



Formation of Political Culture of Society on the Basis of Synergetic Mechanisms

Sherbakova AI*, Selezneva EN, Anufrieva NI, Kamenets AV and Zinchenko EO

Moscow State Institute of Music named after A.G. Schnittke, Russian State Social University, Russia

*Corresponding author: Sherbakova AI, Moscow State Institute of Music named after A.G. Schnittke, 10 Marshala Sokolovskogo st., Moscow, 123060 Russia; Russian State Social University, Russia, Tel: +74991940433; E-mail: sherbakova837485@mail.ru

Received date: May 05, 2016; Accepted date: June 20, 2016; Published date: June 24, 2016

Copyright: © 2016, Sherbakova AI, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Sherbakova AI, Selezneva EN, Anufrieva NI, et al. The Ethno-Lingual Composition of the Russian Federation and Canada: A Comparative Analysis. Global Media Journal. 2016, S3:24

Abstract

The article deals with the topical problems of formation of political culture in the Russian society from the standpoint of synergetics. We consider in this context the main features of the synergetic processes that foster the involvement into political activities of various groups of population. We reveal the features of the formation of synergetic mechanisms of civil society, which is considered taking into account the specificity of the domestic social and cultural traditions of participation of the society's active members in solving the public and political problems. The basic synergetic mechanisms of individuals' adaptation in the space of intercultural interaction are described as the conditions of the political culture formation.

Keywords: Political culture; Synergetics; Society, Civil society; Adaptation; Intercultural interaction; Tradition; Fractality; Symbol; Interaction; Myth; Identity

Introduction

The problem of inheritance acquires a special character in the synergetic dimension: the historicism of the phenomena of sophistication and simplification of social structures demonstrates a potentially endless process of achieving integration in different conditions of social interaction.

Using the language of synergetics, one can talk about the need for understanding the mechanism of inheritance from the standpoint of fractality: "Fractal is an unsteady, unstable, transient structure of an evolving system." The specificity of such structure is its "intermediate" character; it is situated "in between", in a chaotic region between two stable states [1,2].

"The main property of fractals is self-similarity. One and the same pattern is repeated, being embedded into itself..." [3]. In this regard, the synergetic dimension concept is presented in the scientific literature in a variety of contexts and

conceptions. For example, a synergetic philosophy of history exists as an explanation of the desire of mankind for unity. Correspondingly, a synergetic model of the global process can be presented in the form of alternation of the states of social order and chaos, the processes of hierarchization and de-hierarchization of the society, complexification and simplification of its structures, its "ramification", a "non-linear" character of movement, approaching a "singularity" point through some chains of bifurcations and local attractors. It is emphasized that global unity is possible on the basis of not unification, but a potentially infinite diversity [4], which creates unlimited opportunities for cultural-innovation activity.

This process turns out to be possible under the condition of implementation of the well-known aesthetic principle of harmonization as a unity of great diversity [5]. This principle can be viewed as an ideal guideline for the synergetic development of the society. By virtue of what is the movement to this unity possible? And what does it mean in reality? To answer these questions, one should pay attention to the presence of three levels in the process of synergetic interaction: the material level (joint activity for maintaining or changing the artifacts associated with the organization of the object-spatial environment); the social one (realization of social interactions for developing and maintaining social connections); the symbolic one (unfolding in the information-mental space) [6].

For the preservation and development of human populations, the symbolic level is determinative, because, in the beginning, the human being did not possess such psychophysiological adaptive systems as the representatives of flora and fauna. It was already E. Cassirer who in his seminal book "The philosophy of symbolic forms" claimed the decisive role of symbolic organization of culture as an "intermediate level" between the human being and environment. Hence the decisive role in the evolution of the human being and society belongs to their intellectual, creative capabilities, presented, first of all, on the symbolic level (signs, symbols, information, etc.).

Accordingly, the synergetic dimension basically has to take into account all the above levels of a synergetic process with

the determinative role of the symbolic level. This means that the greater the level of presentation of symbolic synergetic in comparison with its material and social level, the greater is the synergetic potential of the society and population, providing self-preservation and development of the corresponding social system [7].

This potential can be realized under the condition of availability of diverse experience of social interactions, providing the interconnection of the symbolic and material levels of the social system, because it is by interacting with each other that people master the real spiritual values both on the material and symbolic levels.

The diversity of social experience is provided by such a socio-political organization as civil society, which is a kind of attractor, necessary for the realization of the synergetic process. This, in turn, is possible under the condition of formation of a real (not imitated) civil society.

Despite the diversity of research and social practices connected with the creation in our country of civil structures, one cannot but note the tendency of uncritical borrowing of foreign experience of the civil society formation without taking into account the domestic political and cultural traditions, the specificities of mentality of the titular nation (Russians) and other peoples of Russia, the real problems and challenges that are faced by our multi-ethnic and multi-confessional society in the conditions of transition.

Methods

It can be argued that, in solving the problems of formation and development of civil society in Russia, a kind of mythology has been formed as a result of superficial borrowing the political experience of the Western European countries.

The first myth is that the civil society in Russia is becoming primarily a space for the activity of human rights advocates, a structure through which it is possible to defend the rights of individuals and groups against the authorities which abuse their administrative resources to the detriment of the rights and freedoms of the individual. In the history of Russia, the civic consciousness has traditionally been understood mainly as a public service and as a service to the fellow human being. It is primarily in this aspect that the struggle has been evaluated for the rights of the individual members of society, who for one reason or another found themselves "on the periphery" of social life, but not as an expression of the group and private narrow-corporate interests. The entire society, its social institutions and administrative structures were called, first of all, to have more responsible civic attitude (not just to protect the individual VIP-persons) towards the socially disadvantaged individuals and groups.

The second myth is that the civil society in Russia can be formed primarily from the middle class, the main representative of which are involved in the medium and small business.

Russian history is replete with the examples of involvement into civic initiatives of quite diverse social strata and groups.

Many representatives of these groups could even become national leaders in specific periods of time (Sergius of Radonezh, Minin and Pozharsky, Tolstoy, etc.). Within the Russian tradition, civic consciousness is, first of all, the orientation on the transformation of the entire society, its further improvement understood as "transfiguration" (transformation), often at the cost of one's own life, a deed of sacrifice and love.

The third myth is that the main content of the civil society's activity should be alternative to the state-power structures. This confrontation is necessary for the further progress and development of the entire Russian society.

In Russian history, the basic pathos of civism has been connected not so much with a protest component against the state (although this line has also been present), but rather with the goals and objectives of moral perfection, regardless of the social position and status. In the context of civism, this improvement should be realized mainly in the form of activity in those areas where the state and its institutions are functioning unsatisfactorily. Accordingly, the civil service is often carried out in the niches which are "not occupied" by the state in the form of selfless socially significant activities which do not have, in modern parlance, noisy "PR", career motivation, etc.

The fourth myth is that in Russia, due to its multi-ethnicity, civil society must be "supranational" in nature and, in a certain aspect, must resist its national-ethnic modifications in order to guarantee the rights of a particular ethnic group, nationality against the impingement from other national groups [8].

The "universal responsiveness" of Russian culture and literature (F. M. Dostoevsky) and its unique ability to use the achievements of other cultures and civilizations suggest the possibility of such a guarantee in civil society without abandoning the "Russian factor" as an essential one in the formation of domestic civil society. The national history clearly demonstrates that the best representatives of Russian culture have always been ready for dialogue, empathy and understanding of the problems of other nations and ethnic groups. Accordingly, "Russianness" as a necessary component of civil society should be interpreted not in a national-ethnic way, but from a worldview standpoint, taking into account a special importance of preserving the richness of Russian language and the context of Russian culture as a condition of interethnic communication.

The fifth myth is that the basic ideologies and value orientations of civil society should be "connected" exclusively to the so-called "Russian intelligentsia" as the civil society leaders, as the "conscience of the nation." This myth was generated already by the activity of the democratic intelligentsia consisting of commoners of pre-revolutionary Russia and was continued by the intelligentsia generations, one way or another opposed to the official authorities (such as the dissident movement, "the sixties", the modern liberal intelligentsia).

However, a characteristic feature of the domestic tradition of formation and manifestation of civic consciousness is the

society's consolidation around common patriotic values, which establish a common field of interactions of various social and cultural groups.

In the process of demythologization of the ideas about civil society, one should especially focus on:

Humanization of domestic education at all levels, contributing to the formation of moral principles on the material of Russian history and the achievements of Russian thinkers, writers and historical figures [9];

Recognizing the educational programs on Russian history and culture as one of the priorities of the state cultural policy [10];

Involving the media into the process of formation of the civil society's norms, using the traditions of domestic culture;

Activation of research in humanities concerning the civil society issues in the field of domestic art and philosophical thought.

As the integrative factors of formation of the civil society culture in Russia, one can distinguish the creation of a sustainable content of socio-cultural meanings, which makes it possible for the diverse structures to interact in a civilized fashion in the framework of legal norms regardless of their social and political interests, and for these structures themselves to interact constructively with the government bodies and agencies [11].

In this regard, it is quite common when some civil society groups, the human rights groups being their vanguard, one way or another, claim some niches in the "system" state structures, having preliminarily pushed out from there the officials that infringe on the rights of certain groups of individuals and citizens. In turn, many of the "system" civic associations try to displace the "alien" ones from the niches of social space under the slogan of "the interests of the entire society", which, in their opinion, are always prioritized over the individual private and corporate interests. As a result, there takes place degeneration or mutation of both types of civil structures, which try to "do something that they are not fit for", to change the content of their activities according to the opponent's type of activity, while maintaining the formal structure of the same civic association.

In this regard, it is important to identify as a positive trend the formation of a kind of "division of labor" between many associations of both types and the emergence of the possibilities (still poorly realized) of the dialogue between these types of civic associations. The dialogue is possible taking into account the following circumstances. The closer a civil union is to the target-oriented civil initiatives (having a universal social significance), the more it gravitates toward system integration, because a basic characteristic of the latter is the aspiration to establish a social order in the interests of the safety of all citizens. Accordingly, the endless dispute regarding "order for all vs. freedom of individual citizens" has no meaning in this context. Ultimately, integration provides absence of conflict and social solidarity. And vice versa: the stronger the civil society adheres to the search-like behavioral

strategies, the more it gravitates to the "lifeworld" (Lebenswelt), functionally autonomous, unsystematic and ultimately asocial activity.

Each of these types of civil unions has its "own truth" and its own social logic: for some of them it is the truth of humanity, attention to the individual person; for others, the truth of social protection of "all", the logic of universal civil patriotism. However, this division of ideologies and value orientations makes very essential the ongoing dialogue, cooperation between civil associations of both types to reach a consensus between the "egoists" and "altruists", which establishes a realistic measure of realization of democratic principles and modernization changes, taking into account the formed balance of social forces in the society, its socio-cultural differentiation, cultural and historical traditions, mentality, etc. It is exactly in the course of this interaction that a real culture of civil society is formed, which does not have its own "cultural territory", but is a derivative of such interaction. Moreover, civil structures as independent social formations can exist in a relatively autonomous social-ecological niche.

Discussion and Results

In determining the culturological foundations of social-cultural transformation of the Russian society from the standpoint of synergetics, T. Parsons' classification of autonomous social action has a great heuristic value. It includes: affective and emotionally "neutral" actions ("affective-affective neutrality"); socially-oriented and private or private-corporate actions ("universalism-particularism"); value-regulatory and goal-oriented rational actions ("prescription-achievement" or "quality-implementation"); differentiating and integrative actions ("specificity-diffuseness") [12].

Accordingly, the socio-cultural communities, presenting themselves as civil structures, can also be classified according to the peculiarities of socially autonomous (and therefore the real social-civil) actions. With respect to the first of the above-listed positions, we can determine to what extent a civil initiative is a result of deliberate or affective socio-cultural activities. At present, in the civil society having a culture-creative significance, the affective sociocultural actions prevail. This is reflected in the predominant reaction of the civilian population to the already occurred social events that are important to the society, with a lack of a long-thought-out development strategy of a civil structure and its corresponding socio-cultural activity. Most often it is manifested as a "meeting-based" democracy, various protest actions and others. The culture-creative meaning of this activity is to find civilized, cultivated forms of demonstration of one's own civic position. There appears a new phenomenon of the "street stage-direction", which greatly enriches the palette of socio-cultural means of self-expression of different social groups, communities, associations (for example, performances, theatrical demonstrations, marches, etc.) [13].

The second type of the above-considered social actions is significant to the following most common socio-cultural

situations in the world of civil initiatives: the situations of asserting the rights of individual artists, creators (and then we deal with a civil union as an instrument for the protection of these creators-individuals) or defending the corporate interests of particular groups, professional guild of workers, cultural workers, fighting for their rights and new opportunities for self-realization in the society (e.g., the employees of theaters, libraries, museums, etc.). In the third type of social actions, the dominating in Russia are the private-corporate, not public-oriented activities.

Moreover, many creative movements, which were public civil initiatives in the beginning, then under the influence of the market social dominants can be commercialized and become an independent private-corporate structure (e.g., rock culture, the domestic jazz, etc.). In the fourth type of social actions, there are prevalent in the domestic civic initiatives and movements the rational actions with the apparent shortage of the value-normative socio-cultural programs (the latter being often the field of activity of politically marginal and extremist people, but not of constructive civilian opposition). Finally, concerning the fifth type of social actions, there is the prevalence in the domestic civil society of integrative methods, compared with differentiating social activities, because in our society the institutions of social protection and social-cultural activity of the major social and cultural groups, social and cultural strata are still insufficiently developed.

A comparison between the civic activity trends in Russia with the typology of social actions due to N. Parsons shows the presence of a certain distortion of this activity toward particularism and private interest, while the universal social civil aspirations and initiatives are underdeveloped. In this situation, such civic initiatives are especially significant that reproduce social activities in accordance with the requirements of "Alter", not only "Ego". Moreover, the impact of social-cultural initiatives, changing the consciousness of the "Ego" carriers into the direction of altruism, is quite unique in the Russian reality, because it is based not on the administrative-legal pressure, but on the formation of humanistic moral consciousness through the appropriate voluntary choice of social behavior. It is precisely this voluntariness (which is only possible in the mechanism of real inculturation) that is a guarantee of the irreversibility of forming positive civic awareness and civic morality.

As a basic concept of constructing a model of transition of the Russian society, one can hypothetically take the concept of "social adaptation". Accordingly, the problem of "transition" in this context can be solved through the paradigm of social adaptation, developed by E. A. Orlova. This adaptation is considered at three levels:

The real one – as a "joint activity" of maintaining (or changing of artifacts) and organizing of the object-spatial environment;

The social one – implementation of social interactions, maintaining or changing of connections;

The symbolic one – as the changing values of the processes in the form of conventional sign and symbol systems [14].

On the basis of these principles, it is proposed to distinguish a "joint activity field" and then represent it in the intersubjective forms. This is a vast research program to find a variety of different components at all the above-mentioned levels. Therefore we propose those components that are quite clearly manifested in the symbolic values of the changing social interactions.

Referring to Luhmann, Habermas speaks of determining the functional dominant and takes "functional differentiation" above the borders of national societies, which contributes, in the globalization conditions, to "unrestricted exchange of people, goods, capital, technology, music, popular culture, sports, etc." [15].

Accordingly, all the more important in this context are the ideas of a multicultural "world-society" as a new formation, in the framework of which an analytical perspective can be seen of integration of social theory and diversified traditional civilizations [6].

At the same time, the intercultural dialogue is becoming particularly topical (i.e., the desired intersubjectivity) regarding common rules of existence which can be realized on a variety of conventional levels, contributing to the socio-cultural adaptation of individuals in the intercultural interaction space [16].

The symbolic level in this context can be represented through the aspects of social-cultural adaptation which are offered by E. A. Orlova:

Representation of "the field of joint activity" in the intersubjective forms;

Delimitation of this field and its representation in the instrumental forms (i.e., ends and means, methods of organization of interaction);

Normalization of all adaptation-significant stages of interaction and communications;

Construction of the symbolization concepts (designation of the identified connections) [14].

The social level, which will determine the construction of the concepts of the joint activity symbolization, which is constituted on the basis of changes in the social structure of the modern Russian society in its differentiation and stratification.

Accordingly, the space of culture of symbolic communication will be differentiated in a complicated fashion in accordance with the scale of values.

For example, distinguishing the elite and the lower middle class, one can identify different sets of values:

For the elite, these are individual freedom, initiative, entrepreneurial spirit, but also greed, careerism, desire for power and luxury;

For the lower middle class, these are the desire for the habitual, fear of change, paternalistic expectations, but also a sense of duty, responsibility and justice.

Also, in both the first and second cases, one can note the culture of glamour, hedonism, entertainments and demonstrative behavior.

Obviously, consumerism is becoming a value of the highest priority, as the Russian society is being shaped "by default" as a consumer society. A question arises: "How to turn this process to humanistic direction?" From the viewpoint of a synergetic philosophy of history, a priority role is then played by the creation of not utilitarian but spiritual values, spiritual creativity [4]. Building on this synergetic thesis, we can claim a compelling necessity of conceptualization of the identified field of social compatibility in its humanistic forms.

Surely, it will be expressed in different, often alternative forms of socially significant knowledge, which will present different "versions of modernity." How to lead this variety of socially unordered philosophical and humanitarian knowledge to a hypothetical unity? A synergetic dimension may serve as an instrument for that; namely, for the conceptualization of the "multi-heterogeneous indeterminate" we propose E. A. Orlova's "transformation program" as a functional dominant. This program can be expressed through a set of educational and outreach projects, normalizing social interaction [17], differentiated according to the forms of social activity, as it was mentioned above.

For example, it can be achieved through the cultural-symbolic reference points that form the cultural identity of the Russian society. Studies show that the process of formation of cultural identities is not carried out spontaneously, but on the basis of constructive programs [13].

We can identify the values, samples, patterns of religious, ethical ideas, inclusion into groups, etc. prevailing in the society:

- An image of "us";
- Civic consciousness;
- Ethnicity;
- "Russian factor";
- Local community etc.

Tradition (from the Latin *traditio* – transfer, narrative, lore) is a mechanism of intergenerational communication for supporting, preserving and sustaining cultural norms, samples, values. Tradition has always been seen as one of the items of cultural heritage and in relation to its development and use. The tradition is considered as a "direct transmission" of social and cultural experience, direct transfer of culture samples from one generation to another. The characteristic features, properties and qualities of tradition are continuity, selectivity, differentiation, reference, variability.

Continuity ensures the reproduction of the society's genotype. Accordingly, each successive generation, inheriting a certain set of culture samples, assimilate them in a "ready-to-use" form but accept them selectively. At the same time, each generation chooses not only its future but also its past.

To be included into today's culture, the traditional socio-cultural experience is subjected to selection in terms of social significance, stability of preservation and reproduction in different spheres of social-cultural activity and institutional organizations. It should be noted that the realization of specific fragments of heritage in the conditions of transforming society cannot be carried out in the form of gradual transfer of a paradigm of traditional values, which is one and the same for all members of the society [18,19]. The predominant trend is selective continuity of those parts of the cultural heritage that are significant, one way or another, for certain socio-cultural groups. The selection takes place of such elements of historical experience that allow adequately adapting to the modern world.

Another feature, the differentiation of tradition in a socially stratified society, characterizes the multiplicity of traditional orientations, when a "splitting" of tradition takes place: different social strata, classes, groups claim their "own" historical origins, cultural memory and traditions, which are sacred for them: hence the diversity of cultures and subcultures existing in the world due to the diversity of cultural traditions.

The next characteristic of tradition is reference. Some sociologists suggest to consider tradition as a form, a kind of collective identity, which can be defined in historical perspective as a combination of primordial and symbolic signs; in other words, tradition as a certain integrative wholeness of cultural samples, norms, values, rituals, customs, ways of life, material and spiritual practices, etc. forms a "collective memory" of social strata and groups, ensuring their self-identification, i. e. one's self-attribution to a certain integrity of cultural artifacts, a pan-culture [19]. As is known, cultural self-determination is impossible outside of social identification.

The fifth among the listed characteristics of tradition is variability. Clearly, cultural heritage is a certain conditional balance of the traditional and innovative samples as parts of today's culture. In different historical periods, this balance varies depending on the trends of stability or variation of the society.

In the periods of reform, it shifts towards the predominance of innovations with a certain neglect of tradition. Conversely, in the periods of counter-reforms a return to traditional values is usually declared. Thus, the tradition later becomes a part of the entire cultural complex.

In the conditions of accelerated restructuring of social-cultural interactions of the transforming society, the previously established cultural orientations dramatically change, which cannot but affect the tradition. Some characteristics appear that are referred to as "identity crisis" by philosophers. As an example of such crisis, we can consider the change of axiological structure of the Russian society in the reform period of the 1990s: collectivism, great power mentality, national spirit, social service, justice, equality, duty, sacrifice, patriotism, conciliarism, the public spirit and other values were contrasted to liberal priorities: anti-etatism, democratic electiveness, autonomy, individualism, private property and

others. Accordingly, the identity crisis is reflected in the fact that, on one hand, new priorities are predominant, but, on the other hand, nostalgia for the past of those social groups which did not find themselves in the new social structure actualizes the return to the traditional samples of the past, habitual relations. This society is divided into different sub-cultures, formed around the selected values.

Meanwhile, despite the analytical distinguishing of the characteristic signs of tradition, the notion of tradition itself remains a debatable issue in terms of answering the main question: is it possible to formulate some universal characteristics of tradition, or is it original for each country, people, nation? What reasons determine the transfer of certain artifacts through tradition on the historical scale? For example, a well-known Russian historian N.P. Milyukov defined the mechanism of tradition as "the expedience of continuity" in the ranks of generations, when there appear the "carriers" of tradition, the so-called "apparatus of nation", the elite, intelligentsia, the ruling class. He defined a coordinate system of tradition consisting of three components: the designing one, a plan, image, design of tradition; the axiological mindsets, values, preferences of the subject of tradition; the subject one, the carriers of tradition. Such definition of tradition opens up a possibility to use comparative methods in studying the dynamics of the value orientations of the past, to structure the tradition on this basis and to form its constructive model.

Taking into account the fact that any identification with the culture of the past is based on a certain image of tradition, as its plan or an ideal-typical model, we can conclude that there exist different projects of tradition which differ depending on the goals, values and attitudes of the inheritors.

P. N. Milyukov considered tradition as a "living link" with the past, transmitted from generation to generation. "The essence of the true national tradition is a living link between generations. It has its own cult, symbols, its sacred objects. These sacred objects are carefully passed from generation to generation as the most precious heritage of the nation" [20]. Thus, Milyukov acknowledged that historical consciousness is not amorphous, but goal-oriented, that this goal is somehow formed, creating an image of a particular culture, an image of the nation. Accordingly, in the opinion of Milyukov, on the lower, prehistoric stages of development of society with no social memory, there could not appear a tradition, or, more precisely, it acted in a non-reflexive manner, in the authentic following of the patterns of the past. It is a kind of pre-tradition, which was regulated by the ritual, and carried mythological folklore content. The selection of the elements of continuity was carried out then according to the archetypal matrices.

Meanwhile, not all the researchers of the history of Russian national culture agreed with such understanding of the tradition and its inheritance as the non-reflected reproduction of the experience of the past generations in a "pre-philosophical period". After all, if this experience is not recognized as in the prehistoric period, then it turns out that there was no tradition there, which is contrary to all the laws

of development of societies. The Milyukov's referring to the fact that at that time the tradition was "discontinuous and random" does not convince other researchers of the possibility of lack of tradition in ethnographic societies. Meanwhile, the Milyukov's emphasis on that tradition must be "constant" and its content must be organized and goal-oriented indicated an effort to identify some universals, so that not only the ethnographic primordial characteristics but also the symbolic ones are distinguished.

N. Berdyaev and S. Bulgakov recognized national tradition as interconnectedness with the historical destiny, as a set of specific national features. As they wrote mostly about the Russian national tradition, they were talking about such characteristics as collegiality, communalism, great power statehood, the ideas of Russian messianism, etc. This understanding of tradition was opposed to the theory of universals, its interpretation as a product of evolution. And, in this sense, they strongly disagreed with Milyukov, who, in effect, denied "distinctive character" as being purely ethnographic empirical material.

In the research of modern scientists, these discussions are not reflected; however, the tendency to identify the "negative" aspects of tradition continued. For example, the well-known Polish scholar E. Shatsky identified a "negative tradition", by which he understood the taboo inheritance, when some of the samples of the past are denied by descendants. Then the society's culture develops by rejection of negative traditions. A negative tradition is characterized by the selectivity of inheritance, when not all of the inherited socio-cultural experience is assessed equally positively by the descendants, but a certain selection is made.

An example of such selective inheritance in modern culture is the concept of "neo-traditionalism", the essence of which can be understood in the most general form as the inclusion into the present of the fragmented and partly mythologized and reinterpreted elements of the past. The modern neo-traditionalism is not an integral system, but a variety of references to the diachronic patterns, inclusions of quotations into the text of the actual culture.

Conclusion

Summing up the considered innovative model of formation of civil activity of the society, it is worth noting the relevance of an interdisciplinary approach in the study of social processes. The conducted study has shown that the application of the mechanisms that are peculiar to natural sciences to the social processes, including the formation of the political culture of society is efficient and opens up new ways of overcoming social problems. Thus, the synergistic analysis allows creating a model of measuring the degree (depth) of the changes taking place in the Russian society both at the societal and personal levels, which allows using the results of this analysis in the formation of the political culture of the population.

References

1. Mandelbrot B (2002) *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. Institute of Computer Science p: 656.
2. Feder E (1991) *Fractals* Mir p: 254.
3. Voytsekhovich VE (2009) Crisis in the development of society as a fractal. *Synergetic Paradigm, social synergetics*. p: 307-313.
4. Bransky VP, Pozharsky SD (2006) Globalization and synergetic philosophy of history. *Social Sciences and Modernity* 1: 109-121.
5. Orlova EA (2004) The cultural (social) anthropology. *Akadem Proekt* p: 480.
6. Prigogine IR (2000) The end of certainty. Time, chaos and new laws of nature. *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* p: 208.
7. Malinetsky GG (2009) *Synergetics: research and technologies*. The "LIBROKOM" Book House p: 224.
8. Epstein GS, Mealem Y, Nitzan S (2011) Political culture and discrimination in contests. *Journal of Public Economics* 95: 88-93.
9. Anufrieva N, Anufriev E, Korsakova I, Slutskaya I, Shcherbakova A, (2015) Formation of modern musician's personality in educational environment of higher education institution: complex approach. *Asian Social Science* pp: 13-18.
10. Reidy CM, Taylor LK, Merrilees CE, Ajduković D, Biruški DČ, Cummings EM (2015). The political socialization of youth in a post-conflict community. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 45: 11-23.
11. Skoric MM, Park YJ (2014) Culture, technologies and democracy: a cross-national analysis of political development. *Telematics and Informatics* 31: 364-375.
12. Stepin VS (2000) Self-developing systems and the prospects of technogenic civilization. *Synergetic paradigm. A variety of searches and approaches*: pp: 12-27.
13. Evgenyeva TV, Titov VV (2010) The formation of the national-state identity of the Russian youth. *Political studies* 4: 122-134.
14. Orlova EA (2009) A theoretical model of the socio-cultural code. *Observatory of culture* pp: 14-19.
15. Habermas J, (2010) Religion, Law and Politics. *Political Justice in a multicultural world-society*. *Political studies* pp: 7-21.
16. Spink J, Haywood L, Kew F, Bramham P, Capenerhurst J, et al. (1995) *Understanding Leisure*. Cheltenham Stanley Thornes (Publishers) Ltd p: 272.
17. Shcherbakova AI, Kamenets AV, Zinchenko EO (2014) Potential of Musical and Pedagogical Analysis of Socio-cultural Interaction Processes. *Asian Social Science*. pp: 140-150.
18. Anufrieva NI, Anufriev EA, Korsakova IA, Shcherbakova AI (2015) Worldview formation of the teacher-musician personality in the higher education system. *Asian Social Science* pp: 99-104.
19. Hassan WE (2012) The Impact of Political Events on the Development of Society Visual Culture, *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences* 51: 908-915.
20. Milyukov PN (2007) *Essays on the History of Russian Culture*. Directmedia Publishing p: 4144.