

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INNOVATIONS IN THE STATE CULTURAL POLICY FOR STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Andrey Goloborodko¹, Sergey Vorontsov², Aleksandr Ponedelkov³

Abstract: This article reviews the modern hazards and challenges of national security for the Russian Federation and the need to reformat its main issues and determining factors. The authors examine the concept of cultural policy, the interdependence of politics and culture, where the political sphere is considered a product of cultural and social life, or in other words, where politics is a form of cultural existence. The authors describe the previous political science research concerning culture and the phenomenon of cultural policy where culture is considered the main mechanism of socializing an individual (Goloborodko, 2012). They also examine a cultural policy as an instrument reflecting the social and political systems' relationships. The authors explore the concept of national security and ways to ensure that national interests are protected within the systems of both Russia and international affairs. It is noted that in recent years, the problems of culture and cultural policies, as factors of national security, have drawn crucial public and scientific attention, substantiating reasons for increased effort on the humanitarian issues of national security. The authors conclude that the culture accumulated in the political sphere could influence the regulation of social development and ensure a stable public and political existence.

JEL Classification Numbers: O39, F52, Z10; **DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.12955/cbup.v6.1216>

Keywords: state, society, culture, cultural policy, national security, globalization, security hazards.

Introduction

The content, forces, methods, and directions for ensuring national security are central issues of political science, law, and economics. The relevance of these issues is increasing in direct relation to the growing political, economic, and social contradictions between Russia and 'the West' that have been observed in recent years. Contact between these entities, on many political platforms, have been suspended. Large-scale economic sanctions have been introduced against Russia. In addition, military bases of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) block have been positioned close to the borders of the Russian Federation.

The problems existing in interstate relations are essentially determined by the contradictory processes of globalization. As noted in the Russian 'National Security Strategy', the trend towards 'polycentric world' is growing. In this regard, there is a significant need to reformat the main issues of national security and the factors that determine them.

The national security of the Russian Federation is understood as being the state of protecting an individual, society, and the state against internal and external hazards. This state of protection ensures constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens of the Russian Federation, a decent quality and standard of living, sovereignty, independence, state and territorial integrity, and sustainable economic development of the state and society. National security includes the defense of the country and all types of security envisaged by the Constitution of the Russian Federation and the legislation of the Russian Federation (Vorontsov et al, 2017).

National security not only strengthens the country's defense capability, ensuring the effectiveness of organizations and structures that protect state and public interests. To a large extent, national security is associated with the state of protection of the individual, society, and the state from a variety of internal and external threats and challenges.

In the current geopolitical situation, the key issue for political practice and science, as a field of scientific research, is the study of issues of effective inclusion of cultural policy in the national security system.

Traditionally, culture is viewed primarily as an object of national security. However, the conservative potential of culture, ensuring its stability in the context of external and internal challenges, remains underutilized in developing and implementing mechanisms for ensuring national security. There is an

¹ Chekhov Institute of Taganrog (branch) of the FSBFEI HE «Rostov State University of Economics»,
goloborodko2009@mail.ru

² Department of Procedural Law at the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, raven_serg@mail.ru

³ Department of Political Science and Ethnopolitics at the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, ponedelkov@skags.ru

urgent need to reconsider the cultural potential of Russia and objectively assess external challenges and internal threats to the sustainability of culture as a code for civilization in the context of an expanding economy. The threats are associated with the erosion of traditional values of culture and morality including the loss of cultural norms, cultural heritage and memory, and cultural pragmatism, along with the spread of low-level mass cultural products.

Of research interest, is the analysis of conditions for implementing an integrated approach to cultural policy in the political, managerial, and social spaces, i.e., in the field of interaction of all stakeholders and entities included in the sphere of cultural production and creativity.

Over the past years, the problem of ensuring security has increasingly been linked to tasks of practical-oriented cultural policy, which is conditioned by both the active development of information and globalization and the significant complication of human activity within society. In this regard, the problematic field of analysis and comprehension of the state's cultural policy in terms of national security fits into the political context. The culture accumulated in political arenas can regulate social development and ensure a stable society by influencing the human consciousness and behavior.

The Concept of Cultural Policy

The interdependence of politics and culture exists, with the political sphere a product of cultural and social life. In other words, politics is a form of cultural existence.

The focus of political science on culture and cultural policy is due to the fact that culture is considered the main mechanism for socializing an individual. Thus, culture and cultural policy can be interpreted as tools for reproducing the system of social (including political) relations.

Political management of the cultural sphere is realized by influencing the processes in this sphere. The orientations of the state cultural policy are determined by the entity selected to compose the policy as well as the guidelines elected for reproducing a certain type of social relations (Natochiy, 2001).

According to Martjanov (2003), the policy from the viewpoint of the metalanguage can be viewed on three different levels:

1. Politics as a system of action directly representing political practice. This is called the 'zero degree of politics'. In this case, the political entity is not capable of self-reflection: They neither produce a political theory nor realize the theoretical comprehension of the field of politics, but rather reproduce political theory more in a retrospective dimension, by copying and repeating the widespread models of the metalanguage.
2. The external metalanguage (the metalanguage of politics) is interpreted in the framework of the theoretical 'grasp' of politics as an aim. In this case, it concerns the use of widely spread theoretical schemes and established paradigms. In fact, most political texts, primarily of an applied nature, can be viewed in terms of the external metalanguage as limited and ideological in the methodology.
3. The internal metalanguage (the metalanguage of political science) provides the orientation mainly on markers of the external metalanguage, the self-reflection of political consciousness, and means of constructing the policy for political representation.

In regards to the third level, Martjanov (2003) defined this further by saying that

"Reflection over politics is realized indirectly here because the subject of reflection is a set of texts and theories in political science. The internal metalanguage is oriented towards the theory of the method and subject of cognition, being a metalanguage of the self-description of political science". (p.46)

To formulate the research problem based on the above information, it is necessary to consider the state cultural policy of modern Russia and its interrelation with national security within the framework of such a problem.

Understanding and conceptualizing cultural policy involves different approaches. In defining the term 'cultural policy', modern foreign researchers conceptualize the goals, institutions, and resources related to its implementation.

The level of development of the 'cultural policy' concept is characterized by two issues. First, there is a fundamental difference between the theory and analytical levels of its interpretation in the space of

practical administrative decisions. Second, the subject category of cultural policy is either absent or hidden (Vostryakov, 2007).

The term, cultural policy, was first publicly cited in 1967 at the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), held in Monaco. In the course of the report, Policy in the Field of Culture, Preliminary Considerations, the concept was formulated. The field of political action in the sphere of culture envisaged a set of principles of the operational order and activities of various types (particularly administrative and financial), as well as procedures that created a basis for government actions in the sphere of culture.

According to Lavrinova (2010), practical mechanisms for implementing cultural policy can be interpreted as follows:

The entire amount of conscious and deliberate actions (or the lack of actions) in society aimed at achieving certain cultural goals through the optimal use of all the physical and spiritual resources available in the society at a given time. (p.18)

Today, most researchers agree that a cultural policy provides a set of measures aimed at shaping creativity and is used by various social institutions. These measures include the conditions, limits, and priorities of the creative sphere and the fundamental elements for implementing organizational actions in the framework of selection (Natochiy, 2001). They also broadcast the cultural benefits and values (created and emerging) and develop conditions for their adoption by society (Natochiy, 2001).

In the broader context, a cultural policy can be viewed as a guide for people's activities, power, and social structures that are aimed at ensuring optimal functioning and development of a spiritual life.

Cultural policy can be interpreted as an activity that ensures the creation of conditions to "contribute to civic engagement as much as possible, creating real prerequisites for mastering a complex and dynamic socio-cultural life environment in transitional society" (Kamenets, 2006, p.22).

Balakshin (2004, p.30) considers a cultural policy from the reflective aspect as substantially wider than the field of spiritualism. The attributive approach, which is based on axiological and activity concepts, underpins its understanding. Attributive understanding of culture expands the scope of research and allows understanding of its capabilities and reserves in a deeper and multilateral way. In the researcher's opinion, the conceptual basis, reflecting the essence of cultural policy, is "a three-level model that considers culture at mega, macro and micro levels, in interrelation with nature (mega level), politics and economy (macro level) and the individual (micro level)".

Flier (1994) introduced a two-level concept of understanding a cultural policy where the cultural policy includes policy as well as regulation of the current creative practices in culture. This emphasizes the levels of strategy and tactics of managerial activity. Flier views the foremost importance of the need for conscious adjustments to the content of domestic culture (the first level) in the cultural policy. The second level includes a set of actions aimed at solving the problems of the functioning institutions that produce the cultural products.

Lavrinova (2010) regards state cultural policy as a political process of the state's administrative influence on the cultural sphere, directly connected with exercising public power. At the same time, the initial condition for developing and implementing cultural policy is the achievement of an agreement between official and creative and social forces on the priorities of cultural development.

Astafjeva (2010) defines the contemporary cultural policy of the state as a conceptually formed set of scientifically sound views and principles that correspond to certain values, goals, and priorities, and the state type. At the same time, cultural policy for the scholar is not purely a theoretical construct. According to this researcher, this concept allows one to transfer values, as determined by the Constitution of the Russian Federation, to the level of genuine and specific managerial decisions.

Based on the certain information, values and tools are being developed and mechanisms of cultural policy formed to implement a set of programs and projects that have strategic significance for the social and cultural development of the country (the region or the local territory).

Thus, in connection with portraying the phenomenon of cultural policy and its complicated content, the theoretical and methodological problems of studying state cultural policy require special significance.

Karpukhin (1997) stresses that during the course of the reforms undertaken in Russia, a unifying social and cultural concept was overlooked. At the same time, the dominance of quasi-market mechanisms predetermines the development of deculturalization within the space of the various dimensions of social development, which is manifested, mainly in education and through media.

Pavlovich (2008) draws attention to the fact that, in Russia, cultural processes that are part of social life and their constructive principle have started to play an important role. Forming and implementing cultural policy are achieved by varying cultures that have the necessary resources for this purpose.

The main contributor is the state. The sphere of culture involves a strategic task of adapting to changes in affairs with the state and society. Changes in state policy, public consciousness connected with democratization and the development of market relations have a serious impact on culture and deserve unconditional attention and study.

In this connection, Balakshin (2004) focused on the difficulties associated with the insufficient elaboration of the conceptual foundations of the cultural policy, which is largely the reason for a large number of vulnerabilities in the management system in the sphere of culture that explicates its obvious imperfection. In this regard, the current state makes it necessary to claim that there is inefficiency intrinsic in the current system. The reasons for it are related to the need for a meaningful elaboration of concepts about the nature and properties of culture, its relative independence as a subsystem of society; with the limited theoretical foundations of modern cultural policy and a number of other factors. Particular importance in this connection is given to the interaction and mutual influence of culture, the state, and politics.

Natochiy (2001) emphasized that:

The coordination of the interests of participants in cultural activities is the prerogative of the state bodies of cultural management. The main tools for harmonizing interests are legislative methods that regulate the processes occurring in cultural life; measures to ensure a guaranteed minimum access to cultural goods for all groups and sectors of society; encouragement of a private initiative and sponsorship in the field of culture.

The state also implements the coordination of the interests of participants in cultural life by forming the subject of creativity, a cultural figure, influencing the future results of his creative activity, and also by creating public cultural needs, adjusting the 'demand' for cultural goods and values to supply.

These measures lead to a certain level of coherence of interests of subjects and objects of cultural life. It is not necessary to speak about the full coordination of interests (it can be implemented only to a certain extent), therefore the process of reconciliation has a permanent character. (p.13)

The Concept of National Security

National security involves the means to ensure national interests both within the country and within the system of international affairs.

Kozlova (2009, p. 10) argued that "security refers to the basic needs of individuals, the groups they form and the institutions they create, and its provision is an eternal problem of human existence, always relevant to a person and any of his communities". The researcher considered security to be somewhat an abstraction in that security in itself does not exist.

Klimova (2009, p.61) identified subjects and objects of national security: "a person with personal rights and freedoms, a society with its material and spiritual values, a state with its constitutional system, sovereignty, and territorial integrity."

In this regard, the state, society, and the person are interpreted by the political science of national security both as security objects and subjects of its provision.

Lovtsov (1999) understood the security of the nation broadly as the security of its material and spiritual needs in resources and technologies, relations with other nations, and the information and moral ideals necessary for its functioning and development (mastering).

Traditionally, many researchers adhere to the point of view reflected in the Concept of National Security of the Russian Federation of 1996. Security in this instrument is treated in terms of the state

of protection from miscellaneous threats manifested in both internal and external dimensions (for the individual, society, and the state).

However, not all authors agree with this understanding and some are prepared to contest it. In particular, Dankin (2000) considers that security not only characterizes the current state but also its development tendencies (including those hidden) and the conditions for vital activity of all elements of society. These conditions relate to under which the certainty of quality is ensured in innovations that are conditioned by an objective experience and freedom of expression, corresponding to one's own nature and in maintaining fundamental values and basic institutions.

Ivashchenko (2000, p.19) considers that security is not a state of protecting an individual's interests, but rather the existential conditions that can be controlled by the individual: "The security of the subject and his activity is a complex of conditions of his existence that he has mastered (comprehended, learned, created) in the course of his self-realization and which he is thereby able to control".

Regarding this, Sergeev (2010) notes that understanding security, along with more or less awareness of objective properties and conditions of the present situation of individuals, society, and the state, reflect the ideological assumptions created by various political and economic forces within the society, and the interests of certain social groups and classes and various other groups within the Russian political class.

In this view of Russian cultural security, Sergeev (2010) notes different interpretations from the recognition of sovereignty and independence of Russia's national interests and the need to restore its great-power status to the full subordination of national cultural interests to the interests of Western states.

The National Security Strategy (2015) defines security as the protection of the individual, society, and the state in contrast to the previous (2009) edition where the emphasis was on protecting vital interests. The Basics of the State Cultural Policy (2014) stated that for the first time the state cultivates culture as a national priority and recognizes it as the most important factor in the growth of the quality of life and harmonization of social relations, as well as key to dynamic social and economic development and guaranteeing common cultural space and territorial integrity of Russia (the Basics).

The study of various approaches and aspects of security has continued to be one of the most important state problems and subsequently, these have been thoroughly and widely analyzed in both domestic and foreign science.

At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, scientific publications focused on the social and political problems regarding security. Most researchers assumed that national security incorporated security of all types affecting the individual, society, and the state. It was considered essential for the individual, society, and for sustainable development of the state and had history, patterns, and laws of development. In democratic countries, personal security was viewed as a priority for society and the state. The state was the main authority for ensuring the security of an individual and society. The goal of the state was to ensure the vitality and safety of the people. The main principles of the state policy in ensuring the security of the individual and society were justice, lawfulness, sufficient forces and means, humanity, timeliness, and adequate security measures against external and internal threats (Yurchenko, 2008).

Brenner (2007) draws attention to the fact that the complex and multi-level system of national security comprises a number of subsystems with their own structure. The individual was a basic component in this system and therefore, the main priority in activities to ensure national security was the quality of individual lives. This meant creating conditions for realizing the abilities of each person and their comprehensive development to enable them to adapt to the modern dynamic world. The security of society is an aggregate of security for each person. It creates adequate conditions for developing the economy, science, technology, culture, morality, and health.

The security of the state is linked, first, with preserving the constitutional system and then providing sovereignty and territorial integrity. However, there is a matter of the state, with its attributes, institutions, and bodies, protecting the individual and society as a whole. Where the system fails to serve the interests of individuals and society as a whole, a constitutional mechanism would be needed to adjust the state system accordingly.

Recent expert surveys conducted in Russia show that a part of the current elite is aiming for isolation and retention of their power and commercial preferences, and are focusing less on solving federal and national security problems. Possibly, these are distinct systemic symptoms of oligarchy in the elite. The question has arisen about the direction for civil society when the electorate can no longer influence a corrupt bureaucratized elite. Experts have failed to provide a clear answer. On the one hand, they promote the efforts of the Russian President in redressing the elitism by administrative and political measures that require greater perseverance and consistency. On the other hand, they support legal, cultural, and educational avenues to cultivate the necessary aspirations of the elite. There arises the issue of changing the 'rules of the game' in the social and political situation that has formed in modern Russia. However, there are many options for changing such rules that are alternative and carry significant risks of impacts that had repeatedly affected Russia during the 20th century. Currently, the country is at crossroads since it is under pressure from aggressive circles of the globalist community that pursue interests that diverge from the national interests of Russia (Vorontsov et al., 2017).

Saprykin (1997) proceeds from the premise that national security is an exceptionally broad, multidimensional concept. It is similar in complexity to the concept of society and includes all spheres of life: economic, political, social, and national affairs. These comprise the majority of conversations and written materials and are protected by the state by all available means. However, there remains an important sphere of the public network, where ensuring national security acquires significance in preserving the security of the national culture and its basic values.

For example, Kolin (2010) explains the need for increased attention to the humanitarian aspects of national security issues for two reasons. First, it is increasingly being realized that the individual represents the main creator of wealth in any country. Therefore, protecting the vital interests and values of the individual is a strategic task in the context of national and international security (formerly, protecting the vital interests of the state alone was considered as a leading task). Second, the unconditional increase of attention on the humanitarian aspects of national security is due, in many respects, to the activities directly affecting humans as a result of threats to the system of international and national security.

Filippov (2009) proceeds from the premise that, in the modern context, the state is not able to provide the required level of authenticity and security, which is limited by the efforts of the bodies involved in implementing law enforcement. Therefore, it is necessary to involve all political resources of the state, including a cultural policy, in order to coordinate the efforts of the institutions in socializing the people for their 'entry into culture'.

Conclusion

The solutions to the problems of cultural policy and national security are governed by the culture that accumulates in the political realm and which can regulate social development and stabilize public and political life. The identification and generalization of theoretical and procedural approaches in the study of cultural policy and national security, based on social and humanitarian knowledge, has aided the identification such problems in the state cultural policy of modern Russia in relation to national security. The understanding of cultural policy and its conceptualization are based on differing approaches. The definition of the term 'cultural policy' proposed by modern science is based on concepts about the goals, institutions, and resources associated with its implementation. In actualizing the phenomenon of cultural policy and its complicated content, the theoretical and methodological problems of studying cultural policy in the context of national security acquire special significance. The concept of security in its personal, public, and state dimensions is an important component of national security and, accordingly, a priority. At the same time, national security as a social phenomenon includes many representations and has accumulated a variety of perceived injustices to the vital interests of individuals, society, and the state, as well as the perceptions of threats and their consequences. In the current context of Russia's development, cultural processes are not only a part of social life but also a constructive principle. In recent times, most researchers have agreed that cultural policy can be defined as a complexity of measures undertaken by various social institutions to create conditions for participants to undertake a creative activity, determine priorities in creativity, organize production, and broadcast cultural benefits and values for their development of society. The interdependent nature of the coexistence of politics and culture is manifested in the fact that the political sphere can be regarded as a product of cultural and social life, created at a certain stage of

social development. In fact, politics is one of the forms of cultural existence. Thus, culture and cultural policies, as factors of national security, are of utmost social and scientific importance.

References

- Astafjeva, O.N. (2010). Cultural Policy: Theoretical Notion and Managerial Activity: lectures. Moscow: RANEPА's Publishing House. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.cr-journal.ru/rus/>
- Balakshin, A.S. (2004). Cultural policy: the theory and research methodology. Nizhniy Novgorod, Publishing House of the FSEI HPE VSUWT.
- The Basics of the State Cultural Policy: [approved by the Order of the President of the Russian Federation № 808 dated 24 December 2014]. [Online]. Available at: www.pravo.gov.ru [accessed: 25 December 2014].
- Brenner, A fon. (2007). Introduction to Political Science of National Security. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.von-brenner.com/>
- Dankin, D. (2000). Security – a prerequisite and result of development of political trust, Security of Eurasia, 1, 342.
- Filippov, A. (2009). Development of culture – a factor of ensuring national security. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.alexander-filippov.com/>
- Flier, A.Y. (1994). On the new policy of Russia, Social Sciences and Contemporary World, 5, 14-25.
- Goloborodko, A.Y. (2012). State cultural policy in the system of national security in Russia. Bulletin of RANEPА, (3), 128-133.
- Grinev, I.V. (2008). Native culture and international image of Russia, National interests, 5. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.ni-journal.ru/archive/>
- Ivashchenko, G.V. (2000). On the concept of 'security' // 'Credo', 4(22)'00. Theoretical Journal of Philosophy. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.orenburg.ru/culture/credo/24/>
- Kamenets, A.V. (2006). Conceptual fundamentals of state cultural policy oriented at state society, Observatory of culture, 6.
- Karpukhin, O.N. (1997). Cultural policy of the state in the conditions of reforming of society. Thesis abstract ... Doctor of Sociological Sciences. Moscow.
- Klimova, V. (2009). The role of the state in ensuring national security. Methodological aspect, Observer, 10, 61-62.
- Kozlova, A.V. (2009). Political mechanisms of ensuring security of the state in the economic sphere. Thesis abstract ... Doctor of Political Sciences. Moscow.
- Kolin, K.K. (2010). Spiritual culture of society as a strategic factor in ensuring national and international security. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.astanaforum.kz/2010/>
- Lavrinova, N.N. (2010). The concept of cultural policy. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.analiculturolog.ru/>
- Lovtsov, D.O. (1999). On the paradigm of national security of Russia, Observer, 9(116), 47.
- Martjanov, V.S. (2003). The metalanguage of the political science. [Online]. Available at: http://lit.lib.ru/m/martxjanow_w_s/metalanguageofpoliticalscience.shtml
- Natochiy, V.V. (2001). Cultural policy of Russia: problems and prospects. Thesis abstract ... Candidate of Political Sciences. Ufa.
- Pavlovich, A.A. (2008). The formation of cultural policy in modern Russia: regional and municipal levels. Thesis abstract ... Candidate of Culturology. Moscow.
- Saprykin, A. (1997). Culture – a basis for national security of Russia, Observer, 7. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.rau.su/>
- Sergeev, V.V. (2010). Formation of cultural security in the context of the Russian society modernization. Moscow: Scientific and Research Centre 'Akademika'.
- Vorontsov, S.A., Lokota, O.V., Ponedelkov, A.V. (2017). Fundamentals of national security in the Russian Federation. Rostov-on-Don.
- Vorontsov, S.A., Mamychev, A.Y., Ponedelkov, A.V., Yanguzin, A.R., Vildanov, H. (2017). Elitogenesis in the political processes of modern Russia, based on sociological (field) research, Man in India, vol. 97, 23, 273-284.
- Vostryakov, L.E. (2007). State cultural policy of contemporary Russia: regional dimension. Thesis abstract ... Doctor of Political Sciences. Moscow.
- Yurchenko, I.V. (2008). Security as a basic concept of a political strategy of innovative development in contemporary Russia. Krasnodar: Publishing House of KubSU.