UDC 32.01+72.01

ARCHITECTURE AND ART AS A KEY ELEMENT OF POLITICAL CULTURE OF THE SOCIETY

N. PAULAVA
Secondary School № 9, Pinsk, Belarus
M. KAZLOU
Belarus State Economic University, Minsk

The problem of political culture and the influence of art and architecture on it in the form of basic symbols and markers as a basis that determines the identity of its carriers are analyzed in the article. The importance of preserving one's own culture, dominant and repressive cultures in the modern world by means of restoration of historical heritage as symbols of political culture itself, is emphasized.

Today, the world is again on the verge of new disasters, crises and wars. It must be accepted that the ideas of globalization, that people set their hopes on, were not realized. In essence, we returned to the starting positions, the echoes of the stages passed, which philosophers and scientists wrote about in their works. Here we can recall O. Spengler, J. Ortega y Gasset, E. Fromm, D. Orwell, H. Marcuse, H. Arendt, A. Huxley. One way or another, they all wrote about a crisis in society, the emergence of a mass person, the rise to power of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, and the general decline of culture in the world. These topics are on agenda nowadays, too. It is now that they are starting to talk about the revival of nationalism, the emergence of radical movements and the election victory in different countries of the populists with their policies of protectionism. However, culture plays a key role in all this. If it is developed, many horrors and catastrophes can be avoided. Saying so one does not understand the essence of culture itself. If once own culture is high, other cultures will seem low, therefore, the latter should be enriched by their own culture, which seems ideal and perfect on its own. Many European countries were led by this idea during the period of geographical discoveries and colonial expansion.

Culture proved to be extremely diverse and cannot be simulated with other high cultures. Today, this can be observed in economics and politics. For example, S. Huntington wrote, comparing the economic indicators of several countries, the following: "looking at the economic statistics of Ghana and South Korea thirty years ago, in the early 1990s, I was struck by the similarity of the indicators of these countries. ... Three decades later, South Korea has become an industrial giant. ... In Ghana, where per capita income was only one-fifteenth of that of South Korea, nothing similar was observed. How can such sharp changes in development be explained? Undoubtedly, many factors played a role here, but, it seems that the matter was primarily due to cultural differences. South Koreans valued frugality, skillful investment, education, organization, and discipline. The people of Ghana had different values. In other words, cultures are serious" [1, p. 9]. Huntington offers an interesting way of development, which implies the following: "is it possible with the help of political or other tools to transform the culture or remove the barriers that arise on the way to progress?" [1, p. 12]. In this case, in our opinion, attempts to impose culture are doomed to failure, as it will in any case have different levels for the population. What options can be found to solve this problem?

First of all, one should understand what are the constitutes of a political culture and what are its opportunities to influence culture in general? Political culture can be analyzed as a part of culture in general, but with its own characteristics, which just create a mechanism for the dissemination of culture itself. So what does the term political culture mean? "In the broadest sense, it is a way of life of the people." However, political scientists "use this term in a narrower sense: here it refers to the psychological orientation of people and denotes a certain" psychological matrix "that defines people's attitude to such phenomena as a party, government, constitution, as all this is expressed in beliefs, values and symbols" [2, p. 252]. In this case, it is highly important to pay attention to the problem of symbols in political culture, what are they and what is their semantic meaning? We will not go into the details of symbolism [3] and its psychological characteristics, but simply dwell on the traditional scheme of political symbols.

So, for any person, symbolism is first of all a coat of arms, a flag and an anthem. However, they cannot always reflect the full content of political culture and culture as a whole. We can give examples of a change in symbolism after revolutions and referenda, when they were changed depending on the political realities of a group of people who came to power. A case in point is the return of historical symbols on the territory of the former USSR or the CMEA countries with their modifications, retouching and withdrawal of some attributes of

these symbols themselves. An example is the emblem of People's Republic of Poland. In Belarus, however, historical symbols were replaced with new ones through a referendum or former USSR symbols were transformed. Therefore, today in Belarus one can observe the presence of two symbols representing the coats of arms of Belarus: the official coat of arms and historical symbols recognized at the state level and used by the opposition. On the one hand, this is a problem that shows the complexity of political symbolism and its impact on society as a whole. Moreover, in other countries with a stronger culture, similar situations or even more radical changes occurred. For example, the coats of arms of France, Italy, and Ireland have appeared recently, but at the same time they are not the main political symbols of these countries: the shamrock is a more significant symbol of Ireland, in France it is a royal lily or Lorraine cross which were used at the time of the resistance movement during World War II. In Belarus, unfortunately, the cross of Euphrosyne of Polotsk is treated more like a religious symbol, although its historical and political burden is very significant in society. Confirmation of the importance of these symbols for a citizen is an understanding of his identity, which S. Huntington spoke about. He wrote about the US flag, concluding that "since the Civil War, Americans are accustomed to paying tribute to the national flag. "Stars and Stripes" gradually acquired a religious status, turned into an icon, became a symbol of national identity for Americans ... However, this flag has never had the meaning it acquired after September 11, 2001" [4, p. 22-23]. The personification of the flag and coat of arms as symbols of the nation is of great importance. These symbols may change depending on the political course and power, but at the same time, the identity itself is preserved. But there is a more significant symbolic environment, which is not limited to only one or a small group of symbols of political culture. At the same time, it is important to understand what identity is, because there one finds an important feature. So, S. Huntington wrote that "identity is the identity of an individual or group. It is a product of self-identification, the understanding that you or I have special qualities that distinguish me from you and us from them. Identity is inherent even by a newborn, in whom it is determined by such attributes as gender, name, parents, citizenship. ... Identity, as a group of researchers formulated, "correlates with the images of individuality and distinctiveness ("self") reproduced by the actor, and is formed (and also changes over time) due to the relationship of a person with significant characters from his environment". As long as people interact with their environment they have no choice but to define themselves through relations with others and to identify the revealed similarities and differences" [4, p. 50-51]. In this case, the formation of identity, especially at an early age, is influenced by a cultural landscape that defines and socializes a person living in a certain territory. It can be nature itself, the physical features of the territory - mountains, deserts, forests, swamps or objects created by man, namely: architecture. Its importance in the formation of identity is huge, it is a significant part, if not the basis, of culture itself and political culture as a whole. For a political culture, architecture is a symbolic landscape, a space that forms the human environment, filling it with meaning. It should be emphasized that most architectural monuments that have symbolic significance, for example, various palaces, tombs or religious buildings, carry a touch of power relations, that is, they make up the space of the political life of the population. The essence of this can be imagined and shown through the capital of the state and major cities of the country. Most often this is the quintessence of the ideas of the authorities or the ruler. The most important historical and architectural monuments are concentrated in this city. Capitals are moving or building in a new place. In certain cases, they capture and transfer their residences there. Moreover, they can be destroyed to the ground in order to erase the entire identity and historical past of former greatness. The main thing is that architecture becomes a marker and a symbol of power. An example of this is the imperial capitals, which throughout their existence created a cultural and political space that contains and conveys symbols of the political culture of an entire state, even if the capital was later destroyed. Two cities can be recalled, that influenced the main architectural styles existing in Europe - Athens and Rome. Their model was a certain standard for subsequent architects and their powerful customers. In other words, the architectural environment of the city affects the political culture and is one of the main elements of the constitution of the individual. The layout of streets and the scope of construction are aimed at ensuring that a person identifies himself with this architecture, monuments and is proud of them. In this vein, Paris, London, Berlin and Moscow are built. The task of these cities and their architecture is to transfer its repressive culture and power to future generations through the city spirit. It should also be understood that the core of the architectural style will be represented by a local design, however, the exchange with other styles enriches and fills it in with new content. For example, the Moscow Kremlin, where one can find the influence of architects from Italy. But over time, the features are leveled and one's own style and its cultural content are created. This illustrates another variable representing a civilizational characteristic that is transmitted through architecture to political culture. In other words, the emergence of civilizations with all their attributes is observed. More over according to S. Huntington: "it is impossible to imagine the development of the mankind in isolation from civilizations" [5, p. 22-23]. The understanding of civilization is a separate issue, but

it should be kept in mind that it can also manifest itself in architecture. An example is Belarus, which is on a civilizational break. In Belarus the influence of two civilizations is vivid and this can be found both in political culture and in architecture as a whole. However, this confrontation created a distinctive culture with its own architectural school, the examples of which are various churches, cathedrals and city planning. It is one's own, unique culture that develops in the breaking period that helps the ethnic group or nation survive in the conditions of global cataclysms. Unfortunately, political culture underlines the current situation in Belarus. In fact, Belarus was not lucky in this regard – it suffered greatly from numerous wars and the most terrible social constructs and political regimes were realized here. To understand this, one should compare the restoration plans of Minsk and Warsaw, where completely different ways in the cultural and architectural direction were chosen. These cities suffered almost equally - more than 80 percent of the cities was destroyed, but the symbolism and, apparently, political culture are significantly different. In Warsaw, an ideal replica of the old city was restored from ruins to show its identity and political culture. In Minsk, it was decided to build an ideal new city - the "city of the sun" [6] - to transmit and reproduce the totalitarian ideology and its culture. A classical antique architecture called the "Stalin Empire", rather than constructivism or modernity, was used. What is characteristic, after the construction of the central part of the city, a similar situation continued, for example, the demolition of the old Nemiga. Thus the power makes space through architecture and reproduce political culture within the framework of the system created by it. As far as political culture is concerned, even today, analyzing the architecture of Minsk, one should admit that it is still visible how the authoritarian culture is reproduced, although there are pointed elements of historical monuments restoration works, however, these are only certain examples. It can be said with no doubt that Minsk is the bearer of a political culture that does not exist anymore; it has lost its originality in Jewish quarters and in the district royal city. Reproduction in Minsk of a "patrial political culture" is expressed through the construction of buildings that are not suitable for the city and the destruction of historical buildings in the city center. At the moment, a similar situation is observed not only in the capital: for example, in the ancient city of Polotsk [7]. Today, near the main architectural symbol of the city - "Polotsk Sofia", the construction of a cadet corps building is being held on site of the upper castle. Archaeological excavations and a museum could have been much more appropriate at this place. This would underline the urgent problem of the nation wants to survival of the nation in the era when culture has finally begun playing an important role in the world again. The government should pay more attention to the historical heritage and its restoration. In other words, the creation and return of symbols that will help raise the level of culture in general and political culture in particular. An example is the neighboring Republic of Lithuania, which restored the Lower Castle as a symbol of the state and nation. Now the Castle of Batoria in Grodno is being restored in Belarus, but this is only a little fragment of what can be restored as a symbolic space of the nation. In other words, the people of Belarus should strive to change the architectural appearance and political culture of the state.

REFERENCES

1. Культура имеет значение: Каким образом ценности способствуют обществ. прогрессу / Под ред. Л.Харрисона и С. Хантингтона. - М.: Моск. шк. полит. исслед., 2002. - 315 с.
2. Хейвуд, Э. ПОЛИТОЛОГИЯ / Э. Хейвуд. - М.: ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, 2005. - 544 с.
3. Морозов, И. Основы культурологии. Архетипы культуры / И. Морозов. – Мн.: ТетраСистемс, 2001. - 607 с.
4. Хантингтон, С. Кто мы? : Вызовы американской национальной идентичности / С. Хантингтон. - М.: АСТ, 2004. - 635 с.
5. Хантингтон, С. Столкновение цивилизаций / С. Хантингтон. – М.: АСТ, 2003. – 603 с.
6. Клинов, А. Минск: путеводитель по Городу Солнца / А. Клинов. – М.: Ад Маргинем Пресс, 2013. - 127 с.
7. Тарасов, С. Мнение: сборник эссе / С. Тарасов. – М.: издание автора, 2014. - 142 с.