

DIALOGIC PARADIGM OF CULTURAL POLICY: EXPERT PROJECTIONS AND DESIGN RESOURCES

Olga Astafyeva

Prof., D.Sc. of Philosophy, The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public
Administration, Russia, onastafieva@mail.ru

Abstract

The author associates **the relevance** of the topic with the demand for dialogue thinking in the modern world and the need to study socially-oriented, subject-activity, cultural, philosophical-anthropological, ontological aspects of cultural policy.

The purpose of the article is to justify the need to update the conceptual and methodological principles of dialogue communication ontology, which serve as the basis for the expert evaluation of innovative projects that are devoted to the strategy of cultural policy of Russia.

The main **methodological** solution to the research problem is an interdisciplinary approach.

Problems and scientific results

1. Culture-specified aspects of cultural policy are revealed through the analysis of the problems of intercultural communications transformation associated with the aggravation of geopolitical contradictions and civilizational "gaps" in the context of "global disintegration risks".
2. The strategy of Russia's cultural policy is aimed at expanding the experience of intercultural interaction and at creating international and interethnic institutions that strengthen these processes. Dialogue models are filled with expert and analytical assessments, which fix the philosophy of dialogue relevant to modern cultural processes in the context of the fundamental principle of "unity in diversity".
3. Resources of designing the event intercultural communications as mechanisms of cultural policy of the state for promotion and realization of intercultural dialogue strategy onto the world level.
4. The needs of the governance system in the choice of models adequate to the changes and dynamics of the culture in the context of globalization are due to social "challenges" – increasing failures in communications, to the inability of social groups to achieve civil harmony, in opposition to local and global cultural patterns, models of identity and lifestyles.

Keywords: culture, development, intercultural dialogue, communication, cultural policy, culture dynamics, sociocultural projection.

1. INTRODUCTION. RELEVANCE OF THE RESEARCH TOPIC

One of the key conditions for ensuring domestic social and political stability and a factor of sustainable development of the Russian Federation is the expansion of the space for intercultural dialogue. Orientation

to peaceful interaction in the conditions of geopolitical instability, dictated by the very course of the cultural and historical development of the country, on the territory of which different peoples coexist from time immemorial, needs both a theoretical justification and a critical analysis of the practices of socio-cultural interaction. Moreover, at present in terms of conceptual updating of the principles and mechanisms of the state cultural policy, there is an increasing interest in the themes of the all-Russian unity and civic solidarity, intercultural and interfaith interaction outlined in the Fundamentals of the State Cultural Policy of the Russian Federation and the Strategy of the State Cultural Policy of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2030 (Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 24, 2014 No. Pr-808 "On the Fundamentals of State Cultural Policy"; Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of February 29, 2016 No. 326-r. "Strategy of the state cultural policy for the period until 2030"; The strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation until 2025. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 19, 2012 No. 1666). This requires additional efforts of scientific communities, since the problem is interdisciplinary. Scientists primarily of socio-humanitarian areas in whose field of interest are certain aspects of cultural policy are actively involved in this research. Among them we single out a group of researchers (G.A. Avanesova, L.E. Vostryakov, S.B. Sinetsky, A. Ya. Flier, etc.) and the author's studies providing theoretical substantiation of the principles of cultural policy and presenting conceptualization of value -sense bases, revealed through an interactive paradigm (Astafyeva, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016).

However, in the works of the last decade, there is also obvious request for applied research. Both theoretical and practical research fill the scientific space with interesting ideas and regulations, actualizing interest in the issues of socio-cultural development of the country as a whole.

At the same time, a limited number of theoretical studies, based on an interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of the dynamics of the processes of formation of dialogue strategies at different social levels, makes it difficult to regulate interaction and cooperation between different countries, primarily in the Eurasian space. It is obvious that there is a need to develop management models adequate for the state and dynamics of the current sociocultural situation, as well as mechanisms for regulating social processes, strengthening the value vector for achieving interethnic harmony under the pressure of globalization.

Thus, the urgency of the topic is linked with the relevance of dialogical thinking in the modern world and the need to study socially-oriented, subject-activity, cultural, philosophical-anthropological, ontological aspects of cultural policy.

The purpose of this article is to substantiate the conceptual and methodological principles and semantic foundations of dialogic communication supporting sustainable development both within Russia and in the Eurasian space, understood as a benchmark for expert assessment of programs and projects serving as instruments of the state cultural policy of the Russian Federation.

The main methodological solution of the research problem is the interdisciplinary approach allowing to problematize the subject of cultural policy and to reach a level of broad generalizations about the sense of the ongoing reforms and the consequences of the next stage of modernization in the context of the dynamics of changes affecting the state of the socio-cultural environment.

In the study of the dialogue as a goal of cultural policy, we proceed from the interpretation of the dialogue as a communicative strategy guiding the actors to the process of strengthening mutual understanding and mutual respect for cultures, in a broad sense - intercultural interaction. Dialogue is a complex and open process, which has become the subject of scientific study of many authors (Bakhtin, 1980; Bibler, 1991; Intercultural and interreligious dialogue for sustainable development: Proceedings of the International Conference, 2008; Habermas, 2009; Philosophy in the dialogue of cultures. World Philosophy Day, 2010; Astafyeva, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016, etc.), where the creative power and constructiveness of culture is revealed, and the ideas of the support of the dialogue strategy by historically proven philosophical and methodological values are held. Ensuring respect for the principles of cultural diversity and encouraging all that unites people and fosters deep mutual understanding of peoples is a condition for the existence and reproduction of society, the coexistence of power and society, different ethnic groups and faiths, and so on.

Intercultural communication is considered as a special type of interaction for the purpose of transmitting or exchanging information through the use of symbol systems, methods and means of using them between different subjects: individuals, social groups, communities, cultures, civilizations, the nature of which determines the type of communication (interpersonal, personality-group, intergroup, intercultural, etc.). "Intercultural communication" is similar in meaning, but not identical with the notion of "sociocultural communication" as the basic mechanism of socio-cultural processes. Intercultural communication ensures the joint livelihood of people, the accumulation and transfer of socio-cultural experience, the orientation of all

participants of communication to achieve a common goal such as understanding of senses.

The object of the study is cultural policy as a system of goals and priorities aimed at achieving sustainable development in the context of socio-cultural changes. The subject is the substantiation of the dialogue strategy as the conceptual semantic foundations of the state internal and external cultural policy of Russia. Its disclosure is proposed through the formulation of two problematic thematic areas of cultural policy, each of which is devoted to a separate section of this article.

2. STRATEGY OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN CULTURAL POLICY AS A BASIS OF DIALOGUE

Steady interest in the role of culture in sustainable development, demonstrated over the last decade in Russia, is the indicator of the turn of cultural policy towards the problems of quality of the living environment, raising the level of development of human capital and strengthening the ideas of cultural diversity. These goals are the most relevant for all mankind on the agenda of the twenty-first century, which is to become a new stage in the sustainable development of civilization.

The increasing complexity of sociocultural processes, connected with tension in the ratio of bi-directional processes of "global integration" and "global disintegration", use of advanced technologies, increasing demands for achieving intercultural dialogue and common ethical values, has activated the political and intellectual elite in search of new foundations of cultural policy. Relying on the concept of sustainable development, the Government of Russia has put forward, as one of the strategic goals, a transition to a new stage of modernization changes. Their essence is an innovative "breakthrough" in all areas and spheres of people's life and activity; it is impossible without a "humanistic turn" as an imperative of civilization in the development paradigm and ensuring the achievement of harmony of the sociocultural and socio-natural components to maintain the integrity of civilization (Humanistic twist: imperative of human civilization, 2018).

The actualization of the problems of cultural policy in the context of the new tasks that Russia is to solve in the near future is associated with an orientation toward a practical component, that is, concrete results. They should become visible for the entire population of the country, included in the flow of sociocultural changes. Transformation of people's styles and ways of life, norms and behaviors in conditions of globalization, mobility of the hierarchy of values and traditions, attitudes to faith affect all layers of culture: personal-everyday, national and socio-identification, socially-integrative, regulatory and normative, semantic and symbolic, linguo-communicative, politico-ideological, religious, artistic-imaginative, etc. In these conditions, problems of cultural policy become problems of a national scale, such as social status culture, recognition of its powerful integration potential of society. Such cultural discourse is approved by the whole of Russian society.

A certain turn to dialogic strategy was the Year of Culture in Russia (2014). Summarizing its results, we drew attention to the fact that recently there has been a transition from a conservative sector management strategy (protection, restoration and use of historical and cultural monuments, fiction, scenic, musical art, cinematography, folk arts and crafts, museum business and collecting, book publishing, librarianship, as well as other activities) to an innovative policy as a leading line of cultural policy. It is connected with the search for constructive semantics that can determine the activity of the institutional system in the development of the Russian national culture of the near future, and develop adequate ways of solving the concept of sustainable development. This vector remained the most uncertain until the adoption of the "Fundamentals of State Cultural Policy" and "The Strategy of State Cultural Policy for the period up to 2030".

The focus on interdepartmental and inter-sectoral dialogue will contribute to solving the tasks of cultural policy such as strengthening collective identity and institutions of civil society, freedom of creative expression and personal growth. But this allows us to maintain cultural diversity and preserve the experimental line oriented to innovation and creativity included in the conceptual framework of postmodernity, with elements of commercialization, artistic and aesthetic levels of performances and author's interpretations, landscape solutions of the cultural environment.

On the one hand, the state does not impede the development of experimentation, creating conditions for creative searches, although this line, sometimes is associated exclusively with the destruction of "ossified" forms, the desire to go beyond the "standards framework" etc. On the other hand, cultural discourse on dialogue is aimed at the coordination of the artist's "freedom of creativity" with his responsibility to citizens for preserving the national ideals and spiritual foundations of the Russian culture.

The existing model of multi - subject cultural policy of Russia supports the disequilibrium of the cultural environment, characterized by a variety of values and senses, wide opportunities for realizing the creative

potential of cultural and civilizational innovations initiated by the unexpected trends, giving impulses to the socio-cultural processes that become the source of new cultural trends and semantic systems, fundamental conceptualizations and axiological scales. Discourses of different subjects form a certain logic of communications in society, which overcomes with difficulty historically set trends. "Return" is attractive, but to overcome its inertia creative efforts are needed to a greater or lesser extent manifested in the expansion of an integrated system of "circuit-level" for a long time existing in Russia. These levels-contours are presented on:

- a) General political, related to the development of ideological and ideological semantics of a wide range of social development strategy of the state symbols, etc.
- b) Sectoral, relevant to the competence of specific ministries and cultural units, as a special institutional system determining the structure of departments and the scope of competencies;
- c) the mass, developing through the cultural activity of broad segments of the population through the inclusion in the public mind of the world image with the concept of uniform standards of morality and behavior and a certain consistency of homogeneity and diversity, which does not create monotony and did not initiate a conflict of different social and ethnic backgrounds (Astafyeva, Avanesova, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c).

Let us emphasize that the central question concerning the tradition of developing cultural policy on the selected "level-contours" has not been solved and is still relevant today; obvious need for new content aspects of cultural policy, replacing the previously existing hierarchy of values and senses (Astafyeva, 2014). The fact that "often the value of giving to the onslaught of destructive meaning and existence of life tendencies meaning and significance, for its part, contribute to the fact that these destroy the meaning and existence of the trend is constantly updated, and together with us updated and specific form of positing values and giving meaning, designed to serve as a defense against the former " (Elias, 2001).

Such broad understanding of the principles of dialogue of thinking is particularly significant in the face of the deteriorating geopolitical situation and civilization "gaps" in the context of the "global risk of disintegration." First of all, it is necessary to identify "problem points" and clarify semantic foundations for project management, which is based on the principles of dialogue thinking.

3. DIALOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF RUSSIA'S COOPERATION WITH EURASIAN COUNTRIES: THE SEMANTIC COMPLEX OF CULTURAL POLICY

Cultural policy as a state-social strategy oriented to long-term and complex structured goal-setting, growing out of national aspirations of an existential nature, from the metaphysical positions of the state, which, although determined in many respects by a concrete situation, are based on the consolidated experience of past and present generations of people in a particular strategy. Such policy is devoid of any ideological or political conjuncture, since it is endowed with a meaningful vector of the future development of the nation and is perceived by the prospect of social life as a motivational impulse of its activity.

The central requirement for such system is the presence of a basic semantic core that matches within itself a system of actual values, super-targets, and operational practice-oriented goal-setting. At the same time, the strategy should be systematically adjusted in connection with world transformations, especially if it is a strategy of interstate cooperation oriented towards dialogue.

Questions on the renewal of Russia on the domestic cultural and civilizational basis are at the center of attention of researchers in the social and humanitarian field (A.I. Nekless, A.I. Fursov, S.S. Horuzhy, and others); Realistic goals, ideas, and various models of modernization are written by Russian analysts, noting the experience of the Eastern countries (B.S. Erasov, A.S. Panarin, A.P. Devyatov, V.V. Malyavin, etc.); search for the parameters of Russia's cooperation with the countries of Eastern Eurasia is important in the works of S. Yu. Glazyev, A.I. Podberezkin, K. P. Borishpolets, and others (Peretolchin, 2014, Podberezkin, 2013, Privezentsev, 2011).

So far, the laws of the development of a purposeful complex of foreign policy activities in Western countries that have been formed over the last three or four centuries mainly in the vein of European philosophy, aggressive international and colonial policy, and the national interests of the British, French, and American have been much better studied in the Russian science (Buchanan, 2003, Itskovich, 2010, Podberezkin, 2013, Peretolchin, 2014). This complex initially grew out of the notion of a universal principle of progress, the democratic development of different peoples, human rights, the possibility of a comprehensive development of the personality, etc. At the same time, these senses were supplemented by latent principles intended for

internal use: the unconditional domination of the interests of Western nations over the demands of non-European peoples, capitalist principles of management, in particular, an inequivalent economic exchange with states on other continents, predator etc. Over time, the open part of this complex received a scientific and theoretical justification, as well as support from the Western media, mass art and education system. All this, for the time being, gave the civilizational project of the West credibility in the minds of citizens of different countries. Today, there is a mass disillusionment in the principles of Westernization thinking, the neo-liberal economy, the policy of the unipolar world.

In our opinion, Russia must develop its own position with respect to Western European values both of the classical period and of the epoch of modernity and postmodernity. The educated part of our society spent at least two centuries trying to reject a number of values, others to understand and practically implement, consistent with its domestic spiritual guidelines.

1. Speaking about the senses and values of Russia in the course of its successful interaction with partners from the Eastern Eurasian regions, let us single out those basic semantic units of the Russian civilization, the roots of which grew from the Russian history, later formed in the conditions of the empire and partly in the Soviet era, and which continue to determine the Russian public consciousness today. Having in mind the specifics of interstate interactions, such senses should be seen in the leading spheres of the life of the peoples of the Russian Federation, within which cooperation is most common - economy, politics, interstate relations, and problems of national-state security. So, in the basis of cooperation in the sphere of politics and state security, the values of Russian patriotism can be laid; high authority of the Russian army and soldiers participating in military conflicts; public recognition of the organizing role of the state in the security system and in the organization of the military-industrial complex, etc.

2. Russian participants in cooperation should take into account the leading senses and values, as well as sectoral goals, situational principles followed by the partners from the Eastern Eurasian regions. At the same time, these senses and goals need to be differentiated, firstly, with regard to a specific civilizational region depending on political, cultural, religious parameters; secondly, to a specific country that is a partner and has / does not have experience in participating in such cooperation; thirdly, to one or another industry or group of industries where the interaction develops. The main difficulty lies in the consistent reconciliation of different senses and values that would be acceptable for different parties involved in cooperation.

3. We will also highlight the significance of the senses and spiritual values of Western European civilization, now dominant in the countries of the West themselves and widely represented in the information and media space on different continents. Many of these values have circulation in the Russian culture, although not all of them are deeply rooted in it. At the same time, there are such Western values that have been openly considered in recent decades as destructive for Russia. So, with regard to the direction of cooperation in the field of politics and state security, unacceptable values were: patriotism is irrelevant (a person lives in a country where he is comfortable); the state is a night watchman, his role in the global world is decreasing; mankind is moving towards a permanent world where the war becomes a crime, etc. This proclaimed part of values is supplemented by latent varieties that allow the US, Britain, France, Germany and other countries of the West to form aggressive military alliances and groupings, to unleash world and regional wars, etc.

The Russian side will have to take into account the extent to which foreign partners from the Eastern Eurasian countries are oriented toward Western values, meanings and senses which are present in this segment of interstate cooperation. It is also necessary to distinguish the degree of approval and rejection of the worldview values of Western culture in specific projects and alliances. In the latter case, there may be an appeal to senses and values that acquire purely applied or technological significance, which are quite acceptable for interstate interaction from a professional point of view. In any case, at the intersection of different types of values, it is important to develop a "working semantic framework" that will determine the relationship between the partners.

4. Finally, let us speak about the role of modern senses, values that take an ambivalent, mosaic, partially transitory character. They are born in different countries on the basis of the emergence of a huge number of cultural innovations. The actual values themselves increase in volume also under the influence of intercultural mass interactions, which allows them to move rapidly from continent to continent. In some cases, these senses and values may conflict with ethno-national traditions, while others, on the contrary, can be reconciled with them or adapted to them. Some social groups approve and distribute them; others - reject, demanding to impose a ban on their public usage. However, after a while the attitude to these senses and values can change cardinally. Values of this kind play an important role in adapting traditional cultures to the present world and its future state.

There is a specificity in the analysis of the values of partners from the East-Eurasian countries (the 2nd cluster), and also with respect to values of the West European type (3rd cluster). In either case, the subsystems and subgroups of partner values will have to be shaped in a special way, with which the senses and goals of Russian participation in cooperation should be coordinated. Special attention is also paid to the values of the last cluster (the 4th cluster), which, apparently, are taken after collective work with partners. Some of these values and meanings may reflect situational, accidental circumstances, and therefore will most likely be rejected in the course of cooperation. At the same time, other values of this cluster are able to integrate with traditions without prejudice to the latter, therefore they should be considered as elements of cultural renewal.

The development of a semantic base of Russian participation in interstate cooperation with Eastern Eurasian countries will require not only a focused analysis of the various semantic types listed above, but also to develop their new groupings and systemic subordination in the leading areas of international cultural policy. To this end, it is necessary to classify senses and values that differ among themselves in terms of their metaphysical depth and purpose, in scope and significance in a particular field of activity, in terms of prevalence among representatives of different civilizational communities participating in cooperation, etc. Such integration of selected senses should not look eclectic; different senses and values should be coordinated seamlessly, reflecting the polyphonic combination of the most important spiritual orientations of local civilizational communities. This will require working out the schemes of their structural hierarchical coordination. The more countries participating in the union differ in the leading economic, political, cultural and civilizational parameters, the more elaboration will require a semi - semantic basis for cooperation.

The proposed value and purposeful complex allows us to consider cultural policy as a process that passes through several phases of development. At the same time, the interaction of partners will develop not only on a dialogue basis, but in a polylogue regime, when participants need to take into account several different, sometimes incompatible points of view, which need to be brought together and, on a new semantic basis, to develop contractual goals, tasks and technologies acceptable for all. Particular attention should be paid to the emergence of fields of tension and semantic divergences between partners, arising due to various factors: ideological nature (national-cultural, moral, civilizational, etc.); pragmatic-instrumental in its essence (political, legal, financial-economic, professionally-branch). Let us emphasize the urgency of geopolitical and legal tensions in developing common semantic positions of partners. They sometimes have to be overcome at the highest level of interstate relations. In its final form, this complex will constantly need correction of certain indicators, as well as further development of these or those thematic sections and semantic nodes. This is one of the long-term dialogue projects, which is of strategic importance for our society.

The formation of new forms of interstate cooperation between the Russian Federation and the countries of Eastern Eurasia is especially important for such associations as the CIS, the SCO, APEC, BRICS, etc. Going beyond economic cooperation, political ties, the system of ensuring state security opens up a huge range of cultural and humanitarian cooperation, as well as the need to develop a new target and semantic base for the emergence of Russian civilization and state institutions on the international arena, including multi - vector cooperation in Eastern Eurasia.

4. COMMUNICATIVE PROJECTION DOMINANT IN THE FOCUS OF CULTURAL POLICY

Proceeding from the broad interpretation of culture and the recognition of its integrative essence, which excludes simple summation of its parts and modes, revealing different aspects of human being in the world, problems of the methodology of transition to a new strategy of cultural policy based on an interactive paradigm and updating of management practices of increasing attention to the issues of interactions of different levels become actual.

The purposeful regulation of socio-cultural life, implemented at three interrelated levels - federal, regional and municipal, formerly called the administrative-territorial approach to cultural policy and based more on the principles of resource allocation, is now significantly complemented and expanded through systematic introduction of dialogue thinking. This approach does not destroy the existing institutional structure of governance, but it offers an effective system of interaction between the authorities and society on issues of cultural development, as well as the expansion and strengthening of horizontal communications that allow all citizens, social groups and associations (different institutions of civil society, as subjects of cultural policy) to participate actively in the cultural life, fully realizing their constitutional rights in relation to culture.

Socio-cultural projection is a complex instrumental technology and an instrument of cultural policy that corresponds to the innovation line noted above, which is oriented towards modernization. At the same time,

we note that the spread of socio-cultural projection is characterized by a considerable number of contradictions, since at the regional level many difficulties are associated with the need to support intercultural interaction and reconciliation of interests of different population groups; therefore it is important to take into account the innovative potential of different population groups, among which some support but others are opposed to introducing new practices and updating the cultural environment.

Many contradictions are overcome by professionals of socio-cultural projection, who are active subjects of cultural policy - there are many of them in the business environment, among public organizations, and employees of cultural institutions (it's enough to get acquainted with the participants of competitions held by charity foundations). The specified subjects of activity develop project ideas and introduce them into sociocultural practices of local and regional level, sectoral scale. At this level projects related to the development of the cultural environment, the change of landscapes, the creation of public places, the development of new cultural products and creative initiatives are the most successful (on servicing visitors of museums and theaters, introduction of modern forms of information and library services, search for the most successful and demanded projects, new directions of cultural tourism, etc.).

All this makes it possible to consider socio-cultural projection as an effective tool of innovative cultural policy that acquires its specificity at the regional level, which largely depends on the openness of the territory to the introduction of modern practices aimed at changing its cultural landscape.

5. MAIN RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS:

1. Conceptual foundations of Russia's cultural policy determine the value-semantic reference points in society, aimed, on the one hand, to preserve the integrity of the sociocultural space and the institutional framework; on the other - the creation of the possibility of independent implementation of the regulation of socio-cultural development in a separate administrative-territorial unit, i.e. conditions of dialogue - for interaction between government and self-governing bodies, cultural and educational institutions, contributing to the development and maintenance of the integrity of the socio-cultural space, the integration of the population. Such obvious differentiation of the subjects of the cultural policy strengthens the disequilibrium of the cultural environment, which is characterized by a variety of value-semantic reference points, wide possibilities for realizing the creative potential of culture, and civilizational innovations initiate unexpected trends, imparting impulses to the level of sociocultural processes that become the source of new cultural trends and semantic systems, fundamental conceptualizations and axiological scales.

2. We emphasize that the central question regarding the tradition of developing cultural policy on the discussed "level-contours" has not been regulated and is still relevant today; obvious need for new content aspects of cultural policy, replacing the previously existing hierarchy of values and senses (Astafyeva, 2014). Discourses of different subjects form a certain logic of communication in the society, which are revealed through analysis of the problems of transformation of intercultural communications associated with exacerbation of geopolitical contradictions and civilizational "gaps," in the context of "risks of global disintegration."

3. In this situation, topical management tasks are as follows: a) overcoming the complexity of inter-agency cooperation on the issues of socio-cultural development strategy in the regions related to the coordination of the participation of different actors; b) provision of system support for infrastructure NGOs in the socio-cultural sphere, provided that the transparency of the activities of the NGOs is increased, both from the point of view of developing programs and projects, and the mechanisms for their administration (economic, information, etc.); c) selecting and summarizing the best practices of socially oriented NGOs in the field of culture, thereby contributing to the strengthening of intra-sectoral interaction between non-profit organizations that solve the tasks of socio-cultural projection.

4. The strategy of Russia's cultural policy is oriented towards achieving sustainable development and expanding the experience of intercultural interaction, as well as the creation of international and interethnic institutions strengthening these processes. Dialogue models are filled with expert and analytical assessments that fix the philosophy of dialogue relevant to modern cultural processes in the context of the fundamental principle of "unity in diversity".

5. After accumulation of a certain amount of such experience, specialists will be able to move to more complex levels of cooperation, develop plans for the medium and long term with the help of a well-developed semantic base. It is also necessary to assess the role of the semantic base itself in preventing conflicts and crises within different interstate unions, to monitor the degree of authority of an alliance with Russian participation among the population of Russia, as well as the population of the Eastern Eurasian countries.

6. Socio-cultural projection is a special tool for constructing an intercultural dialogue space based on the results of interdisciplinary development and diagnosis of problem situations, the introduction of new forms of activity of cultural policy subjects, including expert communities. The resources for designing event intercultural communications as mechanisms of the state's cultural policy for promoting and implementing the strategy of intercultural dialogue on the world level must be developed. The needs of the management system in choosing a dialogue model for the development of a specific socio-cultural project that is adequate to the changes and dynamics of culture in the context of globalization are due to: social "challenges" - widening gaps in communications, inability of social groups to achieve civic harmony, confrontation of local and global cultural patterns, models of identity and lifestyles.

REFERENCE LIST

- About higher and postgraduate professional education: federal law: from Aug 22 1996 № 125-FZ. Garant: Information legal support. [Online]. Available: http://base.garant.ru/135916/1/#block_100.
- Astafyeva, O. N., Avanesova, G. A. (2015a). Cultural Policy and National Culture: Prospects for the Strategic Vector of Russia's Development. *Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin*. № 5, pp.193 - 201.
- Astafyeva, O.N., Avanesova, G. A. (2015b). Cultural and humanitarian aspects of Eurasian cooperation: Russia in inter-civilization unions. Part 1. *Social and humanitarian knowledge*. № 3, pp.202-216.
- Astafyeva, O.N., Avanesova, G. A. (2015c). Cultural and humanitarian aspects of Eurasian cooperation: Russia in inter-civilization unions. Part 2. *Socio-humanitarian knowledge*. № 4, pp.163-182.
- Astafyeva, O. N., Belyakova, I. G., Sudakova, N. E. (2017). Theoretical Studies of Mass Culture as a Self-Developing System in the Context of the Tasks of Russia's Cultural Policy. *Eurasian Journal of Analytical Chemistry*; 12 (Interdisciplinary Perspective on Sciences 7b): pp. 1475–1481. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejac.2017.00275a>
- Astafyeva, O.N. (2015a). Cultural policy of dialogue: value orientations and strategic vector of development. Culture. Power. Society: ways to implement the state cultural policy. Ekaterinburg: materials of the UFD conference, pp.42 – 48.
- Astafieva, O. N. (2015b). Development of UNESCO's dialogue models and their inclusion in cultural policy strategies. Education, culture, science and communication in the modern world: Proceedings of the Second International Scientific Web Conference "UNESCO's Basic Ideas in Modern Education, Culture, Science, Information and Communication" (December 2014 - February 2015) Iss. 2, ed.by V. Egorov. Education, Culture, Science, and Communication in the Contemporary World. 2nd Publication, Moscow: Pashkov House.
- Astafieva, O. N. (2015c). Modeling of intercultural dialogue space in cultural policy: opportunities and limitations. *Global scientific potential*. No. 9 (54), pp. 49-58.
- Astafieva, O. N. (2016). Dialogue as an instrument for overcoming the "cultural risks": modeling practices of intercultural interaction. *The World of Culture and Culturology. Almanac NOCO*. Iss. 5, St.Petersburg: Center for Humanitarian Initiatives, pp.20 – 32.
- Astafieva, O. N. (2014). Theoretical problems of cultural policy and integration of the idea of culture in the public discourse. *Library and information Science(Russia)*. №6, pp.13 - 19.
- Avanesova, G. A. (2014). Local civilizations: theoretical postulates and twists in the practice of global interactions. *Polygnosis*. No. 1-2, pp. 105-118.
- Bakhti, M. M. (1980). Aesthetics of verbal creativity. Moscow.
- Benoist, A. de. (2009). Against the fourth liberal political theory. Transl. from Fr. by Dugin A., Kuznetsov A., Brazhnikova I. A., Golobodko A., et al. St.Petersburg: Amfora, 480 p.
- Bibler, V. S. (1991). From the study of science to the logic of culture. Two philosophical introductions in the twenty-first century. Moscow.
- Buchanan, P. J. (2003). The Death of the West. Transl. from Eng. by A. Bashkirova. Moscow: AST; St.Petersburg: Terra fantastica, 445 p.

- Cultural Policy of Russia: Topical Aspects: Collective Monograph. (2015). Ed. by A. N. Chumakova. Moscow: Publishing House "Prospekt", 192 p.
- Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 24, 2014 No. Pr-808 "On the Fundamentals of State Cultural Policy"
- Elias, N. (2001). Society of Individuals. Trans. with him. M.: Praxis, 120 p.
- Habermas, J. (2009). Moral consciousness and communicative action. St. Petersburg.
- Humanistic twist: imperative of human civilization: monograph (2018). Ed. by S. A. Kravchenko. Moscow: MGIMO-University, 209 p.
- Intercultural and interreligious dialogue for sustainable development: Proceedings of the International Conference (2008). Ed. by V. Egorov. Moscow: Publishing House RAGS, pp.120 - 138.
- Itskovits, G. (2010). Triple helix. Universities - enterprises - state. Innovation in action. Trans. from Eng. by ed. A. Uvarova. Tomsk: Publishing House of Tomsk State University of Control Systems and Radioelectronics, 238 p.
- Leontev, M. (2012). A great game: The British Empire against Russia and the USSR. Moscow – St. Petersburg: Astrel, 347 p.
- Lorenz, K. (1994). Aggression (the so-called "evil"). trans. from Ger. G. F. Shvejnik. Moscow: Progress: Universe, 272 p.
- Mazurova, L. (2007, Aug 8). The consumer is now in short supply. *Literaturnaya gazeta*. No. 32 (6132). [Online]. Available: <http://www.lgz.ru/article/1154>.
- Marx, D. (2008). The meaning of basic higher education in the context of competition in the market of educational services. *Higher education today*. No. 9, p. 8.
- On higher and postgraduate professional education: feder. law: from 22 Aug. 1996 № 125-FZ: Guarantor: information legal support. [Online]. Available http://base.garant.ru/135916/1/#block_100.
- On the conspiracy: Sat. monog. (2013). by comp. Al Fursov. Moscow: Association of Scientific Publications KMK, 522 p.
- Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of February 29, 2016 No. 326-r. "Strategy of the state cultural policy for the period until 2030".
- Peretolchin, D. Yu. (2014). World Wars and World Elites. Moscow: The Book World, 416 p.
- Philosophy in the dialogue of cultures. (2010). World Philosophy Day, November 16-19, 2009. Moscow - St.Petersburg.
- Podberezkin, A., Borishpolets, K., Podberezkina, O. (2013). Eurasia and Russia. Moscow: MGIMO University, 1070 p.
- Privezentsev, V. (2011). Cooperation with foreign countries in the field of education. *Educational Law*, No. 2. from 20 Jan. [Online]. Available: <http://www.ug.ru/archive/38662>
- Raven, J. (2002). Competence in modern society: identification, development and implementation. Trans. from Eng. by V. I. Belopolsky. Moscow: Kogito-Center, 396 p.
- Shakhrai, S. (2014). MSU in China. *The arguments of the week*. No. 31 (423), Aug. 21.
- Sheregi, F. E., Savinkov, V. I. (2011). Education as a factor in the formation of the intellectual potential of Russia. Moscow: TsSPiM, 288 p.
- Talgat. (2014). SWOT-analysis for the Eurasian Union. Military review. September 2, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://topwar.ru/57283-swot-evraziyskiy-soyuz.html>.
- The strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation until 2025. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 19, 2012 No. 1666. [Online]. Available: <http://president.rf/news/17165>
- Toffler, A. (1999). The Third Wave. Moscow: AST, 784 p.
- Vandam (Edrikhin), A. (2009). Our position. St. Petersburg: Science, 176 p.