

UDC 316.7

Cultural policies in the context of global-local development

Tat'yana G. Bogatyreva

Doctor of Culturology,
Professor, Expert,
Institute "High School of Public Administration",
Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration,
119606, 82 Vernadskogo av., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: tabogat@mail.ru

Abstract

The article presents the idea that the processes of socio-cultural globalization and localization, however difficult they are and no matter how negatively they are perceived by society, cannot be prevented. Before long, they will be completely activated, bringing with them many risks, including those related to the fact that limiting the ongoing trend of denationalization and creating necessary counterweights to balance it are much harder than continuing the liberalization trend inherent in global processes, the consequences of which in the socio-cultural sphere are virtually unmanageable. The control of socio-cultural processes within any country as an enclosed space must be revisited according to contemporary circumstances and must find its articulation within the complex processes and structures involved in transnational frameworks. Otherwise, the control of cultural processes will be distorted, and its effectiveness will be limited. With the development of global-local socio-cultural processes, there is a need to clarify the institutional foundations, configurations, and dynamics of cultural policies. The control of global cultural processes is impossible; thus, one must adapt to them. However, the degree and intensity of adaptation should be based on reasonable criteria and principles. Sophisticated managerial tasks in these conditions will require calibrated action to overcome the contradictions and negative effects generated by new social and cultural trends.

For citation

Bogatyreva T.G. (2017) Kul'turnaya politika v kontekste global'nogo lokal'nogo razvitiya [Cultural policies in the context of global-local development]. *Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiya* [Culture and Civilization], 7 (5A), pp. 355-364.

Keywords

Culture, globalization, glocalization, cultural policies, control of cultural processes.

Introduction

Currently, the contours of world development, the implementation of public policies, the forces acting to shape society, and the form of their interaction are decisively influenced by two factors: globalization and localization. These two factors reflect the inseparable trends of development related to the universalization of social life and its particularization. These processes cannot be considered independent from each other because they are mutually reinforcing. Today, the creation of a national cultural development trajectory is productive only if it is removed from the traditional system of coordinates.

The quiriness of the relationship between localization and globalization makes it necessary to clarify the institutional foundations of cultural policies, their configuration and dynamics, and the projections of policies on society as a whole. To examine the relationship between culture and policies in its entirety, one has to see culture as a factor of development of creativity and diversity, and simultaneously as a tool of political influence, mobilization, or conflict.

Under the influence of this combination of global and local processes, all socio-cultural structures existing within a subsystem are transformed. Nation-states engaged in the global context experience a form of gradual transition that fundamentally changes the organizing principles of the internal socio-cultural life. U. Beck puts it this way: the international society suggests the emergence of potential powers that crack open and sweep away the political and social orthodoxy of the national state [Beck, 2001, 118]. Referring to the conclusions of Appadurai, Beck argues that the advent of the symbolic worlds of global cultural industries indicates that the state, society, and national identities are abolished. Such processes dramatically affect the establishment of the national trajectories of contemporary socio-cultural development, once again reaffirming that those trajectories can be productive if formulated in terms of global processes.

Research and literature

Today, culture is the main engine of social change. It is actually one step ahead of reality, in the sense that the social changes take place as a result of preceding cultural motivations. According to A. Touraine, first, culture must change before new social actors can appear with their specific behaviors and manners. This development is then followed by a reorganization of the political system by the new actors, and eventually the ideologies that match their interests crystallize [Pascual, 2013]. Equally important is the idea that today's events are a unique intersection of globalization trends. The contemporary globalization has 'diverse modalities—the growing significance of the differentiated patterns of migration and cultural and ecological globalization alongside the enduring presence of the military economic and political aspects of globalization dominant in the late nineteenth century' [Deleuze, 1998, 430].

R. Robertson has similarly stressed that the primary source of change in the context of globalization is alterations of the culture. His argument transcends the traditional differences between the global and local; it contends that the impact of globalization on socio-cultural dynamics is not unidirectional in nature and occurs as a result of the interpenetration of the universalist and particularist trends. He refers to the result of such interpenetration as the glocalization of culture. This view is also shared by some Russian social scientists. Y.V. Yakovets, a well-known researcher of civilizations, emphasizes: 'At the same time, we can observe the processes of integration and disintegration, unification and differentiation. This is because different elements of the socio-cultural sphere are manifested in different proportions and with varying intensity' [Yakovets, 2001, 281].

M. Castells holds a unique perspective on glocal processes, observing the effects of globalization in the changing spatial relationships and in the appearance of closely interlinked 'flows' of the global world and distinctive 'local worlds'. According to Castells, studying the 'space of flows' is the most important prism for considering the different aspects of the impact of globalization on culture, politics, and statehood. This is deemed 'critical for the distribution of wealth and power in the world' [Castells, 1996, 386].

The current global system is developing as a complex interactive system that is heterogeneous and heterogenizing the cultural order. The development of the world's community corresponds to the trends of cultural differentiation and cultural diversity. The value of cultural diversity is emphasized in the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, which expands the range of options available for each person and is itself a source of cultural development.

Differences multiply as a result of the influence of the global culture on the local cultures. To investigate the status of culture in a global environment, special tools are required. Postmodernist theory has plenty of such tools as it pays particular attention to the problems of transition and the uncertainty of the current stage of cultural development, including its diversity and plurality. The positive program of postmodernism seeks to promote differences as the basis of existence, valuing independence, and freedom from sameness, and it also has a unique understanding of hierarchy.

Postmodernism's recognition of heterogeneity and hybridity as the natural state of the global cultural map affects the very understanding of the world as a whole and complicates the formulation of global problems. Thus, when one considers such concepts, an understanding develops that the traditional global map of nation-states, with its fixed view of national differences and national relations, is inadequate for the new global socio-cultural situation.

Of particular interest are the findings of researchers who connect the characteristics of cultural policies with the globalization of culture and changing forms of activity of the nation-state under the influence of global markets and new communication technologies. D. Throsby considers cultural globalization among the broad shifts that characterized the development of cultural policies in the late twentieth century. Among other changes, Throsby stresses diminishing support for elite culture, related to the process of democratization, and the shift of focus from the previous elite criteria for culture evaluation to access and participation. He also highlights the transition from the state-sector domination to the private-sector domination, which reflects the general movement toward denationalization and market liberalization. According to him, these shifts taken together point to the reorganization of powers and obligations in the formation and implementation of cultural policies at regional and national levels [Pachter, Landry, 2003, 145-147].

UNESCO has made a significant contribution to the redefinition of the role and functions of cultural policies in the light of the challenges faced by humanity in the third millennium of the Common Era. UNESCO materials reflect the role of culture in modern society when confronted with problems of a global scale [Robertson, 1992; Throsby, 2001]. UNESCO has examined new areas of state responsibility arising from the proliferation of new technologies and the inability of policy systems based on the balance of powers, preferences, and resources present in the predigital era to respond adequately to such challenges. 'New forms of cultural production present a significant challenge to such frameworks—particularly in fields such as heritage conservation, intellectual property, and diversity—and make them less effective in meeting their objectives' [Touraine, 1984, 13]

Re-examining cultural policies in the ‘space of flows’

Today, cultural policies are in crisis because of a mismatch between the traditional models of culture and the changing socio-cultural situation. As part of globalization, deep structural changes occur in institutions and policies, and cultural policies and institutions cannot escape the strong mechanisms that push for a change in their environments. ‘The continuous urge to change and adapt to new conditions causes dynamics and instability rather than stability and permanence in the institutions’.

Clarifying the state’s role and producing adequate patterns of activity for the scale of the changes becomes important because of the necessity to regulate social and cultural processes in the context of the increasing intensity of cultural and information exchange, as well as of the high permeability of cultural products traded across borders.

The effective regulation of social and cultural processes in the modern era suggests not a country’s insularity but its active access to the global level of interaction. Culture is not only able to strengthen mutual understanding and trusting relationships with foreign countries and promote the creation of a favorable image of a country at the international level but also to ensure a nation’s competitiveness. Such regulation can become an effective instrument for the formation of a country’s unique image in the international arena, helping to overcome ethnic and religious conflicts.

It is crucial to observe that the explosion of global cultural flows and networks occurred when cultural flows in sovereign states (which became the universal form of political organization) were directed primarily inward while outward cultural influences were controlled. To the extent that the world’s socio-cultural processes have steadily increased their potential, the entire cultural sector has begun to develop according to a global paradigm. This is particularly the case for mass media, such as television, cinema, radio, video and sound recording, and the Internet. One significant occurrence in the field of culture at the international level has been the rise of a small number of multinational companies, concentrated in developed countries, which have benefitted from the strengthening of their market positions. This causes monopolization of markets and a sharp reaction from countries that find themselves under the powerful influence of these corporations, therefore raising issues of cultural sovereignty, information control, and censorship. Several states are taking steps to provide energetic assistance to national cultural industries.

The development of the media sector and the need to control cultural processes separate from any ties to the territory of a specific state have led to the emergence of supra-national institutions and infrastructure, which have made a special contribution to the life of the political community and presented new requirements for state activities. Paradigmatic changes, associated with the processes of globalization and creating a new ‘geometry’ of power, create a need to offer new ideas of cultural development.

Thanks to the development of advanced transportation and communication technologies, the circulation of objects and images at global and regional levels is becoming faster than ever. Even places geographically distant from each other are becoming increasingly connected as communication becomes easier and cheaper. This is very important for the institutional context in which many national cultural projects develop. Changes are needed here because the legal and political regulatory institutions in the field of culture were created before the intensive development of the cultural industry began, and thus they do not have sufficient capacity to meet current challenges.

At the international level, it is becoming increasingly important to enhance cultural activities with a view to mitigating the impacts of urbanization, globalization and technological innovation, developing telecommunications networks, performing joint international projects in the field of cultural

industries, and promoting common markets. This necessitates the coproduction of television and radio programs, video and multimedia products, and movies. It also calls for the protection of the rights of the artist and actor, research on the dissemination of culture via media facilities, joint development of methods of evaluating cultural programs, exchange of relevant experience, and training.

Note that the exchange of cultural goods and the implementation of international projects in the field of culture do not occur without controversy. In recent years, there has been a significant increase in the number of disputes regarding people's rights to maintain their own consumption patterns and support cultural diversity despite the pressure of commercial interests. Under the influence of public opinion, it becomes clear that cultural products are assets that influence the values, ideas, and opinions of a society, and thus forms a part of the community's cultural identity. On this basis, they have argued that such cultural assets deserve special treatment, including their exclusion from international trade relations.

At this stage of cultural policy development, there is a growing understanding that the previous tasks facing the state with regards to the field of culture have been fulfilled, and that a meaningful restart of cultural policy is now required. Traditional notions of governance in the field of culture should be replaced with innovative ideas based on the fact that the modern world, under the influence of global competition, has become polycentric. The modern world will have fewer rigid hierarchical structures and more flexible network structures, with horizontal partnership schemes involving different actors. Countries and international institutions must learn alternative management principles that are typical of open network systems.

In the near future, the 'delivery' of culture will be closely linked with the development of mobile telephony integrated with the Internet. Major mobile phone manufacturers intend to increase their revenues by offering a wide range of multimedia content and services to their customers. New services enable mobile phones to download movies, television shows, games, ringtones, and music. Owners of mobile phones can share photos, buy music, and perform extensive activity in the field of entertainment content and services. Initiatives aimed at expanding these activities will help manufacturers to retain existing customers and attract new revenue sources. With regards to the cultural production, the digital economy offers opportunities for new partnerships between the media and technology sectors. Arts organizations have been forced to become digital, i.e., incorporating digital service within their production competence to attract a larger audience [Wong, 2012, 60].

As a process of the monetization of the digital entertainment content within the framework of the deployment of online distribution channels, the transition from print media to digital formats and the shift from stationary to mobile media consumption of cultural goods and services are taking place. Changes in consumer behavior are a very important topic for the media and entertainment industry. Growth of consumer spending on digital services will significantly outstrip spending on nondigital formats. According to PwC's annual Global entertainment and media outlook publication, during the years 2014 through 2018, two-thirds of revenue growth from consumers and advertising will be digital. Of the US\$241-billion growth in the total entertainment and media consumer and advertising revenue from 2013 to 2018, US\$157-billion will come from digital sources. Thus, 65% of the global entertainment and media growth—almost two of every three new dollars—will come from the digital sphere.

Under these new conditions, governments are facing a huge task and must organize their response to these processes accordingly. They must be concerned about local cultural forms and values, which are affected by the conditions of strong cultural interaction and are at risk of absorption by the inexorable forces of the world market. The success of the transformation of relations between the state

and culture can be a decisive factor in the national cultural development. If the focus is only on realities of socio-cultural practices associated with the 'arrangement' of cultural space within individual states, the relationship between the state and society in this area may be limited and may thereby block the dynamics of cultural development.

Localization: A national and public control paradigm in the field of culture

The processes of globalization and localization, occurring in parallel, require significant efforts by national governments to effectively mitigate the negative consequences of globalization while harvesting its benefits. Socio-cultural globalization can be 'controlled' through the activation and reproduction of local cultural forms and the restructuring of local socio-cultural spheres to balance globalization. Conflicting opinions exist about the prospects of globalization with regards to potential collisions and future alliances between civilizations. These prospects depend on how people direct, through their activities, development at the local level, thereby pushing the movement of global processes in one direction or another [Morato, 2012, 59].

The dynamic development of the socio-economic space and complexity of socio-economic processes require a fundamental renewal of public administration, adjusting its methodology, as well as enhancing its efficiency to achieve a sustainable development of society. Localization means the decentralization of management in various areas and the emergence of new actors from other fields. However, note that extreme decentralization in public administration does not necessarily lead to democracy, freedom, and justice for all; it can also bring differentiation, with power accruing only to those who take the best advantage of vacuum that arises when the state relinquishes its decision-making power to the local level.

The state role in conditions of localization is to support the development of independent initiatives, mobilize resources for stimulating activities of these actors, regulate processes in the realm of social and cultural activities (observing the laws of the market), and nurture the creation of institutional mechanisms that mostly meet the population needs. In the context of globalization, the prospects and scope of political sovereignty at the national and local levels are being reviewed.

The main area of renewal in these conditions is the rejection of hierarchical structures, accompanied by a transition to networking interactions between actors, which causes changes in the state's behavior—specifically the rejection of the idea of the state's supremacy over other actors and the development of equal partnerships with them. The question of what should be the scope and structure of the state's activity can be solved differently than before. Historical experience shows that the available models of the state's behavior in the field of culture depend on the level of government interventionism in the processes of social development. This, among other things, is due to the complexity of the relationships between the state and market, the overall level of a country's development, its administrative capacity, and external conditions.

A main feature of the future self-organizing society is that a balanced interaction between subjects will influence the development. If the state does not adjust to this new form of interaction, conflicts will arise and the loss of confidence in the government will spread through the various sectors of the civil society. Outdated management systems will become an obstacle to further development in the field of culture. Government, business, and civil society organizations must act cohesively, and only in this way, it will be possible to provide socio-cultural support for priority areas and projects, implement the economical use of resources, and improve citizens' quality of life. Governments are ultimately responsible for the situation of all people in the country whom they govern, but they require the contribution of other participants for the managerial system to be productive. To this end, a proper

division of responsibility and balanced interaction of subjects are required to maximize the benefits for the population. Socio-cultural policy functions should be separated and performed by charitable and commercial sectors and informal groups to respond to the increasingly complex, differentiated, and growing consumer demand for services in the field of culture. Growth in this sector occurs because of the process of socio-cultural dynamics.

At present, the forms and modalities of the state's activities in the field of culture differ significantly from those in previous periods. The state is released from the part of expenses in the cultural sphere, but simultaneously it can enhance market motivation, ensuring its effective functioning. However, there are certain risks because the population bears the brunt of the cost of providing itself with cultural goods and services.

Because the state's resources are often limited, the state by itself cannot meet all the diverse interests of citizens. Thus, the resources of all the society are required. The availability of these resources becomes possible as a result of replacing the traditional paradigm of management, which envisions a monopoly role for the state, with a new 'public-private' paradigm. The important features of this paradigm are the involvement of new actors in the regulation of social processes aimed at achieving a high social efficiency and the joint efforts of all social groups in supporting the government's management of civil society agencies, local authorities, and various market entities.

The new paradigm will overcome the inefficiency of the principles of the rigid top-down administrative management, which is used to react quickly to changes, and will take advantage of self-organizing processes that are both defensive against and responsive to the globalization project. For the development of the relations between the state and society to proceed in line with this paradigm, it is crucial to make decisions at a level that ensures their effectiveness.

Alteration of the traditional paradigm is objectively caused by the need for society to adapt to ongoing changes. The new paradigm does not negate the important function of the state but suggests that new processes and phenomena have emerged in the course of social development. Traditional and new managerial paradigms for the socio-cultural sphere differ significantly from each other with regards to their objectives, methods, and institutional forms of organization; the nature of decision making and resource allocation and criteria used to determine priorities for system expansion. Special attention should be given to spheres that will still be administered by the state; the new paradigm suggests that more responsibility can be transferred partially or completely to the private sector. This would solve some fundamental problems faced by cultural institutions today. Simultaneously, modern cultural institutions, the most striking manifestation of which is widespread financial difficulty, should get more recourses by proving their usefulness, and indeed their indispensability to society and manage such cultural organizations so as to integrate them into the fabric of modern life, enabling them to be responsive to modern cultural needs [Kangas, Vestheim, 2010, 11].

For the state to establish relations between the different levels of government, the private sector, and civil society, comprehensive strategies guided by the national government are required. Methods, means, and forms of the state government are subject to significant adjustment. The former emphasis on directive control is replaced by the need to create the conditions for public self-development, resource allocation, and partnerships with various actors of cultural activities. Clearly, the measures taken must be comprehensive and reflect the formation of institutions at both the global and local levels. Complementarity of decisions involves the implementation of private or public initiatives, restrictive measures against the products of other countries, and the development of a country's own market of goods and services. It also entails the coordination of decisions that can be made by a single government unilaterally with those that can be made only in conjunction with other governments.

At the macro level, the ideal state regarding advancing culture is observed to be strong and skilled,

with no excesses in the regulation of social and cultural processes. Such states use only subtle control mechanisms associated primarily with the creation of prerequisites for the self-development of socio-cultural processes. The new management processes, if implemented effectively, can create a new perspective. It is important to completely use the possibilities that enable feedback between the local and global levels of cultural life levels and the preservation of the specific features of the local level, while simultaneously adjusting to the dynamic transformation of society. This problem can be solved if at the local level there is a rapid response to emerging issues, underpinned by appropriate administrative measures necessary for the activation of 'self-completion' processes and encouraging the rational use of available resources aimed at the fullest satisfaction of human needs. The new managerial paradigm is the necessary prerequisite for the conservation of specific features of the local level in the context of globalization.

Conclusions

The processes of socio-cultural globalization and localization, however difficult they are and no matter how negatively they are perceived by society, cannot be prevented. Before long, they will be completely activated, bringing with them many risks, including those related to the fact that limiting the ongoing trend of denationalization and creating necessary counterweights to balance it are much harder than continuing the liberalization trend inherent in global processes, the consequences of which in the socio-cultural sphere are virtually unmanageable. Sophisticated managerial tasks in these conditions will require calibrated action to overcome the contradictions and negative effects generated by new social and cultural trends.

References

1. Beck U. (2001) What is globalization? Errors of globalism: responses to globalization. Moscow.
2. Castells M. (1996) The rise of the network society // The information age: Economy, society and culture, 1. London.
3. (2000) Cultural diversity, conflict and pluralism. World Culture Report. UNESCO.
4. (1998) Culture, creativity and markets. World Culture Report. UNESCO.
5. Deleuze G. (1998) Difference and Repetition.
6. (2009) Framework for cultural statistics. UNESCO.
7. Global entertainment and media outlook: 2014–2018.
8. Held D., McGrew A.G. Goldblatt D. and Perraton J. (1999) Global Transformations: Politics, economics, and culture. Cambridge: Polity Press.
9. Kangas A. and Vestheim G. (2010) Institutionalism, cultural institutions and cultural policy in the Nordic countries. Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidskrift, 2.
10. Morato A.R. (2012) Greetings to the participants of VII International Conference on Cultural Policy Research. Barcelona, Spain.
11. (1995) Our creative diversity: The report of the World Commission on Culture and Development. Paris.
12. Pachter M., Landry C. (2003) Culture at the crossroads: culture and cultural institutions in the twenty-first century. Moscow.
13. Pascual J. (2013) Cultural policies, human development and institutional innovation: or why we need Agenda 21 for culture. In: Sustaining cultural development. Unified systems and new governance in cultural life. Gower.
14. Robertson R. (1992) Globalization: Social theory and global culture. London.
15. Throsby D. (2001) Economics and Culture. Cambridge.
16. Touraine A. (1984) Le retour de l'acteur. Essai de sociologie. Paris.
17. Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity.
18. Wong A. (2012) Digital futures in policy and the cultural sector in the UK. ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy, 2.
19. Yakovets Y.V. (2001) Globalization and the interaction of civilizations. Moscow.

Культурная политика в контексте глобально-локального развития

Богатырева Татьяна Георгиевна

Доктор культурологии, профессор, эксперт,
Институт «Высшая школа государственного управления»,
Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ,
119606, Российская Федерация, Москва, просп. Вернадского, 82;
e-mail: tabogat@mail.ru

Аннотация

В статье представлена идея о том, что процессы социально-культурной глобализации и локализации, какими бы трудными они ни были и как бы негативно они ни воспринимались обществом, не могут быть предотвращены. В скором времени они развернутся очень масштабно, принося с собой много рисков. Помимо прочего, они связаны с тем, что противостоять текущей тенденции денационализации и создать необходимые противовесы, чтобы ее сбалансировать, очень сложно. Наблюдается тренд на либерализацию, присущий глобальным процессам, последствия из которых в социально-культурной сфере практически неуправляемы. Контроль социокультурных процессов в любой стране как замкнутом пространстве должен быть пересмотрен в соответствии с актуальными обстоятельствами. Он должен осуществляться в рамках сложных процессов и структур, работающих на международном уровне. В противном случае контроль над культурными процессами будет утрачен, а его эффективность будет ограничена. С развитием глобальных и местных социокультурных процессов необходимо уточнить институциональные основы, конфигурацию и динамику культурной политики. Контроль глобальных культурных процессов невозможен; таким образом, нужно адаптироваться к ним. Однако степень и интенсивность адаптации должны основываться на разумных критериях и принципах. Сложные управленческие задачи в этих условиях потребуют продуманных действий для преодоления противоречий и негативных последствий новых социальных и культурных тенденций.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Богатырева Т.Г. Культурная политика в контексте глобального локального развития // Культура и цивилизация. 2017. Том 7. № 5А. С. 355-364.

Ключевые слова

Культура, глобализация, глокализация, культурная политика, контроль культурных процессов.

Библиография

1. Beck U. What is globalization? Errors of globalism: responses to globalization. Moscow, 2001.
2. Castells M. The rise of the network society. The information age: Economy, society and culture. London, 1996. Vol. 1.
3. Cultural diversity, conflict and pluralism. World Culture Report. UNESCO, 2000.
4. Culture, creativity and markets. World Culture Report. UNESCO, 1998.
5. Deleuze G. Difference and Repetition. 1998.

6. Framework for cultural statistics. UNESCO, 2009.
7. Global entertainment and media outlook: 2014-2018.
8. Held D., McGrew A.G. Goldblatt D. and Perraton J. Global Transformations: Politics, economics, and culture, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.
9. Kangas A., Vestheim G. Institutionalism, cultural institutions and cultural policy in the Nordic countries // Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidskrift. 2010. Vol. 2.
10. Morato A.R. Greetings to the participants of VII International Conference on Cultural Policy Research. Barcelona, Spain, 2012.
11. Our creative diversity: The report of the World Commission on Culture and Development. Paris, 1995.
12. Pachter M. and Landry C. Culture at the crossroads: culture and cultural institutions in the twenty-first century. Moscow, 2003.
13. Pascual J. Cultural policies, human development and institutional innovation: or why we need Agenda 21 for culture // Sustaining cultural development. Unified systems and new governance in cultural life. Gower, 2013.
14. Robertson R. Globalization: Social theory and global culture. London, 1992.
15. Throsby D. Economics and Culture. Cambridge, 2001.
16. Touraine A. Le retour de l'acteur. Essai de sociologie. Paris, 1984.
17. Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity.
18. Wong A. Digital futures in policy and the cultural sector in the UK// ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy. 2012. Vol. 2.
19. Yakovets Y.V. Globalization and the interaction of civilizations. Moscow, 2001.