направления развития региональной культурной политики в северных территориях, реализация которых будет способствовать сохранению исконной среды обитания коренных малочисленных народов и развитию их самоидентификации.

Ключевые слова: культура, коренные малочисленные народы, региональная культурная политика, самоидентификация, культурное развитие, культурные процессы.
