

Part 6.

SCIENCE. CULTURE. EDUCATION

- 6.1. Science and innovative development of Russia
- 6.2. Conflict around “Bologna principles” and the Unified State Examination.
“Mutiny of historians”
- 6.3. The cinema as the world-view “battle field”. Confrontation of film-makers

The “humanistic” sphere of life in the Russian Federation was largely dependent on the political and economic situation in the country. Therefore, one can identify several stages in development of science, culture and education in 2008.

Taking into account the “financial factor”, a very clear division has been provided by the global crisis resulting in sharp curtailment of the state support of the humanistic component, as well as decrease in philanthropic activity of Russian business. Thus, division into “thick” and “thin” periods of science, education and culture funding is evident.

Another differentiating element was the elections of a new RF president and formation of a “tandem”. In Putin’s period, the “etatist” principle dominated the humanistic sphere and the “statehood-patriotic pathos” actively penetrated culture, science and education. Therefore, in 2000-2007 adherers of liberal principles had to retreat and take defensive positions. There were certainly no purges from supporters of liberal values in those years but they had no formal support “from above”. Therefore, a considerable part of liberal humanists had to mimicry and adjust to “etatist” trends. In this respect, their position reminded of the behaviour of the journalist community. For example, the “formal” change of the positions of the teams of the Radio Rossii and the NTV did not evidence their ideological turnabout: most “wordsmiths” preserved their “liberal spirit”. Few men of science, art and education dared to go into open opposition joining the camp of “uncompromising” opponents of “authoritative” power.

When Dmitri Medvedev was approved in the office of the RF President, there occurred some revival in the camp of systemic “liberal humanists” related to expectation of a “thaw” in the sphere of education, science and culture. Such hopes were nurtured by the historical experience: it is no secret that the rise to power of a “political reformer” Nikita Khrushchev in the USSR also provoked “a democratic wave” in the humanistic area, especially in cinematography, literature and education.

Nevertheless, the year of 2008 did not become a time of “a liberal humanistic revanche”. The expectations of the “democratic public” came true only partly: the “thaw” trends revealed themselves only in the policy of bringing the Russian educational system in line with the “world standards” and in a certain “mix” in the creative sphere (“state-patriotic” works were somewhat “diluted” with liberal analogies). Moreover, before the onset of the financial-economic crisis the power strove not to spoil its relations with all “ideological” trends and preferred buying loyalty of representatives of the most diverse trends and outlooks in the situation of “oversupply of resources”. It is worthy of note that the pursuit

of diffusion and “multi-vector situation” in the humanistic sphere revealed itself even in the procedure of awarding men of science, art and culture with government decorations. For example, they were practically simultaneously awarded to “the glory of the Soviet cinematography”, statist Vasily Lanovoy and one of the fathers of “cultural perestroika” satirist Mikhail Zhvanetsky.

Amid the crisis the priorities of support of the humanistic sphere from above have changed only regarding their economic grounds (reduction of public expenditures, refusal from new cash-consuming initiatives, etc.) while the ideological accents have not changed: practically all “humanists” experienced economic problems in implementing creative projects. Nevertheless, science, education and culture can still feel the “multi-vector” power. Both in these spheres and in “big-time politics” the stake was placed on creating a system of “checks and balances” and regular “equalization of opportunities” of “creative” adversaries that were objectively forced in these conditions to appeal to the power as the only powerhouse and the “ultimate arbitrator”.

6.1. Science and innovative development of Russia

The general situation in the RF in 2008 was quite positive, even after the onset of the global financial-economic crisis. This situation was conditioned, firstly, by the growing state expenditures for research projects; secondly, by optimization of scientific sphere administration and thirdly, by mission-focused policy of bringing personnel back and fighting “brain drain”. At the same time, the power started involving the scientific community in development of large-scale projects. For example, the RAS’s specialists participated in developing “billion-worth” state programmes of developing the Far East, Ural and the South Yakutia.

In the first half-year, certain progress was observed even in the sphere of science and business interaction. Private and “quasi-public” commercial structures used to be unwilling to contact, especially in fundamental research funding, as such developments did not guarantee quick profits and sometimes were even lossmaking. Nevertheless, the good market situation in this period did not bespeak any shocks and even stimulated the interest of the entrepreneur community in “academic” projects. Moreover, some companies signed special

agreements for long-term cooperation with the RAS. For example, the “Norilsk Nickel” concluded an agreement for a hydrogen energy programme with the Academy of Sciences. Russian “core” scientists participated in development of a global plan of modernization of the entire Russian power engineering. The RAS President Yury Osipov compared its significance with the GOELRO plan.

At the same time, the year of 2008 witnessed “stock-taking” of Russian science. The formal indicators appeared to be quite impressive. It turned out that according to the Rosstat data, the RF has 4068 research organizations, including 2700 state ones. Although, as noted by experts, science failed to “disengage itself” from the budget, most of these structures are financed by the state. In 2008, the R&D expenditures on civil subjects increased up to 130 billion, which accounts for about 0.3% of the GDP. This indicator brings Russia close to advanced world powers. However, despite such impressive indicators, the effectiveness of the use of the funds leaves much to be desired. Our innovative export volume is only 0.6 billion USD, which is 120 times less than the USA volume. In terms of the publications recognized by the world community, our country comes the 14th and has the 17th position by the frequency of reference to the publications, with a downward trend of these results. By the way, our academic centres have little to show in terms of their “global” recognition. On 9th October 2008, the ranking of the best world universities of the year was published according to the version of the weekly Times Higher Education and international company SQ, Quacquarelli Symonds. The top position was again taken by the Harvard University followed by the Yale University. As to the leading Russian higher educational institution, the Lomonosov Moscow State University, it took the 182nd place in the list sharing it with the Macquarie University of Australia. No other university of Russia or former USSR was included in the top 200. Such rankings are certainly subjective to a great extent and are based on “recognisability” of higher educational institutions rather than on analysis of the level of education and scientific achievements. However, in the current context the popularity factor plays quite a significant role while this is exactly what Russian education and science lack.

Such *results have just confirmed the need for maximum integration of the educational and scientific potential in activities of higher educational institutions*. In 2008, this “synthesis” in Russia was implemented by continued establishment of new research-educational structures: national research universities. In particular, draft decisions were prepared on creation of two NRUs of the kind: the National Research Nuclear University on the basis of “MEPhI”

and the National Research Technological University on the basis of the Moscow Institute of Steel and Alloys. It should be noted that two federal universities have already been created: the Southern and the Siberian Universities. The decision has now been made to create one more federal university in the Far East.

However, it should be noted that *in 2008 Russia did not make much progress in terms of creating “growth points”*. The structures responsible for innovative development (special economic zones, the Russian Nanotechnology Corporation, etc.) preferred “taking profit” to making “intellectual breakthroughs”. The administration of the Russian Nanotechnology Corporation openly announced its refusal to finance fundamental researches considering it “an internal matter” of the academic community. Besides, throughout 2008 the activities of the management of the state corporation were subject to severe criticism both by scientists and experts for too obvious “application of government funds”. As to the administration of the Federal Agency for management of special economic zones, it also preferred taking the path “of least resistance” and minimizing the “fundamental component” in its activities paying priority attention to development of port and tourist-recreational special economic zones capable of bringing “operating” income

However, since the onset of the crisis, the situation in the scientific sphere has been changing, though not dramatically. In particular, business refuses to finance a number of “fundamental” projects. Besides, despite the temporarily maintained considerable volumes of the state support, the scientific community manifests “social pessimism” and there are increasingly more talks about another wave of “intellectual emigration” that took place in the “blind-alley” and “poor” 1990-ies. However, a constraining factor is the fact that the global financial crisis has affected all countries of the world and there are practically no “affluent oases” left on the map of the world.

Speaking about the interaction of the power and the scientific community, we should note that it was not simple in 2008.

For example, *the relations between the power and the “headstrong” members of the RAS were far from being unshadowed*. The academicians’ opposition that seemed to have been suppressed in 2007 after the election of the “power’s envoy”, head of the Kurchatov Institute Mikhail Kovalchuk acting Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences became evident again in May 2008 during voting in electing active members of the RAS. The General Meeting of the Academy voted down Kovalchuk refusing to elect him. As a result, the RAS President Yury Osipov had to expel his deputy from the presidium that may

include only full-fledged academicians rather than correspondent members. 204 members of the General Meeting supported his election, the necessary minimum being 248 votes. It should be noted that it was already the second failure of the representative of the “pro-power” group of the “Russia” bank to run for a “real” member of the Academy, the first attempt was made two years ago. Besides, Kovalchuk was considered a possible successor of Osipov in the position of the RAS president. In academic circles the possible election of Kovalchuk as the president was tied in with the growing government control over the academy. As a result of the failure, Kovalchuk had to concentrate on the work as a member of the supervisory board of the Russian Nanotechnology Corporation and the chairman of the commission on education and science in the RF Public Chamber.

Nevertheless, *despite the tactical defeat the state substantially won the fight against the RAS opposition*. Firstly, on 30th May 2008, the President of the Academy, centrist Yury Osipov was re-elected despite the strong competition on the part of a conservative candidate Vladimir Fortov. The latter received 486 votes against Osipov’s 651 votes. The result of the oppositionist could have been still higher: another candidate, Valerij Chereshev, took away 88 votes from him.

Secondly, the state succeeded in coming to a compromise with the “headstrong” academic community regarding control over the financial flows of the RAS. *By spring 2008 it became absolutely necessary to formalize the almost year-long tacit agreement between the lobbyist groups involved in the conflict*. The budget of the programme of fundamental researches by state academies of sciences for 2008-2012 approved in March exceeded 250 billion roubles, which nearly corresponded to the former volume of state financing of the fundamental science; however, it was spent in a new way. For the first time the financial flows received an external manager. The programme implementation was managed by a coordination council that included representatives of state academies as well as representatives of the RF government and federal bodies of executive power. Thus, removing external control over the academy from the charter the government “moved” it into the document regulating financial activities of the scientific community. However, judging by the response of the academicians, such a “compromise” variant suited them.

Two more “ideological” conflicts developed in social sciences, their representatives being traditionally more politically motivated compared to their “colleagues”.

The first conflict was related to continued discussions regarding the textbook on Russian history compiled by the head of the historical department of the Moscow Teachers Training State University, Doctor of History, Professor Alexander Danilov. In his textbook, the author rather complementarily spoke about “Stalin’s period” and made pragmatic attempts to justify the repressions of 1937-1939. Nevertheless, the textbook received a code of the Ministry of Education and Science and was recommended for higher educational institutions. Such a situation could not fail to cause a protest of many historians as most of them were adherers of liberal values and were absolutely discontented with “reanimation of Stalinism” that, in their opinion, was done away with in the early 1990s. The more so as a sort of nostalgia for “strong-arm rule” still exists in the Russian society. It was evidenced by Iosif Stalin being a winner among the most popular Russian statesmen as a result of “Name of Russia” TV-contest.

The conflict among historians was still more exacerbated by the confrontation concerning the Institute of Russian History of the RAS. A small liberal revolution took place at this institute in December 2008. As a result of the voting, a “conservative” Andrei Sakharov was removed from the position of the Director of the IRH, with a “liberal” Anatoly Chernobaev being elected to the office. Nevertheless, contrary to the “rules of the game”, at its session on 20th January 2009, the RAS Presidium did not approve of the candidature of Chernobaev elected the director of the Institute of Russian History. By the decision of the Presidium Sakharov (director since 1993) stayed in the position of the acting director of the IRH of the RAS for another half a year. According to some information, this decision was made “by a call from above”. However, in this situation the academic community showed its ideological flexibility: the RAS Presidium simultaneously approved the decision of the Department of historical-philological sciences about electing RAS academician Valery Tishkov, being an active representative of the “liberal direction”, the new chief of the Section of history.

6.2. Conflict around “Bologna principles” and the Unified State Examination. “Mutiny of historians”

Another “ground” of quasi-political confrontation was the sphere of education. There was a fierce battle, on the one hand, between “modernists” and “conservatives”, and, on the other hand, between “atheists” and “clericalists”.

The first confrontation started around a major element of the “Bologna reform”: introduction of the Unified State Examination as a form of final certification of 11th year schoolchildren. In accordance with the Ministry of Education and Science, a high mark at the examination will allow schoolchildren to enter the most elite higher educational institutions without special entrance exams. This system is introduced without any exceptions throughout Russia starting from 2009. A great part of the educational community has been fighting against these transformations for several years already. There are at least two motivations to resist the transformations. In their antagonism to the USE and all other changes of the procedure of entering higher educational institutions the critics of the modernization project focus attention on the “inorganicity” of this system for Russia with its traditionally classical principle of organization of higher education. Moreover, a number of opponents of the reform line stress that integrated implementation of the Bologna principles will result in “Americanization” of higher education. In this connection, there exists antagonism to the narrow specialization of future graduates, fragmentariness of the knowledge given to them as well as the decreased teaching load (as distinguished from a western student, due to his/her mentality specificity a Russian student will hardly spend spare time on going to the library or self-education) and the accent on testing that is more likely to test “mechanical memory” rather than creative skills. The USE system is criticized both by representatives of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (for example, the State Duma deputy for the CPRF Oleg Smolin) and the “United Russia” (rector of the Lomonosov Moscow State University Viktor Sadovnichy).

However, protesting against the reform, many opponents of introduction of the USE act in their own selector. It is no secret that most Russian higher educational institutions are deeply corrupt and a “trade deal” entry has become common practice. Therefore, representatives of the “shady educational business” considered being pushed aside from this “trough” almost an insult and obstructed

the project of Andrei Fursenko. However, discussions regarding “Bologna agreements” in general and the USE, in particular, start fading. On the one hand, this is connected with the rigid position of the Ministry of Education and Science that steadily promotes the new educational principles, and on the other hand with a sort of a compromise between “reformers” and “corruptionists”. The latter have succeeded in getting an opportunity “to adjust” the modernization project. For example, a great number of elite higher educational institutions have managed to get special entry conditions or through conducting (apart from the USE) creative contests, or through non-competitive Olympiads or by independently grading the unified state examination.

Another “educational-political” problem for the power is overcoming the influence of the crisis on solvency and employment of students and graduates.

In the “thick” years, the number of students in all modes of study rose sharply, mostly due to students receiving study-for-fee education with simultaneous reduction of the number of students studying on a budgetary system. The good financial-economic situation made it possible for parents (and sometimes students themselves) to afford to pay for education of their children. However, the unfavourable change of the market situation brought down the solvency of both parents and students. Many students receiving study-for-fee education faced the possibility of having to leave the higher educational institution. As a result, the government was in danger of an outburst of mass students’ protests. It was quite possible that the “cast-offs” could have been joined in solidarity by their more “successful” college-mates. In those conditions a “students’ mutiny” could have resulted in events similar to those in France in 1968. Aware of that the authorities took a number of measures to alleviate the situation. First, RF President Dmitri Medvedev called upon the administration of higher educational institutions to ensure more active transfer of successful “study-for-fee” students to “budgetary” places. In particular, in his interview to TV Channel One he said: “those studying at study-for-fee departments and those who would like to be transferred to “budgetary” places: a relevant letter of the Ministry of Education with recommendations that are to be effective for all educational institutions has already been signed.”

Nevertheless, such “protectionism” regarding students caused a negative response in higher educational institutions, their revenues being largely dependent on the number of students of a contractual mode of education. It is the bonuses for teachers working at “study-for-fee” departments enabled universities, academies, institutes and colleges “to keep their cadres” and to ensure their own

survival amid low budgetary funding of the system of higher educational institution.

Another potentially conflict item is the problem of employment of young specialists graduating from higher educational institutions. This is especially relevant regarding specialties with “cadre oversupply” on the labour market: economists, lawyers, managers. The crisis brought about increasingly tough competition and, on the contrary, reduced the need of the government institutions and business for inflow of new employees. In this case the choice between a young specialist and an experienced one is practically certain to be made in favour of the latter.

At the same time, the economic crisis hit the market of “students’ side jobs”: curbing of production, dismissals and salary cuts primarily hit dual jobholders and temporary workers, including a lot of students. Such a situation is fraught with growing protest attitudes among young people that are most often the main “doer” of various revolutions, mutinies and mass riots.

Aware of this danger, the government took preventive actions in this direction as well. In his TV interview Dmitri Medvedev said that “the Ministry of Education prepared a plan of young specialists’ employment that stipulates several things. Apart from those who may be employed on requests of enterprises and those who studied under a contract, these graduates generally are to be employed. It is possible to retrain some graduates in more deficit specialties, and this is presupposed. Some people, some students who would like to continue their education can receive postgraduate education and study under a master’s programme because, I hope, choosing between complicated life and studies most students will prefer to continue their education. Finally, there is one more good idea. It involves creating special small enterprises at universities as well as at colleges that often exist in our country together with universities, and this bill has already been introduced into the State Duma.”

However, these proposals are obviously not enough. Firstly, most young students are ambitious and any downgrading and reduction of “potential possibilities” will be perceived negatively. Secondly, assistance to young students has been so far manifested in the form of “velleities” to business and higher educational institutions. Besides, the latter are unlikely to be willing to listen to the RF government to the detriment of their own interests. However, tougher protectionist actions towards young people in general and students in particular may provoke a serious conflict between power and business and higher education institutions, which will also affect stability in the country. Therefore, given the

ability of the power community to compromise, one can forecast implementation of a “flexible policy” that will produce a positive effect unless the crisis drags along. However, it can also provoke destabilization if all the parties concerned are not satisfied.

By the way, *the paradox is also the fact that social-political instability in the states is provoked by “oversupply” of people with higher education, which entails unduly tough competition for “a place in the sun” and emergence of a “counter elite”*. Therefore, it is easy to understand the desire of the Russian government to minimize the number of “factories of intellectuals”. According to Minister of Education and Science, Andrey Fursenko, the number of Russian higher educational institutions will drop by 20% within the next four years. “We must support effective institutes by increasing their funding rather than waste money on pseudo-education”, he emphasized giving reasons for his opinion. According to him, about a thousand branches of higher educational institution fail to meet accreditation requirements. In regions, their number will soon halve. Some of them will be closed, others will join those giving better education. The RF Ministry of Education and Science suggests introducing “clear criteria, indicators that will allow to understand who is who in the scientific community”. According to Fursenko, these criteria have not yet been introduced into the government and are undergoing negotiation.

Another “education” conflict was the dispute between supporters and opponents of giving equal rights to secular and religious education. In 2008, the Russian Orthodox Church significantly consolidated its positions in Russia through active support of the power’s initiatives. And while the ROC still kept a certain distance in the days of Patriarch Alexy II of Moscow, after election of Kirill (Gundyaev) have started “coming closer together”. One should note that it is the “team” of the former Metropolitan and now of Patriarch Kirill of All Russia that was and is the main lobbyist of two secular-religious projects of total introduction of “Fundamentals of Orthodox Culture” as a compulsory subject in all schools as well as official legalization of the specialty “Theology” in secular educational institutions. This is substantiated both by the needs for “spiritual education” and references to the experience of the leading foreign states where this specialty has already been available for a long time. In particular, at the instigation of the ROC, the RAS correspondent member Yuri Vorotnikov, head of the section of humanistic and social sciences of the working group for preparing the restated version of the Nomenclature of specialties of research workers, has

put forward proposals for including “Theology” section into the Nomenclature in the branch of “Humanities”.

However, these attempts faced tough resistance of two categories of educational workers. On the one hand, the ROC penetration in higher educational institutions was opposed by representatives of the “liberal camp”, who have long been involved in a value-outlook conflict with the “conservative-sovereign” Orthodoxy, and on the other hand, by “social democrats” and “communists-internationalists” criticizing the Russian Orthodox Church for its collaboration with the “anti-people’s” capitalist regime. Their “aggregate” position was laid down in a special letter to the RF Higher Attestation Commission. In particular, the letter said:

“1. Russia is a secular state in which, in accordance with the Constitution, the church has the status of an independent public institution. In other words, similar to the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world, the church is separated from the state. Article 14 of the RF Constitution says:

The Russian Federation is a secular state. No religion may be established as a state or obligatory one.

2. Religious associations shall be separated from the State and shall be equal before the law.

II. Russia is a polyconfessional country, and introduction of elements of religious education in schools and other educational institutions several years ago caused serious frictions between representatives of different religious denominations and their hierarchs. Therefore, there is a danger that inclusion of theology into the register of specialties of the RF HAC will not ensure social stability and consolidation of the society. Moreover, considering the lack of adjustment in this issue between the confessions, it may have a contrary effect.

III. Faith and scientific knowledge are different phenomena. This is the common opinion of representatives of both faith and science. The Higher Attestation Commission is an attestation and controlling agency in the sphere of state (secular) supervision over science. The ROC has its own system of attestation of scientific and teaching cadres that has been effective for many years.

IV. Within the framework of the education system effective in the RF theology that is rather close to religion has every opportunity of free development both as a teaching and even scientific subject. The scientific degrees of a candidate and doctor of theology awarded to scientists by boards of ecclesiastical academies, like the entire system of scientific attestation effective in the ROC, are,

in our opinion, sufficient for satisfying the teaching and scientific needs of religious educational and research institutions.

Besides, the scientific degrees awarded by the RF HAC in philosophy, sociology and cultural studies (in the direction of “religion studies”) also provide a good opportunity to satisfy the demand for highly qualified cadres of teachers and scientists of both religious and secular educational and other institutions.

V. The reference in the letter by Yu. L. Vorotnikov to the experience of most western countries where “theology develops dynamically as a relevant scientific subject“, “with a degree of Doctor of Theology awarded for a scientific research in the form of a thesis“ is not convincing enough. Firstly, because the system of attestation of research workers in western countries is built on absolutely different principles than in Russia, and, secondly, because the problem of relations between religions and religious confessions in these countries is not as acute, relevant and complicated as in Russia“. This results in the conclusion “that there are now enough possibilities for satisfying the needs of the ROC for highly qualified scientific and teaching cadres, while it is too early to include the enlarged group of „Theology“ into the Nomenclature.“

The side of “atheists” has been taken by the head of the Ministry of Education and Science Andrei Fursenko, who expressed his negative attitude to adding theology to the state list of scientific specialties in a special letter to RF President Dmitri Medvedev: “Dissertation researches in the field of theology can be prepared and presented for defence within the frames of scientific specialty 09.00.13 “Religion studies, philosophic anthropology, philosophy of culture”, said the letter. Nevertheless, it is possible that “the fight for theology” has not yet been completed. As it has been said above, after election of Kirill the Patriarch for All Russia the relations between the power and the Church have improved noticeably.

6.3. The cinema as the world-view “battle field”. Confrontation of film-makers.

Representatives of the “liberal” and “conservative” camps “have crossed swords” in cinematography as well.

In 2008, the Russian cinema industry was generally in a state of “social optimism”. This was linked with the active growth of business that was stimulated by citizens’ material welfare. It is only at the end of the year that cinemas started

bearing losses; simultaneously funding started leaving the sphere of cinematography; new cinema projects were frozen and the budgets of the already launched film shootings were considerably curtailed.

As to the world-view background of the Russian “cinema screen” in 2008, it also largely reflected the stake on “multipolarity”. Most domestic and foreign films were purely entertaining. As to “ideological” films, there were practically none of them, with the exception of “patriotic” (although with an “antifascist” implication) film *We Are From Future* and the “anti-totalitarian anti-utopia” *Inhabited Island* after the books by “liberal” Strugatsky brothers. The “omnivory” was also manifested in the accent placed by cinema business on certain events in Russian history. For example, the film *Admiral* for the first presented to the viewer an idealized image of “the Siberian ruler” white admiral Alexander Kolchak, while his enemies among “the red” were presented as a “wild mob”. However, such treatment of the problem did not prevent other authors from creating, at the instigation of the power, a joint Russian-Belorussian monumental film *Brest Fortress* showing the deed of “Red Army men who protected their Soviet Motherland from enslavers.

Lack of clear signals on the part of the power showing what it supported largely provoked the conflict inside the Union of cinematographers of Russia

The scandal started in December 2008, when the Congress of cinematographers elected a film director Marlen Khutsiev with a reputation of “a thaw man” and “left-liberal” the chairman instead of Nikita Mikhalkov or his probable successor Mikhail Porechenkov. Mikhalkov himself mobilized his supporters, who judicially contested the results of the congress. The situation was aggravated by the quite shaky legal grounds of both parties. By preliminary information, the congress had been prepared with violations of the procedure of its calling, which provided Mikhalkov’s supporters with arguments for legal controversy. On the other hand, according to representations of Khutsiev’s supporters, Mikhalkov’s powers had expired more than a year before the congress, in 2007 (he was elected for 3 years in 2004). It should be noted that Mikhalkov’s campaign of electing him the Head of the Union in 2004 was also accompanied by a scandal that was, however, quickly neutralized.

In this conflict, the opponents of Mikhalkov’s team did not risk bringing political charges against him and preferred concentrating on economic particulars. They accused Nikita Mikhalkov of his failure to ensure effective economic activity during his 10 years of managing the Union of cinematographers. In

particular, he was incriminated sales of the share of Russian film-makers in the Cinema-centre. As a result, the Cinema Museum lost its premises. In addition, he was charged with sales of the Art Centre “Krasnaya Pahta”. The money from it was to be spent on reconstruction of another Art Centre, “Bolshevo”, which has still not been restored. However, this accent of the charges arouses serious doubts regarding its reliability. 84-year-old Marlen Khutsiev is unlikely to be a more effective manager than much more pragmatic and energetic Mikhalkov.

Despite the opinion of some experts about a material underlying reason of the dispute, the conflict is obviously beyond a “rational” one, although pragmatic moments are certain to be there. The idea of “ideological reasons” is shown by the “support groups” of both candidates for the chairman’s office. In particular, Khutsiev was supported by film directors Eldar Ryazanov, whose rise is associated with the apogee of Khrushchev’s thaw period, and Vadim Abdrashitov, who became known in the 1980s and is considered a “chronologist” of the collapse of the Soviet moral in the first half of the decade.

In his turn, Nikita Mikhalkov is considered to be an adherer of “steady hand” and “vertical of power”. This is the way he positioned himself as far back as the 1990s (remember his role of “counter-reformer” Alexander III in “Siberian Barber”). As specialists correctly noted, his election in 1997 to the office of the Chairman of the Union of cinematographers marked the turn of mass conscience from “democratic freedom” towards the “state order”, which manifested itself at the political level only two years later when Vladimir Putin took the office. Besides, the Mikhalkov dynasty has had a reputation of “being close to power” for many decades as the cinematographer’s father is the author of “Stalin’s” anthem of the USSR that he himself “reformatted” into the anthem of the Russian Federation not so long ago. It is noteworthy that there are many cinematographers close to the state in Mikhalkov’s “group of support”, for example, director of the State Film Fund Nikolay Borodachev. However, his supporters also include actor having an image of “moderate liberals”, such as Vasily Livanov, who became known for his role of Sherlock Holmes.

At the same time, the power that is not yet inclined to liberal “bends” amid the crisis, especially considering the instability of the public opinion, preferred playing on the side of more “systemic” Nikita Mikhalkov. The position of the RF Ministry of Justice that refused to register the decisions of the 7th (Khutsiev’s) Congress of the Union of cinematographers became “demonstrative”. Encouraged by such an administrative support, Mikhalkov’s team started a counter-attack and

appointed its “alternative” congress. “Being the legally valid chairman of the RF Union of cinematographers I declare calling of an extraordinary congress of the RF UC on March 30-31 in the Gostiny Dvor in Moscow,” as said in Mikhalkov’s statement.

In conclusion, it may be stated that the situation on the market of science, education and culture in 2008 was ensured by the following factors.

Firstly, in the “thick” conditions of the first half-year these spheres were actively spending funds generously provided by the government and private investors. However, by the end of the year the funding dropped considerably, which provoked intensive fights inside “creative” communities and brought a number of “smothering” conflicts into the public sphere. Further on, one can forecast intensive confrontation for the depleting resources, which may result in “a war against all” in case of aggravation of the crisis.

Secondly, lack of clearly formulated world-view and ideological guidelines “sent from above” for science, education and culture as well as the desire of the power “to play on different fields” have brought about a number of latent “political” conflicts inside the “creative” corporations. In addition, “masters of culture and education” are influenced by steady stereotypes: “great power nationalists” expect unambiguous support from “etatist” Vladimir Putin while “thaw people” expect support from “liberal” Dmitri Medvedev. However, as practice of 2008 shows, even in the “humanistic sphere” the “tandem” representatives successfully play the scheme of “good and bad investigators”. At the same time, they are not tempted to follow the public opinion.