SECTION III. CULTURAL SCIENCE

Lazutkina E.V., Zdolbitskaya M.Yu.

Sphere of culture as one of the spheres of society and its elite: aspects of their interaction

*School of Philology and Language Communication, Department of Foreign Languages for Humanities, Siberian Federal University;
(Russia, Krasnoyarsk)*

doi 10.18411/gq-31-07-2019-06

idsp sciencerussia-31-07-2019-06

Abstract

The article deals with the issue of spheres of society, their levels and hierarchy. The hierarchy of Russian cultural elite, interaction of this sphere with other spheres and its objectives are analysed.

The modern society is a system of spheres of life, which are all very important and interrelated. The further development of society presupposes further differentiation and complication of this system. Among the spheres of society, we distinguish the sphere of culture, one of the drivers of which is its elite.

The subject of our research is the peculiarities of interaction between the sphere of culture and the cultural elite.

One of the first to address the issue of spheres of life were V. Afanasiev [1], A. Uledov [2, 3], V. Barulin [4] and V. Rebrin [5].

Let us give the authors' definition of the object of discussion.

A sphere of life of the society is one of several structurally complex subsystems of the highest level in a concrete historical society, performing one of the complexes of vital functions, that has its material and technical basis, a certain mass of members of society and a known contingent of workers, qualitatively special types of productive activity, specific social relations, permanent relationships and association with other spheres of life of the society.

It should be noted that the spheres of life of the society have a specific historical character, they are determined by one or another society at a certain stage of its development. Changing historical conditions leads to the transformation of the spheres of life of society, in the modern era they become more complex, multifunctional, new sub-spheres are born, old ones become a thing of the past.

The peculiarity of a sphere of life of the society is that its members in the process of their life activities are often free to move from one sphere to another, with some exceptions. The boundaries between the spheres are mostly open, often conventional.

Based on our understanding of the issue of spheres of life of the society, we identify the following spheres: political, financial and economic; defensive and military; litigation and legal; scientific, technical and technological; urban; village; environmental; social; cultural; family and household.

We believe that all of them are at the same level of generalisation of the life of society because of their importance, fundamentality and interdependence.

The theory of spheres of social life is a well-known cultural basis in the study of the elites of society, identifying their specificity in various areas of life.

Taking as the main criteria the ratio of productive activity in society, authority and responsibilities, influence on society and state policy, we propose the following hierarchy of the main spheres of life of modern Russian society and its state. In this hierarchy, we distinguish four main levels: higher, higher medium, medium and lower. The higher level of hierarchy in society and the state is occupied by political, financial and economic, defensive

and military and litigation and legal spheres. The higher medium level includes scientific, technical and technological, environmental and urban areas. We define the place of the sphere of culture in the medium level, where also the social sphere belongs to. The lower level is the family and household sphere.

Let us consider the basic content of the cultural sphere.

The cultural sphere is adjacent to the social sphere, but has its own intrinsic features: it is designed to develop people culturally and spiritually. A special place in this sphere is occupied by cultural and educational institutions, the media, which are becoming increasingly influential on the population, creative unions and organisations, cultural and educational institutions, as well as the main confessions of the state and their religious institutions. The cultural sphere, as well as all other spheres, has its own special material, technical base and numerous professional personnel.

In connection with the need to differentiate the elite of the cultural sphere, which naturally reflects the differentiation of society into spheres of life, classes and social groups, we turn to the problem of social hierarchy. The social hierarchy of public subjects has always been inherent in society in various concrete historical forms. In the twentieth century with the advent of A. Bodganov's Tektology [6, 7], V. Vernadsky's noosphere theory [8], L. von Bertalanffy's general systems theory [9], N. Wiener's cybernetics [10], Kotarbiński's praxeology [11], V. Afanasiev's concept of system and society [1] and N. Luhmann's system theory [12], its concepts were actively developed in the study of the social structure of society as functioning of dynamic multi-level social systems. Hierarchical analysis reveals the mutual correlation and subordination of social subjects and processes at the different levels of the system, their specialisation and their interaction in the performance of certain functions. The higher levels of the hierarchical system dominate in the spheres of governance, distribution of social wealth, integration and disintegration processes, etc.

We consider it necessary to briefly phrase the authors' concept of social hierarchy here.

Although the principle of hierarchical organisation of the existence of society, as mentioned above, is universal, it is filled with a variety of content and is shrouded in specific forms in various concrete historical societies and states. The main driving objective and subjective force of hierarchical relations in society and the state is the struggle for power, for domination and retention of power, the struggle for a more successful influence of higher hierarchical structures on the lower ones and in general on society and the state. The criteria of the hierarchical structure include the extent and the might of power, political, economic, social and cultural domination, the number of levels of hierarchy from the highest to the lowest, the importance, value and social "weight" of a certain hierarchical series, the attitude to private property and to the means of production (owner – not owner).

The existence of social hierarchical structures is organically linked to the evolutionary and revolutionary processes taking place in society and the state. It should be noted immediately that the emergence of social hierarchical structures, historically associated with the development of the state and determined by it in a certain way, had a social revolutionary character. In other words, in the conditions of emergence of the state the old, pre-state hierarchical system was broken and the new, closely connected with the state, system of hierarchy was forcibly established. After the first such revolution, the social hierarchical system continued to develop in the evolutionary way until the next social revolution (e.g. when the slave-owning system was replaced by the feudal system, etc.).

When analysing hierarchical structures of society one should also take into account socio-spatial, socio-temporal, socio-status, legitimate and illegitimate, shadow and criminal, socio-dynamic and other characteristics.

Socio-spatial characteristics in a particular society are associated with the city and its status (capital city, large city/town, medium city/town and small town), with settlements or villages, with the territorial location of social institutions, organisations, with spatial

globalisation, integration, differentiation and others. We emphasise that these characteristics are extremely important in the state system of existence of society. Thus, as a rule, capitals focus and materialise on their territory all the main higher hierarchical structures of power, influence and authorities existing in the state. In the socio-spatial hierarchical structure of society it is necessary to distinguish not only vertical and horizontal series of hierarchy, but also hypotenusal, crossing the vertical series of several hierarchies in a certain content-functional way.

The socio-temporal characteristics of the hierarchical system of society have a concrete historical character and change from one historical epoch to another, from one economic and political social formation to another, and these transformations have different qualitative certainty. These characteristics are correlated with the above-mentioned evolutionary and revolutionary processes of both long and short temporal waves.

Important characteristics of the socio-hierarchical structure of modern society are its legitimate, official or illegitimate, shadow, and in some cases criminal levels. The legitimate level of hierarchical structure is constituted by the state, primarily political, economic, social and cultural hierarchies. Illegitimate, various shadow hierarchical structures are inherent, in essence, to all societies and state devices that is a natural way of existence and development of antagonistic class society. In modern states, criminal hierarchies of both national and international character, including terrorist and mafia ones, have developed significantly.

Let us give the author's definition of the phenomenon under consideration.

Social hierarchy is one of the necessary objective and subjective characteristics of the existence of society, which is inherent in it at all stages of development, that is, it is universal, but in the process of evolution of society it is subject to change, and is radically transformed after social revolutions, revealing its new specific historical character; this hierarchy legitimately, officially or illegitimately, informally, in a semi-latent or latent way for a certain period of time reflects the disposition of various social formations: estates, classes, social groups, ethnic groups, nationalities, social institutions, organisations, individuals in the structure of society or its part by the level of authority, power and influence and assumes the mutual location of its subjects from the highest to the lowest, reflects antagonisms and contradictions of a certain society.

Let us turn to the analysis of the hierarchy of the cultural elite of the Russian society and the state.

The cultural elite belongs to the middle level of the elite hierarchy. Like all elites, it has a high responsibility to the state and society for the preservation of national culture, ensuring the consolidation of cultural, educational and ethical activities of the media, the development of spirituality in society, support for religious denominations and their institutions, as well as other forms of cultural activities of the state and society. Representatives of this elite include Minister of Culture, his deputies and other members of the Board, Head of the capital's Department of Culture and his deputies, the relevant heads of the capital's districts, the highest hierarchs of the main confessions of Russia, the heads of the central media, prominent figures of culture and art and other representatives directly responsible for the development of the cultural sphere in the capital and the country.

We distinguish three main sub-spheres within the sphere of culture: popular or democratic, mass or commercialised and high culture. Folk culture is an amateur culture operating at the regional level. In the mass, commercialised culture there are professionals, but it is not characterised by high ideas or principles and is designed for daily use with many Western authors, performers, etc. (music, films and other forms of influence). In high culture there are professionals, it is a synthesis of national culture and Western models, it is a classic of music, theater, etc., innovation in cinema and other forms of influence. It is important that all these sub-spheres solve one strategic task, the task of preserving and developing a single Russian cultural space, the development of all national cultures that are part of it, the development of ideas of humanism.

Elites of all spheres are interconnected, interact with each other, as a rule observing a certain subordination. Interaction and competition are carried out both horizontally, between approximately equal in role and importance elites, and vertically, from top to bottom and from bottom to top, as well as hypotenously, crossing several multi-level elites.

In conclusion, we point out that it is necessary to take care of the cultural elite, criticise it, develop some main ideas that these elites should follow: the unity of the state, patriotism, the unity of national cultures, the formation of a single Russian cultural space. The sphere of culture and the cultural elite has a high responsibility for the fate of the state in the conditions of great international tension, globalisation processes, certain centrifugal tendencies. The role of society is also very important in interaction with the spheres of culture and the elite in solving important strategic tasks facing it. The sphere of Russian culture should actively pursue an international cultural policy of interaction with other cultures and their elites.

1. Afanasiev V G 1968 Scientific management of society (Moscow: Politizdat)
 2. Uledov A K 1975 Sociological laws (Moscow: Mysl Publishers)
 3. Uledov A K 1980 Spiritual life of society (Moscow: Mysl Publishers)
 4. Barulin V S 1982 Dialectics of spheres of public life (Moscow: Moscow University Press)
 5. Rebrin V A 1974 Methodological problems of socialist public consciousness (Novosibirsk: Science)
 6. Bogdanov A A 1989 Tektology: the universal organisational science vol 1 (Moscow: Economizdat)
 7. Bogdanov A A 1989 Tektology: the universal organisational science vol 2 (Moscow: Economizdat)
 8. Vernadsky V I 1989 The Biosphere and Noosphere (Moscow: Science)
 9. Bertalanffy L von 1968 General system theory. Foundations, development, applications (New York: Braziller)
 10. Wiener N 1983 Cybernetics: or control and communication in the animal and the machine (Moscow: Science)
 11. Kotarbiński T 1965 An introduction to the science of efficient action (New York: Pergamon Press)
 12. Luhmann N 1996 Social systems (Stanford University Press)
-