

**DOI: 10.12731/2218-7405-2013-7-2**

**POST-TRADITIONAL SOCIAL-CULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS AND  
CIVIL SOCIETY: IDENTITY OF RUSSIAN DISTRICTS' INHABITANTS  
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF REPUBLIC OF KHAKASSIA)**

Aksutin Y.M.

The modern Russian society is under influence of globalization and traditionalism threats that have serious conflict potential. In this context heightened interest of post-Soviet society to civil alternatives for global and posttraditional trends is quite natural. This is highly topical for those areas where different ethnical group representatives meet each other face to face.

According to R. Dal's conception which distinguished basic criteria of civil identity forming and creating, an analysis of development and maturity of regional civil society by the example of Republic of Khakassia (South-East Siberia).

As a result of respondents' self-identification analysis it was discovered that most of them mean "Russian" concept as social and cultural by nature: their cognitive notions of Russian identity are often similar to the ethnical one. Extra criteria (such as interest and activity of participation in political and social processes, awareness, responsibility, etc.) lead to conclusion that self-organization of regional civil society is on a very low grade; thus, ways for alternative identities (traditional, local and global) energization.

**Purpose**

Analysis of post-Soviet Russians civil "Russiality", characteristics of civil identity criteria and civil society development dynamic in Russian regions by the example of Republic of Khakassia.

### **Methodology**

According to R. Dal's conception which distinguished basic criteria of civil identity forming and creating (1. being interested in and participation of citizens; 2. perception of value of such participation and taken decisions; 3. high grade of knowledge about political and social-cultural events; 4. activity while participating rules are realized) and being based on social researches which took place in 2011–2012, an analysis of development and maturity of regional civil society was held.

### **Results**

It's determined that self-organization of regional civil society is on a very low grade; thus, ways for alternative identities (traditional, local and global) energization.

### **Practical implications**

Research results may be used while making similar researches in social philosophy, ethnical sociology, in everyday activity of ministries and institutions in Russian Federation and Republic of Khakassia, state and local authorities, for national safety and during study.

**Keywords:** Russian civil society; civil identity; traditionalism; modernization.

## **ПОСТТРАДИЦИОННЫЕ СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ И ГРАЖДАНСКОЕ ОБЩЕСТВО: ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ ЖИТЕЛЕЙ РОССИЙСКИХ РЕГИОНОВ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ РЕСПУБЛИКИ ХАКАСИЯ)**

Аксютин Ю.М.

Современный российский социум находится под действием вызовов глобализации и традиционализма, имеющих серьезный конфликтогенный потенциал. В таком контексте закономерен повышенный интерес постсоветского социума к гражданской альтернативе глобализационному и традиционалистскому трендам. Особенно это актуально в тех регионах, где

---

представители различных этнических групп ежедневно взаимодействуют «лицом к лицу» в едином социокультурном пространстве.

Руководствуясь концепцией Р. Даля, выделившего основные критерии формирования и функционирования гражданской идентичности и основываясь на анализе данных проведенных в 2011 – 2012 гг. социологических исследований, был осуществлен анализ динамики развития и степени зрелости регионального гражданского общества на примере Республики Хакасия (Юго-восточная Сибирь). В результате анализа специфики самоидентификации респондентов как граждан, было выяснено, что для большинства респондентов характерно представление о социокультурной природе понятия «россиянин», когнитивное наполнение российской идентичности часто совпадает с этнической, а принятие в расчет дополнительных критериев (интерес и степень активности участия в политических и социальных процессах, информированность, наличие чувства ответственности и др.) позволило сделать вывод, что самоорганизация гражданского общества находится на довольно низком уровне, тем самым открывая возможность для активизации альтернативных гражданской (традиционалистские, локальные и глобальные) идентичностей.

### **Цель**

Анализ природы гражданской «российскости» жителей в регионах постсоветской России (Республики Хакасия), характеристика критериев гражданской идентичности и динамики развития гражданского общества в регионах постсоветской России на примере Республики Хакасии.

### **Методология проведения работы**

Руководствуясь концепцией Р. Даля, выделившего основные критерии формирования и функционирования гражданской идентичности (1. проявление интереса и активное участие граждан в происходящих событиях; 2. осознание ими значимости такого участия и принимаемых социально-политических решений; 3. высокая степень осведомленности о событиях в политической и

социокультурной сфере; 4. активность при реализации права участия в осуществлении политики) и основываясь на анализе данных проведенных в 2011 – 2012 гг. социологических исследований, был осуществлен анализ динамики развития и степени зрелости регионального гражданского общества.

### **Результаты**

Установлено, что самоорганизация регионального гражданского общества находится на довольно низком уровне, тем самым открывая возможность для активизации альтернативных гражданской (традиционалистские, локальные и глобальные) идентичностей.

### **Область применения результатов**

Результаты исследования могут быть использованы при осуществлении аналогичных исследований в рамках социальной философии, этносоциологии, в деятельности министерств и ведомств Российской Федерации и Республики Хакасия, органов государственной власти и местного самоуправления, для обеспечения национальной безопасности, в учебном процессе.

**Ключевые слова:** российское гражданское общество; гражданская идентичность, традиционализм, модернизация.

In Russian multiethnic society problem to obtain social and cultural identity which is possible to unite society and not to commit its disintegration is one of the most discussed not only by learned society but also by wide community. It is confirmed by great amount of publications, discussion mediaprojects with participation of serious experts, scientific conferences in which great attention is paid to civil identity creation and status of civil society in Russia.

A turn to a problem of new integrative social and cultural identity creation is explained by range of reasons. First, it is necessity to keep unite social and cultural area of a country under condition of disappearing of former identity as kinds of Soviet citizenship and alternative identities' appearing (religious, ethno-cultural etc.), which exist as a result of civil self-conscious crisis and have serious conflict

potential. Second, it is requirement to create new Russian civil identity taking into account need to keep ethno-cultural identities of Russian population as main factors to resist influence of globalization trend.

Modern social and cultural identities change its former point of view and content. Traditional identities (imperiality, Soviet citizenship, ethnicity, confessional basis etc.) are doubted: truth can not be absolute nowadays, the amount of opposite concepts (such as justice, interests, rules and rights) is increasing. But the absence of alternatives to traditional and local identities such as mature civicism makes apply to former experience which is seemed to be the only way to solve social problems being “tested by time”.

This conflicting situation provoked point of view according to which modern Russia endures ethnicity raise of non-Slavic nations and raise of imperiality (or Soviet citizenship) of the Slavic ones. This raise is followed by attempts to reanimate elements of the imperial Soviet ideology that leads to traditional political and cultural conscious. In this case a danger of social and cultural conflicts worsening naturally grows. Basics of these conflicts are differences in outlook and value system within the multiethnic country.

According to another point of view, post-Soviet Russia is in process of transformation of social and cultural identities and integration mechanisms, that is caused by conflict cooperation of traditionalism (imperiality, Soviet citizenship, ethnicity etc.) and post-traditional identity models (civicism). Co-existence of different values and outlooks in one culture is not a precondition to escalation of social and cultural conflicts. On the contrary, ways to unite cultural distinctions are often considered to be an “encroachment” on traditional autonomy, considered to be a threat to mutual safety and caused response reaction of resistance and conflict. Identities’ conflict overcoming is possible by constructing of appropriate integrative identity based on civil integration when local identities are not barriers but due to their heterogeneity they are indispensable conditions of civil multiethnic society and reflexive secular modernization forming that ends former traditional projects.

Which is origin of civil “Russian citizenship” of people in post-Soviet Russia (Republic of Khakassia)? What are criteria of integrative civil identity and how does civil society self-organization process in Republic of Khakassia last? How much is perspective to activate alternative identities (traditionalist, local) realistic? These questions are the subject of our analysis.

While defining the origin and content of respondents’ identity factors, it’s necessary to pay attention to characteristics of “the Russian” concept, playing a leading role as a basis of integrative civil identity. During the research of 2012 it was discovered that 30% of respondents considered Russians as those who “is educated by Russian culture and mind it its own”. The amount of those who considers “love to Russia” as a main factor determining “Russian citizenship” is a little less (21%). Great number of respondents (18%) determine Russian identity as a citizenship. The fact that 11.3% of respondents mean reflexive self-conscious: “that one, who considers himself as a Russian” is very interesting. For 3.3% of respondents “Russian citizenship” is determined by erudition in Russian language, and for 2.2% by being Orthodox believer. It is obvious that these answers are of social and cultural character but not of biological. As it is seen from research results, share of respondents who consider Russians as those who “have Russian parents”, is only 11.3%.

For the better understanding of region inhabitants’ identity creating trends it was important to understand which factors are the main when alternative identity creates itself. Those who consider “my parent (or one of them) are of this nationality” to be a main reason for determine “nationality” have the biggest amount – 54.0%. But there are not less of those (44.3% in common), who performs reflexive ethnonational self-consciousness, conjunction with the history, culture (16.35) and language (13.7%) of their nation. In other words, ethnicity develops within traditional screenplay: from parents to children. But traditional ways to construct identity loose their place. Intention to feel commonality is lead mostly by social and cultural factors.

Self-consciousness of post-Soviet Russia population is created under influence of different factors. Among them tradition of state-paternalistic and territorial identity still plays important role (28.3% in general). However, domination of the state identity in Republic of Khakassia is mostly typical for Russians (30.6%) and “alien” nation representatives. Для представителей хакасского этноса более характерна этнотерриториальная идентичность (51,9%), нежели государственная (17,3%). For Khakas inhabitants ethnoterritorial identity (51.9%) is more typical then state one (17.3%).

As most scientists suppose, constructing of the integrative civil identity must be developed being based on both federal and local civil reign institutions. Thanks to civil reign “civil society” determines itself as political and social and cultural subject. R. Dal determines four basic criteria of how civil identity (grade of citizens’ involvement into managing political and social and cultural systems) forms and develops: 1) being interested and participation in current events; 2) perception of meaning of such participation and social and political decision being made; 3) high grade of knowledge about the events in political and social and cultural field; 4) activity when right to participate in political execution is realized [1, p. 82]. Theoretical foundation of integrative civil identity is a civil model by T.H. Marshall, that includes: 1) civil rights as way of protection from authorities’ despotism; 2) political rights as an instrument of participation in self-governing; 3) social and cultural rights that give an opportunity to reach deserved grade of welfare [2].

One of the main characteristics of civil society maturity is interest and involvement of inhabitants into activity of political and other non-governmental institutions. Clarification of people interest in political and social life helps to display certain preconditions to political involvement, because there is strict correlation between grade of the interest in political and social life and intensity of social-political participation. Besides, social-political participation is one of the most effective ways of political stabilization and creating of civil acquirements and aims.

Burst of civil activity in Russia was in 1993–1998. Situation changed in modern Russia. Almost one third of population isn't interested in politics. This trend is typical not only for Russia, but also for different areas. Thus, according to a opinion poll in Khakassia in 2012, participation in non-political organizations or unions is typical for just 19.7% of responders compared to 80.3% who never took part in any social organizations [3]. When taking into account nationality of responders we mention that it does not change the whole pattern. Only for 17.6% of the Russians and 26.9% of the Khakases participation in social organizations was typical. In other words, most citizens of Russia are out of social unities (except just formal trade-unions). People participation in political unions is of the same kind. Similar to Russia in general, in Khakassia only 18.3% (16.7% of Russians, 21.2% of Khakases) mentioned their participation in political unions. The absence of wide political activity is typical for 81.3% of population (83.3% of the Russian, 76.9% of Khakases).

Similar answers were given when respondents were asked about membership in political parties and social organizations. Membership in political party was typical for 18.7% of respondents (18.5% of the Russians, 25.0% of Khakases), negative answer was given by 81.3% (81.5% of the Russians, 75% of Khakases). 15.3% of respondents (13.9% of the Russians, 21.2% of Khakases) are members of any social organization. Not members of any 15.3% of respondents (86.1% of the Russians, 78.8% of Khakases). Similar situation is when answers from not-dominating ethnical groups (Kazakhs, Belarusans, Tuvinians, Kirghizes etc.) were analysed.

It's a fact that while there are more than 100 hundred social unions in Russia nowadays [4, p. 7], many people are excluded from basic social processes. This situation is just the same in region, that means that social self-organization is on rather low level. This society hasn't required necessary qualities for transformation into real civil society.

Development of civil society begins with converting of its inhabitants from homagers into citizens, from creating a feeling of personal responsibility for situation

in society. This process is quite difficult and long for Russia with its deep political system and imperial Soviet ideology of “cathedral collectivism”. Only minority of population has any responsibility and is ready to do something for solving its problems. Facts about respondents’ answers about readiness to demonstrate their civil position [5] are earnestly evidence of it. Only 5 % (in 2011 there were 6%) are ready to protest against something, “go to the barricades” and stand up for their rights and freedoms, 39.3% try to improve their social and economic position, while 16.3% submitted their fate. Most of respondents (77.3%) never wrote petitions, appeals to anybody, open letters. Only every fourth respondent (22%) has an experience to express his opinion in this way. It’s interesting to notice that there were differences in answers among ethnical groups in Khakassia. 17.6% of the Russians told that they had such an experience while 81.9% did not. Only 38.5% of Khakases used appeals, petitions, open letters, while 61.6% of respondents did not use this way of participation. This data demonstrates conflicting character of modern Russian political culture which combines peculiar features of democratic and paternalistic culture.

Reforms which took place in our country were mostly inspired by intension to turn “Soviet person” out into citizen who divides values of freedom, personal responsibility and who is ready to self-organization into a civil society in order to create quality conditions of his own life and determine basic specifics of internal policy on all grades of management in the country by his own efforts in economic sphere and political participation. There is a question: in which grade were this goals reached by now?

It’s no doubt that degree of social and political participation is influenced by personal experience concerned with human rights violation. Researchers mention that about 41% of the Russians faced infringement of their rights. This trend is fixed not only in the whole country, but also in areas.

Let’s draw a picture in general. Constitutional rights is usually divided into three basic groups: 1. personal rights which belong to everybody equally?

Independently of person being citizen, foreigner or person without citizenship; 2. social, economic and cultural ones that provide person's life and activity in a proper way; 3. political rights, which are political and social activity, participation in state management and social and political life. It's important to notice that personal, economic, political, social, cultural rights are of the equal value, they do not have any hierarchy.

According to researches of 2003-2012, only about  $\frac{1}{4}$  of citizens consider the right to freedom of speech and thought to be very important. As much consider a right to freedom and personal immunity to be of similar importance. Only every fifth respondent meant participation in state management to be important. Only every eighth is worried about violation of right to personal immunity and inviolability of the home. The least violated are "rights of using native language" and "right of religious freedom" (3-5%). This situation is typical both for Russia in general and for Republic of Khakassia especially.

Analysis of 2011 and 2013 researches results showed that citizens are not worried about defense and security of their rights and freedoms. Thus, in 2011 8.3% (and in 2012 5.8%) of respondents thought that none of their rights and freedoms are infringed. It looks like the amount of worried (that means conscious) increased. But the amount of indifferent also increased from 10.2% in 2011 to 17.7% in 2012. Nevertheless,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of citizens consider their rights and freedoms to be infringed.

Infringements of rights and freedoms of Khakassia citizens should be noticed in dynamics. In opinion pools 2011-2012 respondents noticed infringement of such rights as right of life (2011 – 11.7%, 2012 – 12.2%); right of freedom and personal immunity (2011 – 19.3%, 2012 – 25.0%); right for private immunity (2011 – 15.5%, 2012 – 12.8%); sanctity of the home (2011 – 6.5%, 2012 – 11.7%); right to use native language (2011 – 5.0%, 2012 – 4.3%); right of liberty of conscience and religious freedom (2011 – 3.5%, 2012 – 7.7%); right of personal dignity (2011 – 21.5%, 2012 – 14.7%).

Concerning political rights, we should notice that respondents mentioned infringement of the right of freedom of speech and thought (2011 – 25.5%, 2012 – 24.7%), participation in state management (2011 – 19.8%, 2012 – 14.0%).

However, violations of social, economic, cultural and political rights and freedoms seemed to be the most important for citizens. Thus, 45.0% of respondents in 2011 and 35.5% in 2012 noticed infringement of their rights for education and medical assistance.

So, Khakassia citizens often face infringement their rights for education, medical assistance, freedom of speech and thought, personal dignity, right to participate in state management, personal freedom and immunity. It's necessary to note almost full absence of positive dynamic in this situation. Improving is discovered only in realization of right for education and medical assistance (the amount of those who noticed infringement of these rights reduced to 10%), right on personal dignity (6.8% less). In other cases positive dynamic is within 5 – 7% which are statistically insignificant. As for national peculiarities, situation here is quite similar.

In other words, devaluation of personal and political rights and freedoms occurred. Some constitutional rights are not necessary to our citizens. Appropriate question about the nature of this event appears. Is the situation with personal and civil rights in Khakassia so stable that doesn't worries people or, on the contrary, people lost any hope to gain them, recognizing useless of their hopes?

Social-economic guarantees devaluated, but still play the priority role unlike civil and political ones. Almost one half of Khakassia inhabitants noted rights on education, medical assistance as significant and demanding protection from violation (about 35 – 45%). What do these per cents talk about? May be about depressing atmosphere of constant problems in social-economic field, uncertainty about tomorrow, in which our citizens live several last years? Or they are not able to blend with new reality and prefer order and quietness even when necessary to allow some violation of democratic principles and restrictions of personal freedoms?

As for worrying of ethnical groups in Khakassia by their right infringement, we see the following. 24% of the Russians and 33.3% of Khakases are worried about their political rights infringement. We should mention stability in respondent's marks. Divergences in answers in 2011 and 2012 are almost absent (about 2 – 3%). In respondents' answers, especially Khakases, some positive dynamic can be seen. For example, in 2012 15.7% of the Russians and 8.3% of Khakases noticed infringement of their right to participate in state management against 16.5% and 26.8% in 2011 correspondingly.

Ethnical groups representatives almost unanimous about evaluating of sense and exposure of their right to education and medical assistance (41.5% and 51.6% correspondingly for the Russians and the Khakases in 2012), and situation with these rights infringement, in respondents' opinion, becomes worse (24.0% and 33.3% in 2011). Let's note that point of view of Khakases and other nations on personal right infringement is unlike one typical for the Russians. In any way, worrying about right to life infringement was typical for 16.5% of the Russians in 2012 (12.8% in 2011) against 5.9% of Khakases who did not see any problem with this right infringement in 2011. Worrying about rights to freedom and personal immunity infringement was noticed by ¼ of respondents in 2012, that corresponds answers of 2011. Khakas representatives demonstrate opposite trend (41.7% in 2011 and only 12.4% in 2012). Differences in ethnical groups reaction were shown up by evaluating of opportunity to realize right to sanctity of the home. While in 2011 Russians were more worried about these rights infringement (17.0% against 9.2% of Khakases), in 2012 there were Khakases who were more worried about it (20.8% against 11.6%). But there is a positive dynamic in evaluating of realization of right of dignity protection (in 2011: Russians – 22.2%, Khakases – 21.6%; in 2012: Russians – 14.2%, Khakases – 16.7%). Worrying of the Russians about right to sanctity of the home infringement increased (5.7% in 2011 and 12.8% in 2012). Khakas nation representatives noting this right infringement reduced from 6.5% in 2011 almost to zero in 2012.

We should pay attention to almost indifferent respondents' reaction to infringement of rights to use native language (in 2011 this infringement was noticed by 1.1% of Russians and 4.6% of Khakases, and in 2012 4.2% of Russians, 4.2% of Khakases) and religious freedom (2011 – 4.0% and 2.0%; 2012 – 8.9% and 4.2% correspondingly).

So, personal and political rights are not priority for most of respondents. However, in 2012 they were three of five most infringed along with right to education, right to medical assistance and right to personal dignity (the last one has the third place). But we should remember that rhetoric about necessity to protect and defend rights and freedoms, participation in state and society management was a main part of Soviet ideology and advocacy. That is why such value orientation, unfortunately, can not be considered only as a post-Soviet desert. It's more important to discover how this orientation corresponds more specific patterns, research of which lead to non-optimistic results.

Forms of participation and reaction to rights and freedoms forming Russian political culture are evidence not of stability in Russian civil society creation, but rather of adaptation of Russians to values and forms of social-political participation. Respondents are most worried about infringement of social-economic rights, which provide life and activity in a proper way (infringement of right to education and medical assistance was mentioned by 45.0% of respondents). The most worried about realization of this right is typical in 2012 for bigger nations (Khakases – 45.8%, Russians – 35.6%). Positive dynamic is not more than 3 – 5%.

Summarizing we should mention that for post-Soviet people of Russia political rights and freedoms are not priority to personal and social-economic ones. Respondents express too much indifference to these rights. It was not successful to discover citizens' interest to social and political event happening in Russia and Khakassia. So, little involvement of citizens in social-political unions activity and participation in policy realization is easily explained. This is an evidence of absence of perception of this participation meaning and made social-political decisions. Also

it is an evidence of little involvement in basic civil society structures. Khakassia inhabitants are much worried about: price growth on goods and services (2011 – 67.5%, 2012 – 46.3%); drug and alcohol addiction (2011 – 39%, 2012 – 46%); unemployment (2011 – 32.3%, 2012 – 25.5%); criminality (2011 – 22.3%, 2012 – 32%); situation in education field (2011 – 25%, 2012 – 25.5%); quality of medical assistance and social security (2011 – 37.5%, 2012 – 21.7%).

Creating of integrative civil identity and stable connection between social and cultural communities have a great role in conflict solving. Civil identity creates condition for reduction of identity conflicts and interest conflicts. We should certify that self-organization of civil society in republic, as in whole country, is on a quite low level. So opportunity to activate identities alternative to civil (traditionalist, local) is open.

*Исследование выполнено при поддержке ФЦП: «Научные и научно-педагогические кадры инновационной России» на 2009-2013 годы (номер соглашения: 14.B37.21.0511).*

*Research is made under protection of federal proposal programme “Scientific and scientific-pedagogical staff of modern Russia” in 2009–2013 (agreement number 14.B37.21.0511).*

## **References**

1. Dahl R. *Sovremennyy politicheskiy analiz* [Modern political analysis]. *Aktualnye problemy sovremennoy zarubezhnoy politicheskoy nauki* [Relevant problems of the modern foreign political science]. M., 1991. Issue 4, pp. 82-93.
2. Marshall T., Bottomore T. *Citizenship and Social Class*. London, 1992. 280 p.
3. Sociological research (August 2012) on project “Supraethnic identity: analysis of state and potential evaluation of how to optimize regional model of intercultural cooperation”. General totality – 133158 people, selective totality – 300 people (0.23%). Based on proportional share by Khakasstatistics.

4. Russia'2012: *Statisticheskiiy spravochnik* [Statistical reference-book] / Rosstat. M., 2012. 61 p.

5. Sociological research (September-October 2011) on project "International relations in republic of Khakassia in evaluations and recognition of population mass consciousness" on request of Khakassia Department of Education. Selective totality – 400 people; sociological research (September-November 2012) on project "Studying of statement of international, interfaith relations among children and youth in Republic of Khakassia" on request of Khakassia Department of Education. Selective totality is 400 people.

### **Список литературы**

1. Даль Р. Современный политический анализ // Актуальные проблемы современной зарубежной политической науки. М., 1991. Вып. 4. С. 82-93.

2. Marshall T., Bottomore T. *Citizenship and Social Class*. London, 1992. 280 p.

3. Социологическое исследование (август 2012 г.) по проекту: «Надэтническая идентичность: анализ состояния и оценка потенциала оптимизации региональной модели межкультурного взаимодействия». Генеральная совокупность – 133158 чел., выборочная – 300 чел. (0, 23 %). Использовалась целевая выборка (пропорциональная квота) на основе данных Хакасстата.

4. Россия'2012: Статистический справочник / Росстат. М., 2012. 61 с.

5. Социологическое исследование (сентябрь-октябрь 2011 г.) по проекту: «Межнациональные отношения в Республике Хакасия в оценках и представлениях массового сознания населения» по заказу Министерства образования и науки Республики Хакасия. Выборочная совокупность – 400 чел.; Социологическое исследование (сентябрь-ноябрь 2012 г.) по проекту: «Изучение состояния межнациональных, межконфессиональных отношений в

детской и молодежной среде Республике Хакасия» по заказу Министерства образования и науки Республики Хакасия. Выборочная совокупность – 400 чел.

#### **DATA ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**Aksutin Yuri Mihaylovich**, associate professor of Philosophy and Culturology chair of the Economy and management institute, Candidate of philosophy.

*The N. F. Katanov Khakas State University*

*90, Lenina street, Abakan, Republic of Khakassia, 655017, Russia*

*e-mail: aksutum@yandex.ru*

#### **ДААННЫЕ ОБ АВТОРЕ**

**Аксютин Юрий Михайлович**, доцент кафедры философии и культурологии института экономики и управления, кандидат философских наук

*Хакасский государственный университет им. Н. Ф. Катанова*

*пр. Ленина, д.90, г. Абакан, Республика Хакасия, 655017, Россия*

*e-mail: aksutum@yandex.ru*

*SPIN-код в SCIENCE INDEX: 9464-5212*