

UDC 008

Socio-cultural understanding of factors of development of cultural policy in forecasting the social environment of society

Elena A. Zeveleva

PhD in History, Professor,
Academician of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences,
Head of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: aleksandr.sapsai@yandex.ru

Lyudmila K. Kazakova

Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: kazakovalk@mail.ru

Sergei V. Lepilin

Senior Lecturer of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: kaffilos@yandex.ru

Natal'ya M. Tret'yakova

Senior Lecturer of the Department of Humanities,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: natalia.tretyakova@mail.ru

Tat'yana S. Karandaeva

PhD in Philosophy,
Associate Professor of the Department Philosophy and Law,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: tkarandaeva@yandex.ru

Lyudmila E. Denisova

Master of Public Administration,
Head of the Youth Policy Department,
Russian State Geological Prospecting University named after Sergo Ordzhonikidze,
117485, 23, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: denisovale@mgri.ru

Abstract

The article presents the socio-cultural understanding of factors of development of cultural policy in forecasting the social environment of society. The authors consider the history of relations of USSR and USA in the context of space policy. It is noted that it was the United States, not the USSR, that initiated new rounds of the arms race throughout the post-war years, the creation of new types and systems of weapons, including nuclear and neutron, strategic bombers, nuclear submarines, nuclear aircraft carriers, separable heads of individual guidance on missiles carrying nuclear charges, long-range cruise missiles, etc. The USSR never sought to achieve military superiority, limiting itself only to the measures necessary to ensure reliable security – its own and its allies. This consistent course was repeatedly proclaimed at the highest level by Soviet leaders. Regarding the present, the deployment of space-based anti-satellite systems capable of disabling early warning satellites increases the possibility of a sudden nuclear attack. Such a development would not help to build confidence between the parties and would only increase the other side's fears about the possibility of a first disarming strike. All this also increases the possibility of misinterpretation by the parties of each other's actions and leads to the creation of situations fraught with nuclear conflict.

For citation

Zeveleva E.A., Kazakova L.K., Lepilin S.V., Tret'yakova N.M., Karandaeva T.S., Denisova L.E. (2019) Socio-cultural understanding of factors of development of cultural policy in forecasting the social environment of society. *Kul'tura i tsivilizatsiya* [Culture and Civilization], 9 (1B), pp. 264-275.

Keywords

Culture, structure, development, opportunity, becoming.

Introduction

Since the early days of the space age, the United States has viewed space as a kind of "absolute position", the conquest of which will allow to dominate the Earth. "Whoever has superiority in space will have superiority on Earth," said us President John F. Kennedy. The same idea was pursued by President L. Johnson. As early as 1960, the then chief of the us air force ballistic missile Command wrote: "we seek space not because it attracts us, like everything unexplored, but because it is a space where we can carry out military operations of a strategic scale with great efficiency." And he went on to argue that a nation that took advantage of the new theater of war would inevitably become a leading nation. Implementing these installations, the us military in those years considered a number of options for creating weapons designed for placement and use in space.

The fact that the control of space pursues earthly goals and is necessary for the establishment of American domination on Earth, in the United States a lot of talk and write. "Whoever can seize control of space, this main arena of all future wars, will be able to change the balance of power in such a decisive way that it will be tantamount to establishing world domination," wrote the magazine "Business week". He is echoed by U. S. news and world report: "Whoever wins in space will have an overwhelming strategic advantage on Earth."

The calculations for the achievement of American dominance in the space are also untenable, as the plans to ensure military superiority on the Ground. With the current state of strategic nuclear weapons, their control systems and missile launch detection, it is impossible to launch a pre-emptive nuclear strike without receiving an equally powerful response. Therefore the illusory hopes of those who want to find a safe recipe for nuclear war, which could in a moment one knockout strike to disarm the enemy without putting yourself in danger of total destruction. The bet on space weapons is no exception in this regard.

Washington believes that the United States will be able to break ahead in the field of space weapons, as they have a technological advantage over Russia. This is an old misconception that has fueled the arms race for years. Unwinding a new round of the arms race, Washington should be aware that the Soviet Union can not allow the superiority of the United States. As a recognized pioneer of Astronautics, it has the necessary material and technical capabilities and economic potential to oppose any American plans, to protect its security and that of its allies, including from the threat posed by space warfare.

Main part

The groundlessness of Washington's plans to achieve military superiority both in space and on Earth does not, however, make them less dangerous for all States and peoples. After all, preparations for the deployment of various types of weapons in space are conducted in parallel with the buildup of us nuclear forces, especially strategic ones, with an eye to the use of nuclear weapons first. It is impossible not to see a direct link between Washington's military-space ambitions and the aggressive military-political doctrines officially put forward there, one more adventurous than the other, which proceed from the "permissibility" of nuclear war and the "possibility" of winning such a war. Under these conditions, the deployment of combat space systems in orbit, which would be an additional element of the first nuclear strike potential being created in the United States, would have an extremely dangerous destabilizing effect on the entire strategic situation. Strategic stability in the presence of nuclear weapons, until nuclear disarmament is achieved, is based on the fact that neither side can count on the use of such weapons first in the hope of winning a nuclear war. Obviously, strategic stability depends on a number of factors. Changing at least one or more of them can lead to a violation of strategic stability. Therefore, the emergence of space weapons and their deployment in orbit will have a negative impact on strategic stability.

In conditions when in full swing the development and improvement of the strategic offensive forces of the United States in the direction of the purchase of the building of the first nuclear blow, the intention to be able to destroy with a missile defense strategic means other hand, that is, to deprive her of the ability to strike back, intended to disarm Russia in the face of American nuclear threats.

When the USSR and the United States began to discuss the problem of strategic arms, they jointly recognized that there is an inextricable relationship between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. It is no coincidence that in 1972 the Soviet-American Treaty on the limitation of missile defense systems and the first agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons were simultaneously

concluded. In other words, the parties recognized and recorded in these documents that only mutual restraint in the field of missile defense will allow to move forward on the path of limitation and reduction of offensive weapons, that is, to restrain and reverse the strategic arms race as a whole. Now the US is determined to break this relationship. The result of such a concept, if implemented, would in fact be the opening of the floodgates for the unrestrained race of all types of strategic weapons-both offensive and defensive.

The same applies largely to anti-satellite weapons. The deployment of the United States in space combat space systems, which would be given the ability to disable space satellite systems that ensure the normal functioning of the Soviet means of defense, including nuclear missile strategic potential, would mean a significant addition to the nuclear strategic potential of the American side, that is, would lead to a weakening of strategic stability.

In the near future, writes A. Dean (Switzerland), effective systems of beam weapons will be developed, which, however, will not replace nuclear weapons, but will "only contribute to the decisive advantage of one of the parties in the exchange of nuclear strikes, largely weakening or eliminating the enemy's retaliatory strike as a result of the neutralization of its defensive systems."

In addition, the deployment of space-based anti-satellite systems capable of disabling early warning satellites increases the possibility of a sudden nuclear attack. Such a development would not help to build confidence between the parties and would only increase the other side's fears about the possibility of a first disarming strike. All this also increases the possibility of misinterpretation by the parties of each other's actions and leads to the creation of situations fraught with nuclear conflict.

Washington's plans to militarize space further increase the threat of nuclear conflict. At the same time, it would be a dangerous delusion to believe that if there are combat vehicles in outer space, then only space will be their proving ground and "battlefield" in the spirit of science fiction, as it was perceived by some people in the West. It is not a question of preparation for the "wars of the stars" depicted in fantastic works. The "terrestrial" orientation of American military preparations in space will pose a threat to the vital interests of all States without exception. It is no secret that none of them will remain on the sidelines if a nuclear war is unleashed with the use of weapons from space.

In pursuit of the illusion of military superiority, the United States, as not once in the past, are the instigators of the creation of new types of weapons, this time their space varieties. The implementation of Washington's ambitious military space programs, the saturation of space with supernova weapons would mark the beginning of a new round of the arms race, this time in the military space direction. An arms race launched into orbit would receive a new, truly cosmic acceleration, and the associated military threat would be even more widespread. It is needless to say what astronomical means will in this case be diverted from the earthly needs of Nations.

As noted in the annual edition of the Stockholm peace research Institute (SIPRI), unrestricted competition in the field of anti-satellite weapons will be "unbearably expensive for both sides, as the creation of means of attack will inevitably entail the creation of means of defense. Such a contest, moreover, will encourage States to take preventive action and thus weaken rather than strengthen the sense of security of States and will not benefit either side."

The development of space-based weapons would also seriously complicate control issues. This is due to the specifics of outer space and military space facilities. "Qualitatively new types of weapons are being developed... which can make control over them, and hence the agreed restriction of them, extremely difficult, if not impossible," the XXVI Congress of the CPSU noted.

The American journal foreign policy States that the creation of space anti-satellite weapons will increase the risk of nuclear war, since the creation of such a system will destroy the very basis of "the

possibility of checking the balance of strategic means of first strike", which will not be tolerated by any party, and will lead to the temptation of pre-emptive strike. The Director Of the center for defense information of the United States Vice Admiral D. Lyarok urged the American public to fight for the termination of the implementation of programs for the creation of space weapons. He stated that " an attack on any of a country's early warning satellites is a prelude to a sudden nuclear strike. Therefore, the leaders of the state whose satellite was attacked will be forced to launch their entire Arsenal before it is too late. And when nuclear missiles start flying... the end of civilization will come. "

That is why the question of the absolute prohibition of the military use of outer space is so urgent today.

The total prohibition of the military use of outer space means its demilitarization and neutralization. The neutralization of territory in modern international law refers to the Treaty prohibition of its use for military operations or in support of military operations. The concept of demilitarization of the territory covers the Treaty prohibition to place military facilities on it and to maintain armed forces in peacetime.

It is obvious that a cardinal solution to the question of a complete ban on the military use of outer space would be the conclusion of an international agreement that would contain obligations for the demilitarization and neutralization of this space. Such an agreement would have to be universal among the participants. Unfortunately, the development of events has led to the fact that space has become organically linked to the General problems of disarmament. Therefore, the task of prohibiting the military use of space in practice is being solved gradually.

The total prohibition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction could also be a step towards the neutralization of outer space. The fact is that expensive strategic delivery systems, especially ICBMs, are designed to transfer nuclear weapons to Intercontinental distances. In the absence of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, these systems would simply become "unprofitable" – their use would not provide strategic advantages [Escaffre, 2011].

Considering the prohibition of the military use of outer space as an integral part of the problem of disarmament in General, it is necessary to proceed from strict consideration of the security interests of the parties, preventing any of the parties to disarmament agreements from obtaining unilateral advantages. It is this principle for negotiating the containment and cessation of the arms race that was enshrined in the joint Soviet-American communique of may 30, 1972, and in the document on the foundations of relations between the USSR and the United States of may 29, 1972. This approach was later reflected in the final document of the first special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, held in 1978, which States: "the adoption of measures in the field of disarmament should be carried out in such a fair and balanced manner as to ensure the right of every state to security and that no state or group of States could gain an advantage over other States at any stage."

In a speech at the November (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, Yu.V. Andropov said: "We are for the search for a healthy, acceptable basis for the parties to solve the most complex problems, and above all, of course, the problems of curbing the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. But let no one expect us to unilaterally disarm. We are not naive people.

Proceeding from the principle of equality and equal security, the struggle of the USSR for the complete withdrawal of outer space from the sphere of military use was carried out in the 50-60s in three main directions:

– in conjunction with the elimination of American military bases near the borders of the socialist Commonwealth;

-
- as part of the General and complete disarmament programme;
 - as part of the struggle for nuclear disarmament.

The programme for the demilitarization and neutralization of outer space was first set out in the Soviet proposals of 18 March and 30 April 1957, submitted by the Soviet delegation to the Subcommittee of the disarmament Commission and entitled, respectively, "Proposal on the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons" and "Memorandum of the Soviet government on the implementation of partial disarmament measures".

Thus, in the Soviet document of March 18, 1957, it was proposed to conclude an international Convention on the reduction of arms and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. And the Soviet Union, ended by that time, creating the world's first ICBM, said that since the entry into force of the proposed Convention and, pending the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons States possessing them have pledged "not to use these weapons, including missiles with atomic and hydrogen warheads", and would consider this weapon for yourself is prohibited. The Soviet proposal provided for the establishment of effective international control over the prohibition of the use of guided missiles for military purposes. "Simultaneously with the removal of atomic and hydrogen weapons from the arms of States," the document said, "international control over guided missiles is established so that all types of such missiles suitable for use as carriers of atomic and hydrogen weapons are used exclusively for peaceful purposes."

In a document dated 30 April 1957, the Soviet government invited all States represented in the Subcommittee of the disarmament Commission to come to an agreement on partial disarmament measures [Bori, 2019]. This document provided for an agreement on the renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons of all kinds, including aircraft bombs, missiles of any range with atomic and hydrogen charges, nuclear artillery, etc. The elimination of nuclear weapons would "decapitate" Intercontinental ballistic missiles, deprive them of the quality of strategic weapons, which would almost put the beginning of the use of launch vehicles exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Along with this, the Soviet proposals envisaged the elimination of foreign military bases in the territories of other States and proposed a significant reduction in the armed forces and conventional weapons. Thus, in the Soviet proposals of March 18, 1957 it was proposed to consolidate the obligation of States "not to allow the deployment outside their national borders of nuclear military formations and any types of atomic and hydrogen weapons", as well as the obligation of States with "military, naval and air bases in the territories of other States... to eliminate these bases". The document of April 30, 1957 stated that "the Soviet government... he proposes to consider the elimination of foreign military bases in foreign territories and agree, first of all, on which of these bases can be eliminated within a one-year or two-year period." All these activities were to be carried out in an interconnected manner, as a single process, and this was the guarantee of the security of all participants in the agreements proposed by the Soviet Union. In essence, the Soviet proposals of 1957. if adopted, they could already lead to a complete ban on the military use of space, since they provided for the prohibition of the main and only means of military use of space in those years-ICBMs.

In the Memorandum of March 15, 1958, submitted to the XIII session of the UN General Assembly and entitled "Proposal of the Soviet government on the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes, on the elimination of foreign military bases in foreign territories and international cooperation in the field of space exploration", the USSR again proposed a specific way to completely ban the military use of space. This document was also based on the interests of ensuring the security of all States and preventing military advantage for any of the parties. Therefore, the ban on the use of outer

space for military purposes was associated with the elimination of foreign military bases in foreign territories, where the main threat to the security of the USSR and other socialist States came from [Carrington, 2015].

The Soviet proposal stated that the peaceful cooperation of States in the field of space exploration could be significantly expanded and bring huge benefits to all mankind, "if an agreement is reached on a radical solution to the problem of disarmament, including the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the elimination of foreign military bases in foreign territories, etc.". Further, the Soviet Memorandum stated that other (along with ICBMs) means of delivery of nuclear weapons in the hands of the United States, such as bombers and medium-range missiles located on U.S. military bases near the territory of the USSR, are no less a threat to the world than ICBMs. The Memorandum stated: "Atomic and hydrogen bombs can equally wreak death and destruction, regardless of whether they were delivered to the target by an Intercontinental ballistic missile or thrown from military bases by bombers and other means of delivery of atomic and hydrogen weapons", and proposed to find a solution that would ensure the equal security of the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all other States. "This would be consistent with the implementation of such an event," the document noted—" as the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes while eliminating foreign military bases in foreign territories, primarily in the countries of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa." The Soviet Union proposed a broad international agreement on the issue and a complete ban on the military use of space in close connection with the elimination of foreign military bases.

This position of the Soviet government was generated by the need to ensure the security of the USSR and other socialist countries. The fact is that ICBMs have become an important means of protecting the USSR from aggression and ensuring strategic stability. In the 50s and 60s, the US deployed advanced nuclear weapons on the territories of its NATO allies in Europe, as well as in a number of other countries near the Soviet borders. These were mainly nuclear weapons carriers, which from military bases in these countries and from aircraft carriers are capable of carrying out nuclear strikes on the territory of the USSR and other socialist countries. In these circumstances, banning ICBMs alone would put the US in a position of military superiority, leaving it with the possibility of a nuclear strike on Soviet territory from its military bases and depriving the USSR of the opportunity to strike back at American territory.

However, all these Soviet proposals were rejected by the United States and its allies.

The USSR's promotion of a program of General and complete disarmament represents a new stage in the struggle for the complete prohibition of the military use of space. The meaning of this new Soviet initiative was that the world community was presented with a specific program for the destruction of all weapons and the dissolution of all armed forces, including the elimination of all means of military use of space.

At the plenary session of the XIV session of the UN General Assembly on September 18, 1959, the Soviet Union introduced the Declaration of the Soviet government on General and complete disarmament. The main provisions of the proposal of the Soviet Union of March 15, 1958 were included as an integral part in the Soviet program of General and complete disarmament. The Declaration proposed that the programme be implemented in three phases. In the third phase of the disarmament programme, it was intended to destroy all nuclear and missile weapons, along with other weapons, that is, "military missiles of all ranges of action will be eliminated and rocket technology will remain only as a means of transport and space exploration for the benefit of all mankind". The destruction of military missiles was proposed to be carried out in parallel with the elimination of foreign military

bases.

On March 15, 1962, in The Committee of 18 States on disarmament, the USSR submitted a draft Treaty on General and complete disarmament under strict international control. The Soviet program of General and complete disarmament provided for the gradual destruction of all weapons, the dissolution of all armed forces, the elimination of all foreign bases in foreign territories. Moreover, the destruction of nuclear weapons was supposed to begin with the destruction and cessation of production of all nuclear weapons delivery systems, including missiles of all calibers and ranges. The destruction of combat missiles was to be accompanied by the destruction or, where possible, the diversion to peaceful purposes of launch sites, underground storage facilities, test sites, all instruments and equipment necessary to equip, launch and control such missiles. It was also envisaged, if it was impossible to switch to peaceful needs, the destruction of enterprises, workshops, devices and equipment for the production of such missiles. Only launch pads, instruments and equipment for launching missiles for peaceful purposes were preserved. In art. 15 of the draft said: "the Launch of missiles and spacecraft is carried out exclusively for peaceful purposes." Compliance with this provision was proposed through the establishment of control groups that would be present at launches and thoroughly inspect each rocket or satellite before launching [Couper, 2018].

The Soviet program of general and complete disarmament was widely supported by all peace-loving forces. However, the basis of the us position was the desire to achieve military superiority, to ensure for themselves the freedom of military use of outer space. The position of the United States and its allies, in fact, led to the failure of consideration of the program of General and complete disarmament.

Because of the close link between the problem of demilitarization and neutralization of outer space and the problem of disarmament, only the implementation of real disarmament measures, including the reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery through and from outer space, can properly guarantee that outer space will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that there will be no threat to the security of any state.

The world community and all mankind have a vital interest in preventing the danger of an arms race spreading to outer space. In the UN and in the Committee on disarmament, many States Express just concerns about the possible consequences of the lack of agreements on the complete demilitarization of space, and they Express considerations about the need to turn space into an "environment of exclusively peaceful use".

Conclusion

Thus, based on the study, it can be concluded that relations between the USSR and Russia in the context of space police have always been difficult. Regarding the present, the deployment of space-based anti-satellite systems capable of disabling early warning satellites increases the possibility of a sudden nuclear attack. Such a development would not help to build confidence between the parties and would only increase the other side's fears about the possibility of a first disarming strike. All this also increases the possibility of misinterpretation by the parties of each other's actions and leads to the creation of situations fraught with nuclear conflict. The Soviet program of general and complete disarmament was widely supported by all peace-loving forces. However, the basis of the us position was the desire to achieve military superiority, to ensure for themselves the freedom of military use of outer space.

References

1. Alonzo G., Saiano F., Tusa N., Fatta Del Bosco S. (2001) Analysis of volatile compounds released from embryogenic cultures and somatic embryos of sweet oranges by head space SPME. *Plant Cell, Tissue and Organ Culture*, 66(1), pp. 31-34. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010608417457> [Accessed 12/12/2019].
2. Andrade M.A.P., Salazar A.E.A., Déleg J.A., Vintimilla A.C.S. (2019). Social memory, political culture and the right to the city. An analysis in two public spaces in cuenca, Ecuador [Memoria social, cultura política y derecho a la ciudad. Un análisis en dos espacios públicos en cuenca, Ecuador]. *Revista INVI*, 34(96), pp. 53-75. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-83582019000200053> [Accessed 17/12/2019].
3. Bori J.P. (2019) A case of gender, culture and space in Thakkar Bappa Colony, Mumbai. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 80(1), pp. 127-132. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.32444/IJSW.2018.80.1.127-132> [Accessed 18/12/2019].
4. Carrington A.M. (2015) *Salon Cultures and Spaces of Culture Edification. A Companion to the Harlem Renaissance*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118494110.ch15> [Accessed 12/12/2019].
5. Chiu C.-Y., Mallorie L., Keh H.T., Law W. (2009) Perceptions of culture in multicultural space: Joint presentation of images from two cultures increases in-group attribution of culture-typical characteristics. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(2), pp. 282-00. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022108328912> [Accessed 18/12/2019].
6. Chung S. (2014) Science museum, its roles and meaning in Korea space culture. In *Proceedings of the International Astronautical Congress, IAC* (Vol. 12, pp. 8537-8543).
7. Couper P.R. (2018) The embodied spatialities of being in nature: Encountering the nature/culture binary in green/blue space. *Cultural Geographies*, 25(2), pp. 285-299. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474017732978> [Accessed 12/11/2019].
8. DeFazio K. (2011) *The city of the senses: Urban culture and urban space. The City of the Senses: Urban Culture and Urban Space*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230370357> [Accessed 18/12/2019].
9. Dović M. (2012) The network of memorials of Slovene literary culture as semiotic appropriation of (national) space [Mreža spomenikov Slovenske literarne kulture kot semiotično prilaščanje (nacionalnega) prostora]. *Slavisticna Revija*, 60(3), pp. 339-363.
10. Escaffre F. (2011) Public spaces and sport-related recreational practices: The expression of a sport-based urban culture [Espaces publics et pratiques ludo-sportives: L'expression d'une urbanité sportive]. *Annales de Géographie*, 119(680), pp. 405-424.
11. Kanas N. et al. (2009) Psychology and culture during long-duration space missions. *Acta Astronautica*, 64(7-8), pp. 659-677. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2008.12.005> [Accessed 09/11/2019].
12. Kobayashi K. et al. (2012) Increased expression of drug-metabolizing enzymes in human hepatocarcinoma FLC-4 cells cultured on micro-space cell culture plates. *Drug Metabolism and Pharmacokinetics*, 27(5), pp. 478-485. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2133/dmpk.DMPK-12-RG-016> [Accessed 12/12/2019].
13. Korhonen J.J.S. (2013) Urban social space and the development of public dance hall culture in Vienna, 1780-1814. *Urban History*, 40(4), pp. 606-624. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926813000217> [Accessed 12/12/2019].
14. Langeegger S. (2014) Reprint of "Emergent public space: Sustaining Chicano culture in North Denver." *Cities*, 40, pp. 183-189. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.12.007> [Accessed 03/12/2019].
15. Mikhalevski D. (2015) Representation of the development of social space, social structures and forms of culture through the notion of Paradigm of Spatial Multidimensionality (PSM). *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social and Community Studies*, 9(2), pp. 1-12.

Социокультурный подход к пониманию факторов развития культурной политики в контексте социального прогнозирования

Зевелева Елена Александровна

Кандидат исторических наук,
профессор,

академик Российской академии естественных наук,
заведующий

кафедрой гуманитарных наук,

Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;

e-mail: aleksandr.sapsai@yandex.ru

Казакова Людмила Константиновна

Доцент кафедры гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: kazakovalk@mail.ru

Лепилин Сергей Владимирович

Старший преподаватель кафедры гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: kaffilos@yandex.ru

Третьякова Наталья Мизаировна

Старший преподаватель кафедры гуманитарных наук,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: natalia.tretyakova@mail.ru

Карандаева Татьяна Сергеевна

Кандидат философских наук,
доцент кафедры философии и права,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: tkarandaeva@yandex.ru

Денисова Людмила Евгеньевна

Магистр государственного управления,
начальник Управления молодежной политики,
Российский государственный геологоразведочный университет им. Серго Орджоникидзе,
117997, Российская Федерация, Москва ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 23;
e-mail: denisovale@mgri.ru

Аннотация

В статье представлено социокультурное понимание факторов развития культурной политики при прогнозировании социальной среды общества. Авторы рассматривают историю отношений СССР и США в контексте космической политики. Говорится о том, что именно Соединенные Штаты Америки, а не СССР, инициировали новые этапы гонки вооружений в послевоенные годы, создали новые типы вооружений, включая ядерные и нейтронные, атомные подводные лодки, ядерные авианосцы и т.д. Что касается противоспутникового оружия, то Соединенные Штаты присоединились к гонке противоспутниковых вооружений 20 лет назад. При создании своих вооруженных сил СССР

был вынужден реагировать на угрозы, исходящие с Запада. СССР никогда не стремился к достижению военного превосходства, ограничиваясь только мерами, необходимыми для обеспечения надежной безопасности – своей и своих союзников. Этот последовательный курс неоднократно провозглашался на самом высоком уровне советскими руководителями. Авторами сделан вывод о том, что в современных условиях развертывание космических противоспутниковых систем, способных отключать спутники раннего предупреждения, увеличивает вероятность внезапного ядерного нападения. Такое развитие событий не поможет укрепить доверие между сторонами, а лишь усилит опасения другой стороны относительно возможности первого разоружающего удара. Все это также увеличивает вероятность неверного толкования сторонами действий друг друга и приводит к созданию ситуаций, чреватых ядерным конфликтом.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Зевелева Е.А., Казакова Л.К., Лепилин С.В., Третьякова Н.М., Карандаева Т.С., Денисова Л.Е. Socio-cultural understanding of factors of development of cultural policy in forecasting the social environment of society // Культура и цивилизация. 2019. Том 9. № 1B. С. 264-275.

Ключевые слова

Культура, структура, развитие, возможности, становление.

Библиография

1. Alonzo G., Saiano F., Tusa N., Fatta Del Bosco S. Analysis of volatile compounds released from embryogenic cultures and somatic embryos of sweet oranges by head space SPME // *Plant Cell, Tissue and Organ Culture*. 2001. No. 66(1), P. 31-34. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010608417457>
2. Andrade M.A.P., Salazar A.E.A., Déleg J.A., Vintimilla A.C.S. Social memory, political culture and the right to the city. An analysis in two public spaces in cuenca, Ecuador [Memoria social, cultura política y derecho a la ciudad. Un análisis en dos espacios públicos en cuenca, Ecuador] // *Revista INVI*. 2019. No. 34(96), P. 53-75. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-83582019000200053>
3. Bori J.P. A case of gender, culture and space in Thakkar Bappa Colony, Mumbai // *Indian Journal of Social Work*. 2019. No. 80(1). P. 127-132. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32444/IJSW.2018.80.1.127-132> [Accessed 18/12/2019].
4. Carrington A.M. *Salon Cultures and Spaces of Culture Edification. A Companion to the Harlem Renaissance*. 2015. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118494110.ch15>
5. Chiu C.-Y., Mallorie L., Keh H.T., Law W. Perceptions of culture in multicultural space: Joint presentation of images from two cultures increases in-group attribution of culture-typical characteristics // *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2009. No. 40(2). P. 282-00. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022108328912>
6. Chung S. Science museum, its roles and meaning in Korea space culture // In: *Proceedings of the International Astronautical Congress, IA*. 2014. Vol. 12. P. 8537-8543.
7. Couper P.R. The embodied spatialities of being in nature: Encountering the nature/culture binary in green/blue space // *Cultural Geographies*. 2018. No. 25(2). P. 285-299. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474017732978>
8. DeFazio K. The city of the senses: Urban culture and urban space. *The City of the Senses: Urban Culture and Urban Space*. 2011. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230370357>
9. Dović M. The network of memorials of Slovene literary culture as semiotic appropriation of (national) space [Mreža spomenikov Slovenske literarne kulture kot semiotično prilaščanje (nacionalnega) prostora] // *Slavistična Revija*, 2012. No. 60(3). P. 339-363.
10. Escaffre F. Public spaces and sport-related recreational practices: The expression of a sport-based urban culture [Espaces publics et pratiques ludo-sportives: L'expression d'une urbanité sportive] // *Annales de Géographie*. 2011. No. 119(680). P. 405-424.
11. Kanas N. et al. Psychology and culture during long-duration space missions // *Acta Astronautica*. 2009. No. 64(7-8). P. 659-677. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2008.12.005>
12. Kobayashi K. et al. Increased expression of drug-metabolizing enzymes in human hepatocarcinoma FLC-4 cells cultured on micro-space cell culture plates // *Drug Metabolism and Pharmacokinetics*. 2012. No. 27(5). P. 478-485. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2133/dmpk.DMPK-12-RG-016>

-
13. Korhonen J.J.S. Urban social space and the development of public dance hall culture in Vienna, 2013 1780-1814 // *Urban History*. No. 40(4). P. 606-624. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926813000217>
 14. Langegger S. Reprint of "Emergent public space: Sustaining Chicano culture in North Denver." // *Cities*. 2014. No. 40. P. 183-189. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.12.007>
 15. Mikhalevski D. Representation of the development of social space, social structures and forms of culture through the notion of Paradigm of Spatial Multidimensionality (PSM) // *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social and Community Studies*. 2015. No. 9(2). P. 1-12.