



**Supplementary Notebook** (RTEP - Brazilian academic journal, ISSN 2316-1493)

## **The Role of The State in Preserving Cultural Heritage in The Context of Globalization**

Natalya I. Anufrieva <sup>1</sup>  
 Alexander V. Kamyanets <sup>2</sup>  
 Anna I. Scherbakova <sup>3</sup>  
 Elena Olegovna Kuznetsova <sup>4</sup>  
 Kseniya Dmitrievna Zanina <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Russian State Social University, Russia, [nata415485@mail.ru](mailto:nata415485@mail.ru)

<sup>2</sup> Russian State Social University, Russia, [kamenez.a@rambler.ru](mailto:kamenez.a@rambler.ru)

<sup>3</sup> Schnittke Moscow State Institute of Music, Russia, [anna.68@list.ru](mailto:anna.68@list.ru)

<sup>4</sup> Russian State Pedagogical University n.a. A.I. Herzen, Russia, [kyznetsova65@mail.ru](mailto:kyznetsova65@mail.ru)

<sup>5</sup> Russian State Social University, Russia, [ZaninaKD@rgsu.net](mailto:ZaninaKD@rgsu.net)

**Abstract:** *The article deals with the problem concerning the utilization of the potential of globalization in solving the state task of preserving cultural heritage. The main essence of the article is to reveal the state and prospects of uncovering the possibilities of state assistance in solving this problem. In this regard, different styles of management activity are distinguished, which determine the corresponding models of state cultural policy. According to the authors of the article, each of the considered models can be implemented, provided that these models interact with the globalization processes that contribute to the preservation of the national cultural heritage. The authors consider also possible negative consequences of the impact of globalization on the cultural space of Russian society and the necessary alternatives in the state cultural policy, which neutralize these consequences and form a reasonable balance between national and global interests concerning heritage preservation. Special attention is devoted to the possibilities of the project strategy in the state cultural policy, which is aimed at implementing a systematic approach to solving this problem, taking into account the specifics of regions in the interrelation of local cultural traditions and innovative solutions offered by globalization in preserving the national cultural heritage. The article may be of interest to a broad spectrum of specialists who are somehow associated with the preservation of cultural heritage, as well as for researchers and administrative bodies that deal with the problems of cultural policy at the federal and regional levels.*

**Keywords:** *globalization, cultural heritage, the problem of considering the potential of globalization.*

## INTRODUCTION

The role of the state in preserving cultural heritage is most clearly shown in raising the level of daily life culture, which is the main indicator reflecting the familiarization of the population with cultural values. In everyday life, the inheritance of cultural achievements is implemented through the appropriate way of life, moral and legal norms, cultural orientations, etc. Any certain social and cultural community joins this process in its own way, mastering the cultural heritage according to its vital meanings and respects. However, representatives of state bodies can also express their own cultural and social interests; this also affects their activities towards the preservation of cultural heritage. The influence of the personal factor in the state protection of this heritage is expressed in the formation of a certain style of management activity, whose study is necessary to build an effective state strategy when solving this problem.

One of these styles is the bureaucratic style, which is focused mainly on formal adherence to cultural traditions, reproduction of external cultural patterns of the past, so as not to change radically the cultural way of life prevailing in society, as well as the system of social relations. When this style of management dominates in the field of cultural heritage preservation, a dangerous trend is emerging to discredit the very idea of its revival and use. In this case, the focus of managerial authorities is on state support of heritage sites of federal importance, and due to this, maintaining a positive cultural image of the country in the global cultural space. Besides, special attention is devoted to the development of formal administrative and legal indicators to monitor the state of cultural heritage sites that are included in the list of world heritage sites. In both cases, this is carried out not without the positive impact of globalization in the form of international control and appropriate information support to protect such objects. However, globalization based on bureaucratic management style can also have negative impact if a particular public jobholder is interested in the approval of his activities by globalizers for various reasons and is less guided by the national interests of his country in preserving cultural heritage. This results in the priorities encountered in the development, dissemination, and protection of the cultural heritage of developed countries in their territories with the eternal lack of funding and state support for domestic cultural objects and institutions.

Thus, the bureaucratic style of management in the field of heritage protection can be transformed into a civilizing style, according to which a total break with the task of systematic state support of domestic heritage in favor of foreign achievements and cultural traditions. Representatives of this management style most often adhere to the strategy of bringing the national cultural space as close as possible to the samples of the civilized West. With many positive aspects of this management style, there is a risk of destroying the national and cultural identity of one's own country with all the resulting negative consequences according to various Western model globalist scenarios. The process of preserving cultural heritage is also influenced by various social strata and cultural communities forming a corresponding social mandate in this area. It is their energetic efforts that can lead to various initiatives to preserve cultural heritage if the latter express their basic socio-cultural orientations (Osipov, 2003). The influence of globalization on this process can be expressed through various international contacts and mutual influence of these groups (for example, in the form of international relations of businessmen, representatives of youth subcultures, religious organizations, confessions,

ethnic communities, etc.). Proper style of public administration that implements the interests of these social strata, groups, and communities can be called socializing, because the development of cultural heritage, in this case, contributes to the corresponding social identity of these actors in the process of preserving cultural heritage sites.

All these management styles have their advantages and certain drawbacks. If any style begins to prevail, it inevitably negatively affects the state of the national cultural heritage. Accordingly, the task of building a general management strategy in this area in which each style of management activity complements and corrects the others is relevant. For this purpose, a project style of management is desirable, since it makes it possible to implement positive impact of each style on the preservation of the cultural heritage, considering the globalization processes. The essence of project style consists in building a national project in which the heritage is some ideal representation of the national and cultural identity of the nation, to which all social strata of society and cultural groups should correspond in one way or another. This style has not yet received the necessary distribution in the cultural practice of Russian society. However, each of the inheritance styles discussed above can implement its strengths within the project approach. For example, the bureaucratic style can ensure the effective use of state and legal mechanisms in the preservation of cultural heritage, using the relevant international experience through the influence of globalization. The civilizing style can be constructive if it focuses on the creative use of the achievements of material culture widely transmitted by globalization processes. The socializing style can be remarkably effective based on establishing horizontal international relations between different social strata and groups, contributing to the socialization and cultural identity of many members of society. The development of an appropriate methodology for studying the state influence on the process of preserving cultural heritage considering the globalization processes is discussed further.

## METHODS

The employed method is based on the identification of existing models of state cultural policy, whose elements are present in public administration in the cultural sector (Kamenets, 2012). These models are represented in the following Table.

**Table 1.** Correlation of public administration styles and state cultural policy models in the field of cultural heritage preservation

	Management style	State policy model to preserve cultural heritage
1	Bureaucratic	Mythological
2	Civilizing	Modernizing
3	Socializing	Socially oriented
4	Project-oriented	Systemic

Let consider the mythological model of cultural policy indicated in the Table. Studies of myths allowed developing their certain typology. Myth can be theogonic, which means the birth of gods; cosmogonic, which is associated with the creation of the whole world; cosmological, revealing the structure of the universe; anthropological, dedicated to the creation of people; etiologial, which deals with the origin of natural objects; soteriological, related to the salvation of a human; as well as eschatological, predicting the

end of the world. All these kinds of myths are present in the mythological model of state cultural policy.

*Theogonic* mythology is implemented through the state's cultural policy of idealizing various leaders, political and public figures, which can be trusted due to their outstanding personal qualities.

The *cosmogonic* myth is reproduced in contemporary Russian society in the form of the widespread confidence of many representatives of public administration that the new Russian state being created is a fundamentally new entity with an appropriate system of cultural values and norms that has nothing to do with the national cultural and historical past. This myth fully corresponds to the manifestation of discontinuity in the social and cultural development of Russia, where there is a tendency to completely deny the previous state of society when approving new prospects for social development.

*Etiological* mythology is a transformation, emerged since the time of paganism. It is the belief in the possibility of artificial creation of the universe. At present, the role of the Creator of the universe is played by the human mind, which can create a new virtual reality in the form of universal computerization and digitalization, artificial intelligence, achieving human immortality, etc. At that, the etiological mythology remains significant in the global space. This is Russia's desire to solve environmental problems employing scientific and technological progress, to participate in the space program, to develop robotics, etc. In this effort, it is important not to succumb to the existing globalist scenario of control over all of humanity to implement the well-known dystopia of creating an artificial world that destroys any spontaneity and freedom of the individual in a new artificially created reality.

The *eschatological* myth in contemporary culture is most developed in the Christian and Islamic predictions of the Last Judgment, which will lead to the spiritual transformation of all mankind. This myth is necessary to preserve in contemporary humanity the hope for the ultimate triumph of justice and good. When this belief weakens, the expectation of the end of the world is actively exploited by globalists to create a general atmosphere of fear of the coming apocalypse and, accordingly, the desire to maximize the consumption of goods and services offered by the global market as a kind of consolation in the face of this threat.

The continuation of the myth-making traditions in the state cultural policy is one of the conditions for achieving compliance in Russian society with the basic values that link the past, present reality, and future prospects for its development (Hegel, 1977). These traditions also contribute to the creation of myths that have the necessary vitality for the preservation and development of cultural heritage. The rejection of the traditions of creation and the preservation of domestic myth-making in one way or another leads to filling the freed mythological space with myths created by globalists, which may pose a threat to the preservation of national cultural heritage.

The lack of domestic positive myth-making leads to many problems in contemporary Russian society. This is what T. Voevodina writes about: "In fact, in contemporary Russian society, there is no ideological support for democratic reforms and liberal values, because there is no positive social mythology that can shape the positive thinking of contemporary human by creating role models, without which society is demoralized. Mythology is recognized as the main resource of the country's modernization." (Voevodina, 2002, pp. 140-141). And further: "The universal nature of the myth allows considering culture as a whole, rather than as something fragmentary since the myth synthesizes and connects various phenomena of philosophy, religion,

morality, literature, art, history, science, and politics. The similarity of plots, images, and poetics of world mythologies indicates the fundamental unity of humanity, the structure of thinking of different peoples, and the archetypal repetition in the history of the culture of a complex of existential problems, situations, and behavioral models." (Voevodina, 2002, p. 141).

The *modernizing model* of the state policy in the field of cultural heritage preservation is best suited to the globalists' scenarios. This model involves the implementation of those values and norms of Western culture into Russian society that differ significantly from domestic cultural traditions and values. In this process, special attention is paid to foreign achievements in the field of everyday culture, material comfort, entertainment industry, computer game programs, etc. At that, these cultural achievements are supported primarily by the given model of public administration in the cultural sector (Murzina, 2017; Orlova, 2004). This accent focused on meeting material and physiological needs, is primarily in line with the requirements of the global market for cultural goods and services (Zubenko, 2012).

The *socially-oriented model* of state policy aimed at preserving cultural heritage, as can be seen in the Table, is implemented based on the socializing style of cultural inheritance. Based on this model, a compromise is sought between the cultural interests of different social groups (Berger, Luckmann, 1995). Here one can find both common interests (for example, the preservation of national parks) and individual interests that differ depending on the belonging of certain actors to a particular social stratum, ethnic community, religious association, etc. The socializing purpose of this model of state cultural policy is to provide certain society members with the necessary cultural self-identity with a particular social community.

There is also a hidden danger here of active state support for actors interested, first of all, in translating the values and achievements of foreign culture into the domestic cultural space, which is often opposed to traditional Russian cultural values and meanings. The systemic model of state policy in the field of cultural heritage protection (project-based management style) is a potential opportunity to synthesize other models and their functional relationships (Kamenets, 2015). If the implementation of the models discussed above does not imply their integration into the general system, this may result in irreconcilable competition between them, opening up vastness for the cultural space of globalists, which replaces cultural traditions and domestic cultural values in favor of the global market of cultural services and goods. At that, the actors, representing the interests of globalizers, offer their system in the form of the relationship of the above-mentioned models of state cultural policy, but with globalist content. This systematic approach is based on the recognition of the priority importance of the cultural heritage of the civilized West, its history, cultural heritage sites, and its traditional cultural values. In this case, the *mythological model* of cultural policy will be aimed primarily at implementing the ideals of Western culture and civilization as guidelines for the social and cultural development of Russian society. The *modernizing model* of cultural policy will mainly be represented by the ideas and cultural practices of postmodernism, which, for all its undoubtedly significant cultural achievements, can, if it dominates, destroy any national cultural heritage in the course of deconstructing and recombining cultural heritage in favor of the global market.

The *socially-oriented model* of cultural policy based on Western cultural samples implies the development of a differentiated market for cultural services for various social groups of the population. According to the well-known theory of social stratification, a

system of cultural proposals is created for various social strata, namely, for the upper, middle, and lower classes. This model is based on a system of market relations for each group of consumers. With all the flexibility and proximity to the cultural needs of various social groups, this model can destroy the general value and cultural space of society, creating a kind of cultural ghettos for a particular social group. The considered interpretations of the cultural policy models described above based on uncritical following the requests of the global cultural market actualize the task of building their state support strategies to protect cultural heritage without denying the importance of achievements in this area in the existing global cultural space. It makes sense to consider the relevant outcomes when studying these possibilities.

## RESULTS

The considered problems of state involvement in the preservation of cultural heritage sites allowed identifying the basic conditions for the success of the state cultural policy towards preventing the negative impact of globalization on domestic culture. The major condition here is the improvement of the legal framework to preserve heritage sites, which implies the perception of the legal culture by all representatives of the state, one way or another, related to protecting cultural heritage. Legal culture includes not only the necessary minimum of legal competency of public jobholders but also ensuring public control over the state of cultural heritage sites; as well as continuous monitoring studies of the existing legal protection of heritage. Among the most pressing problems of legal security for the preservation of cultural heritage, one can distinguish the lack of proper state control over the privatization and corporatization process in the field of cultural inheritance by persons representing the interests of foreign businesses. In this regard, the task of developing detailed regulations and control over the privatization process is quite demanding, since this should contribute to the formation of social responsibility of such owners to Russian society, which consists in the obligations to preserve the acquired cultural heritage sites.

There is also a need for special state control over the condition and use of cultural heritage sites of national significance included in the register of world-class cultural sites. This can be considered the upside of the globalization process (Balakshin, 2005). The formation of the national expertise institution is of great importance to assess the state of cultural heritage which is in a situation of vulnerability to the interests of globalizers that are of a commercial nature. Moreover, these experts must be able to act on behalf of the state authorities in the control of one or other privatizers. To overcome the negative implications of globalization on the preservation of cultural heritage, the state must take part in supporting national cultural associations and movements involved in state cultural policy. In turn, these associations themselves have all the opportunities to assist state bodies in this work, representing an important resource in countering certain globalizers having an irresponsible attitude to the national cultural heritage.

An upcoming trend for improving the state policy to preserve cultural heritage in the context of globalization is to strengthen the social targeting of this policy (the socially-oriented model discussed above). In this case, the composition of social actors interested in preserving their cultural traditions and related heritage sites broadens. However, as mentioned earlier, the best option is to combine this strategy and the corresponding socially-oriented model of state policy with other models (mythological and modernizing) within the framework of a single project approach (project-oriented model). In this regard, the development of regional heritage preservation projects that resist the

mindless globalization of cultural processes in specific regions becomes increasingly popular. Each Russian region can preserve and develop its own culture if it not only implements a socially-oriented cultural policy but also preserves its mythologemes associated with the "memory of the place", local cultural traditions, as well as involves the modernization processes. All these components of regional projects are implemented in an integrated way, holistically, ensuring a balanced approach in interaction with global cultural processes based on a common long-term project (Vernadsky, 2003; Habermas, 1995).

The negative trends encountered in the impact of globalization on the preservation of cultural heritage can be largely evened out, provided a full-fledged information base is created, which is necessary for the state to fully and systematically take into account the condition of cultural heritage sites in the regions. Analysis of the existing information support of the relevant state cultural policy shows that it needs to be significantly improved and developed. Studying the information resource of the state cultural policy shows that the priority in collecting and using information about the real status of culture and heritage sites is given to quantitative indicators (mainly statistical information) while underestimating qualitative indicators. Overcoming these distortions is possible if developing a methodology for comprehensive examinations of the heritage status, which assumes the relationship between quantitative and qualitative indicators of cultural heritage assessment (Kaulen, 2015; Vedenin, Shulgin, 2006). These examinations should not be of a one-time nature but should be one of the tools for systematic monitoring of the state of culture in the regions, organized by state cultural bodies.

The effectiveness of such monitoring, as shown by the analysis of this research procedure in the cultural sector, will depend on the following conditions: carrying out the coordination of various organizations, institutions, and departments that have a particular relationship to the state of culture in the regions and individual territories; giving special attention in such monitoring to the study of the state of cultural heritage sites that are important both in the national and global cultural space; conducting a state control over the effectiveness of budget funding to restore and reconstruct cultural heritage; studying this process shows that a common trend here is the misuse of funds by some government officials, which is one of the consequences of the negative impact of globalization in the form of the temptation to become rich quickly and easily by any means.

## DISCUSSION

The revealed links between management styles and corresponding models of cultural policy allow concluding that the human factor is important in management activities in the cultural sector, which is often underestimated. Meanwhile, the activity of one or another public jobholder in the cultural sector is particularly dependent on their values and worldview. This is also evident in the corresponding management styles that determine the choice of the state cultural policy model. Thus, the *bureaucratic* management style tends to preserve the existing situation, even with the outward appearance of a propensity for innovation. This style is followed by the officials who tend to maintain the existing top-down system of power, in which management activities are carried out from top to bottom. Accordingly, it is at the very top that certain mythologemes, norms, and values should be created, which should be followed by all those who are on the lower levels of the power system. This style and the corresponding model of cultural policy have certain advantages and vulnerabilities in the context of

globalization. The upside is that bureaucrats in state authorities, one way or another, strive to maintain their social status and significance in society, forming their image in the eyes of the population as defenders of state interests, including in the cultural sector, in contrast to the pressure of globalists who threaten the cultural sovereignty of the country (Hobbes, 2001). To maintain this image, these public jobholders disseminate relevant national myths that ensure cultural identity and form patriotic consciousness among all members of society. The downside of the bureaucratic style and the corresponding mythological model of cultural policy is that under the pressure of globalization, certain state officials seek to implement many Western values and myths which can reformat the cultural consciousness of a significant part of society towards unconditional acceptance of the myths and values of other countries in the prejudice of preserving and developing national cultural heritage.

The *civilizational* management style is mainly followed by Western-oriented government officials, who perceive Russian society as always lagging behind developed Western civilizations. According to this style, a corresponding modernization model of cultural policy is being built towards rapprochement with the culture of the civilized West. This management style and the corresponding management model also have their positive and negative features. In such management activities, the positive feature is the desire to borrow the best cultural achievements of Western countries that determine the relevant global cultural processes, including creative industries, postmodern creative discoveries, promising entertainment technologies, and organization of spectacles. The negative aspect is the desire of modernizing officials to maximally modernize the national cultural space by bringing it closer to global tendencies and civilizational trends. Accordingly, public opinion forms an attitude towards their cultural heritage as archaic and not fitting into the modernization processes. This process is carried out both through the import of cultural values of globalism and the creation of their own cultural products according to the Western model. Besides, the market strategy in the sphere of cultural goods and services is also being implemented according to the priorities of the global market as the dominant one.

The *socializing* style of management and the corresponding socially-oriented model of cultural policy are inherent to public jobholders who have the worldview of pillars of culture and educators, who are called to join all social groups of the population to the cultural heritage. A positive aspect of this management strategy is the desire to link culture with the solutions to social problems of various communities and ethnic groups. Here, the positive experience of the relationship between social work and cultural services, which is widely represented in the global cultural and information space, may be quite relevant. However, the foreign experience of socio-cultural stratification, often misinterpreted by some public jobholders is a negative aspect. While abroad and in the practice of globalism, the upper class includes people who have undoubted merits as figures who ensure the social, cultural, and economic progress of their countries and societies, in Russia, self-styled elites are common, whose distinctive feature is a high level of consumption and possession of material benefits. The special attitude to such persons of some Russian state officials involved in the cultural sector is expressed in the desire to use the material benefits of such pseudo elites to support national culture. Not denying the importance of developing domestic patronage and sponsorship in the cultural sector and art, the widespread disregard of state authorities should be noted to individuals and groups who can really preserve and multiply cultural heritage, without having the appropriate material opportunities for this.



The above-considered design style and the corresponding systemic model of cultural policy are typical for public jobholders who are concerned about preserving cultural heritage in all its diversity, regardless of a particular political environment, personal financial benefit, and ideological preferences. Accordingly, it is necessary to significantly enhance state efforts toward creating projects to protect cultural heritage in the regions, considering the globalization processes. Following this model of cultural policy, it is necessary to take into account the prevailing orientations of a particular region to use the achievements of globalization (the *modernizing* model), with the other models considered as additional (*mythological* and *socially-oriented models*). Other regions are more focused on the *mythological* model of cultural policy, which is expressed in a preference for traditional cultural values and heritage sites. Then the other two models can also be implemented as additional ones (Bergson, 2006; Guseynov, Apresyan, 2002; Schweitzer, 1973). This differentiation of cultural interests and preferences is also present in different types of human settlements. For example, the impact of globalization in the cultural sector is more susceptible to megapolises, and to much lesser extent – to small and medium-sized cities. All this should be considered when designing projects to preserve heritage in the regions, thus ensuring their viability and effectiveness.

## CONCLUSION

The study of the state's role in preserving cultural heritage in the context of globalization shows that in all kinds of state cultural policy, priority should be given to national cultural heritage, taking into account the diversity of regions, the characteristics of certain ethnic groups, and social communities. If foreign cultural achievements are a priority, then there is a real danger of destroying domestic cultural heritage, which in the future threatens to lose the national and cultural identity and sovereignty of the country (Selezneva, 2009). The most productive is the desire to preserve national cultural heritage while creatively using the achievements of foreign culture that enrich the country's cultural space without compromising national cultural traditions and values. Thus, preserving national cultural subjectivity, Russian society can enrich world culture and civilization through the demonstration of its cultural heritage, where the role of the state can hardly be overestimated. The management styles and models of cultural policy identified in the study allow outlining a variety of management strategies to preserve cultural heritage, considering the trends of globalization in the contemporary Russian cultural space.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was carried out with the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research according to research project No. 19-311-90067.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Balakshin, A.S. (2005). Kul'turnaya politika: teoriya i metodologiya [Cultural policy: Theory and methodology]: Ph.D. thesis in philosophical sciences. Novgorod: Volga State University of Water Transport.
- 2 Berger, P., Luckmann, T. (1995). The social construction of reality. Moscow: Medium.
- 3 Bergson, H. (2006). Creative evolution. Moscow: Kuchkovo Field.
- 4 Guseynov, A.A., Apresyan, R.G. (2002). Etika [Ethics]: textbook. Moscow: Gardariki.

- 5 Habermas, J. (1995). *Democracy. Reason. Morality*. Moscow: AO "KAMI".
- 6 Hegel, G.V.F. (1977). *Filosofiya duha [Lectures on the Philosophy of Spirit]*. Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences. Moscow: Mysl.
- 7 Hobbes, T. (2001). *Leviathan*. Moscow: Mysl.
- 8 Kamenets, A.V. (2012). *Osnovy kul'turnoj politiki [Fundamentals of cultural policy]*. Moscow: Russian State Social University.
- 9 Kamenets, A.V. (2015). *Vvedenie v teoriyu social'nogo vzaimodejstviya [Introduction to the theory of social interaction]: monograph*. Moscow: Russian State Social University.
- 10 Kaulen, M.E. (2015). *Muzeefikaciya istoriko-kul'turnogo naslediya Rossii [Museification of historical and cultural heritage of Russia]*. Moscow: Eterna.
- 11 Murzina, I.Ya. (2017). *Osnovy kul'turnoj politiki [Fundamentals of cultural policy]*. Yekaterinburg: Ural State Pedagogical University.
- 12 Orlova, E.A. (2004). *Kul'turnaya (social'naya) antropologiya [Cultural (social) anthropology]*. Moscow: Academy Project.
- 13 Osipov, G.V. (ed). (2003). *Sociologiya. Osnovy obshchej teorii [Sociology. Fundamentals of general theory]*. Moscow: Norma.
- 14 Schweitzer, A. (1973). *Culture and ethics*. Translation into Russian. Moscow: Progress.
- 15 Selezneva, E.N. (2009). *Problemy duhovno-nravstvennogo vospitaniya v strategiyah obrazovaniya HKHI veka [Problems of spiritual and moral education in the education strategies of the 21st century]: scientific and methodological guide*. Moscow: Russian State Social University.
- 16 Vedenin, Yu.A., Shulgin, P.M. (eds). (2006). *Nasledie i sovremennost': informacionnyj sbornik [Heritage and modernity: Information collection]*. Moscow: Institute of Heritage.
- 17 Vernadsky, V.I. (2003). *The biosphere and the noosphere*. Moscow: Iris Press.
- 18 Voevodina, L.N. (2002). *Mifologiya i kul'tura [Mythology and culture]*. Moscow: Institute of General Humanitarian Research.
- 19 Zubenko, V.V. (2012). *Globalizaciya mirovoj ekonomiki: vyzovy i orientiry [Globalization of the world economy: Challenges and landmarks]: monograph*. Moscow: Dashkov, and Co.