

SCTCMG 2018
**International Scientific Conference “Social and Cultural
Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism”**

**SOCIAL-ECONOMIC CHANGES IN POST-SOVIET RUSSIA
(REGIONAL LEVEL)**

B. Khubiev (a)*, Z. Atabaeva, L. Guketlova (a), A. Kushhova (a), R. Dzelegotova (a)
*Corresponding author

(a) Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H.M. Berbekov, Chernyshevskiy Street 174, Nalchik, Russia

Abstract

The article addresses the most significant aspects in socio-economic development strategy in the post-soviet time; provided the most typical views of the Russian experts about the dominating position of the high finance, a monopoly position of private ownership; outlined the critical analysis towards the social development strategy that is applied. The important aspect to be considered is a place of social ideals in achieving the social progress, in the value system in the period of social changes, and in social disintegration. The special attention is paid to the regional level, in particular: the issue of material security, employment level, ownership development, a civil society development, local governance. The authors share their opinions towards the key issues relating to the social changes in modern Russia. The accent is done on studying the essence of the evolution development that should have been the alternative to existing radicalism in all social spheres in Russia. In this context the authors set a problem about the ideals of the social equality and justice, freedom and humanism that are responsible for the holistic development of a human being. In the article there is an evaluative and critical analysis towards the place of the issues to be mentioned in the holistic social development strategy. The special attention is paid to the evaluation of the large ownership monopoly that does not have the alternative in the social-economic system of changes. In this vein, the authors provide the argument about the necessity to develop the other forms of ownership.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Social progress, quality of life, liberal conception, civil society, social antagonism.



1. Introduction

The social-economic and political development of Russia during the last decades has been accompanied with some contradictive results and this fact gives rise to actualize the vector for further changes that should be initiated in Russia. This issue is referred to the most burning ones in the social consciousness. The present-day research studies are inclined to describe this issue from the theoretical point of view and rarely look beyond the frames of the empirical approach to it. Furthermore, the social ideals are also a rare subject to consider, although, it is the integral part of the social progress. All disputes about it are practically removed to the periphery of scientific interests. Since then, there are not researches focused on futurological aspects, which would include some prognosis towards possible society developmental states and transformations. As a result, we still do not have the modernized paradigm for Russia development. There are not models that could be applied to predict future development and to model the social reality. The proposed and already implemented models in the framework of the liberal conception do not include some serious argumentation to the social ideal, as the goal.

2. Problem Statement

It is well known that in the world the basic standard of the society institute consists of the key components primarily as human well-being, material security and life quality. If these positions are applied in the economic reforms analysis, it should be noted that the policy to establishing ownership monopolies can not be taken as the formula of a social progress. This point of view is very spread among the Russian social experts. As Nikitin (2006) states “practically in no one country there is ownership in a pure format, among it, there were government-based ownership with different forms of government monitoring and control”. Radical reformation, ignoring the social ideals, contradicts the idea of evolution development and the principles of the social progress. All progress-based theories known up to now consider the evolution as the society moving from less expanded forms of a social life organization to more expanded ones. The common universals in this context for all stages are considered the ideas about equality and justice ideals, the principles of freedom and humanism, all-round human being development. However, particularly these common significant universals, as the value system, are ignored in the practice of Russia. They have not become the goal of the social development reforms and, as a consequence, the idea of progress as a vector in the development and possible means of goal-achievement is negated.

Meanwhile, the world history documents that in all times the idea about the social ideals was based on the nation’s gene pool. Gene pool was founded on the value system to be considered as a constant element. From the evolution point of view this concept has been kept throughout time, and the only change in it there was the critical attitude towards the value system coming from different parts of the society. Under conditions of Russian radical changes, as the practice shows, the critical refuse from well-established and universally-accepted ideals are not accompanied with the productive activity geared at building up a new model of the social ideals, which would be based on the historically-established system of values of the Russian society. As a result, the radical changes that have been achieved are very contradictive and antagonistic by nature. On the one hand, the contradictory source is the fact that the radical changes of recent years have not been come from demands and needs of the social practice. On the other hand, they have not been connected conceptually with the past history, either in the short or in the long terms.

Meanwhile, every researcher understands that the scientific conception of the social development and the vector of the Russian changes are to be built with taking into consideration the historical experience towards the principles within which the social life was organized. Therefore, the important task is to take into account the experience of our past that allows to provide the interaction between all federate entities and the center with the aim to prevent a varied-speed character of the modernization processes in regions. In past, when identifying the vector of the development this fact was ignored or partially avoided.

3. Research Questions

It is well known that scientific methods relating to consciousness are supposed to predict and model social ideals and possible way for development, which will be based on these ideals and with inclusion them into the society development strategy that will imply the society readiness to the proposed historical challenge. Novgorodtsev (1991) noted “the social ideal is becoming equal to a criterion used in identifying the way for the society to go forward and this criterion should be followed in accordance with the historical choice that has been done by people”. The history experience should not be negated: every stage of the society development objectively reflects the previous stage and includes the tendencies for future. This axiom is coming from well-known evolution theories and, as Kluchevskiy (2001) noted, the history gives the lesson to those who do not follow this tenet. It is obvious that in new conditions we have principally new methods towards understanding the social realities and this dictates the necessity to improve the knowledge-based technologies helping in projecting and constructing a new social development.

Above all, we need to take into account the domestic and world tendencies in the development of social, political, economic and religious spheres of a social life. In so doing, it is needed to consider the fact that the world tendencies in relation towards a particular country play a role as the external and internal factor as well. This means that in making a prognosis for the social reality in globalization conditions, it is needed to dialectically connect the international tendencies, domestic interests and tendencies of Russia. Globalization does not mean unification based on the model of other country development. However, the development vector in the modern Russia a priori takes the model of the USA and Western Europe countries as the only right example, as if they were the center of the world development. The events happened in recent years eloquently demonstrate that in many respects these countries are not translators of high values. Other world countries, including Russia, possess the historically-conditioned and socio-cultural diversity of values and this can lead, in globalization process, to unification of the society standards and this, in its turn, will not contribute positively to further development of any society. The vector according to which Russia should be developed is to come from the social values having the many-century history but not copy blindly the experience of other countries.

Meanwhile, the reality in modern Russia is that the ideologists of the Russian neoliberalism, scarifying the human ideals and Russian interests, have established the high finance monopoly due to the country natural resources. To full extent, the ownership diversity is neglected, including governmental one; there are no mechanisms for keeping up the governmental control. The relation between the government and oligarchic capital demonstrates polarization and autonomy of the government, allowing business interest to penetrate into politics. And this quick-speed process geared at merging a business sector and the government was going under conditions when the polycentric power system of the first president was being

formed, which is still in functioning even after the transmission to monocentric power system of the present-day presidency (Kantarsh, 2006).

The world history proved the objective conditionality in co-existence of public and individual types of ownership. In the process of society development they were based on different models providing the sustainable development through the reasonable proportion between them. Country-examples of these flexible types of ownership can be China and Japan and others where the ownership institution or its convergence is organized from the position that something is possible and needed within the control from the government. Dialectics of social (governmental, cooperative and others) and private ownership reflects people's interests independently their social status. Relatively large form of ownership and its domination existing in Russia or in the Western countries, in experts' opinion, is a closed chapter and without the interaction with other forms of ownership cannot ensure the social progress. Moreover, if we take into account a relatively quick growth in intelligence-based industry where the engagement of human labour is constantly being reduced, the values of freedom, equality and justice are raising, whereas, the private ownership, *inter alia* a big one, should correlate with the public ownership. It is obvious that only through these means we can plead the oligarchic capitals to mitigate its pretention on the total power over people and society on the whole. Furthermore since, the Russian State has been enshrined as social one, it is to express the interests of the whole society because the dominating role of the State should be constantly kept at the appropriate level. "Even in centuries of high blossom of economic freedom – Paips (2000) says – the government interfered whenever and everywhere and however in economic and social spheres: inactive State is a notion as much mythical as prehistoric communism. Meanwhile, as particular researchers think, in the Russian society the dominating factor is keeping the situation of "minimal State presence" in the spheres of social welfare and development (Kantarsh, 2006). In the same way Fedotova (2005) writes "in spite of declared status in the Constitution that Russia is the society-based State, it is not obvious in practice. Moreover, implementation of liberal-radical projects in the Russian economy is fully legitimated and can be accepted as anti-constitutional". The evidence to this, primarily, is the high finance attracting, which freely disposes the resources that belong to the national domain.

In total, in the social development of Russia we can point out some characteristic features: economic reforms making attempts to absolute the market mechanisms without the governmental control; mono-party system with multi parties participation; a paradigm monism ignoring the national values; trends based on practicality and individuality in the social life; orientation on the civil society based on the liberal model. We have the monopoly power of the high finance ignoring the representatives of other ownership forms, including the interests of the medium class of owners, the society disintegration in the unprecedented scale. The conditions in which the Russian population appeared can not be changed through the liberal model of the Western capitalism because, as B. Kapustin aptly noted, "in order to achieve the capitalism-based economy, the politics should be conducted not in the capitalistic way ..., if separate "bad and good" the competitiveness is becoming impossible" (Kapustin, 2004). The State social policy contradicts with the RF Constitution and a number of international Acts defining the material security of people in a society. In our view, it is a matter of the social disintegration in the unprecedented scale as a result of the monopoly-based domination of the private high finance. In 2009, the Chamber of Accounts stated that as a result of privatization happened in 90th and the years to come the disintegration in the Russian society led to the

statistics that 71 percent of the population were referred to the poorest who had only 3.3 % of the ownership, while 5 % of the rich and the richest possessed 72.5 % of it; whereas per 2 % of the richest, it accounts 52.9 %. Moreover, within the official statistics the difference between 10 % of the poorest and 10 % of the richest is 20 times. In Moscow this difference is higher, it is 34 times. As a comparison, in the Western Europe countries this difference is only 7-8 times (Erakhtin, 2010).

4. Purpose of the Study

Based on these data, the authors of this study made an attempt to conduct the evaluative-critical analysis towards the changes running at present in the social and economic spheres; to make own prognosis on prospects of further social development of Russia.

5. Research Methods

A substantial number of scientific pieces of literature are devoted to the modern state of social-economic and social-political issues. These issues find the reflection in papers of B. Nikitin, M. Bilalov, V. Nikitina, P. Novgorodtsev, V. Fedotova, A. Erakhtin, B. Kapustin, V. Levashov, A. Borov. The social and economic situations in the republics of the Northern Caucasus at the beginning of XXI century are introduced in papers of H. Dzutsev. All these authors concentrate their accents on the evaluation of the social content reforms, a role of the State in this process.

The authors are adherents towards the conception reflecting the escalation in contradictions appeared in the system due to some methods applied in the reforms' purposes that are based on the principle of globalism. The methodology of this research comprises the inter-disciplinary approach and system analysis of some phenomenon and processes running in the context of social-economic and social-political reforms. The system analysis of the socio-cultural environment of the Northern Caucasus is based on the historical principles, whereas the culture-center approach and interdisciplinary approach are provided with the systematic use of different methods applied in some historical and ethno-social studies enabling to model an object (and its states) under study. There are applied general scientific methods of objectivity and historicism that allowed: to study the socio-political relations as the leading component involving into the socio-political processes in the society; to define the mechanisms of sustainable and non-sustainable development.

The methodological level is based on the philosophical ideas about the particular role of socio-cultural factors in the society functioning as a system of institutions, as well as dialectics about the unity of the society; the acceptance of a human being as an agent of the society development and the main value of it. The added methods applied in this research have been taken from social, law, and socio-cultural paradigms used successfully in studying the total social organism.

6. Findings

Based on the previous analysis conducted towards the social-economic changes in Russia, we can make the conclusion with the accent to the results we achieved.

The important aspect in an optimal model development that meets the interests of all layers of population is an adequate estimation on how well the vector of the social development and its results are

implemented. The basic indicator of the social progress was and still remains the social standards of living. The reforms conducted in recent years were with disregard for its social value. As a result, in the country a salary level of 90th has not been reached yet and the rate of labour exploitation is by 3-5 times more the corresponding norms existing in the USA. The constitutional arrangements and commonly accepted international acts relating to the minimum cost of labour rate are infringed; when the level of it cannot be lower the minimum standard of living than a work capacity of the country population. A cost of labour is much lower a cost of living and it is multiple times lower than a cost of labour in many European countries. It is known that the minimal rate of a cost of labour in Russia is 11 153 rubles per month (196 USA dollars), whereas, for example, in Turkey, the country that is ranked lower than Russia according to the development index on human potential (Turkey – 79 position, Russia –71 position) this index amounts to 400 dollars (about 23 thousand of rubles), in the Czech Republic – 415 euro, in Spain – 600 euro, in Luxemburg – 2000 dollars. In many countries (the Czech Republic, Turkey, Great Britain) the average pension rate amounts to more than half a salary (from 70 to 80 %), in Russia – 25 % (Chirkin, 2010). The State gradually takes the distance from the education and health care services, people lose their rights to have a comfortable life in their old age, the State shrinks from its direct responsibilities to protect the country from external expansions.

In recent years of social and political intensification in the country and in the world in general there are many talks about the necessity to change the vector of the Russian reforms. Scientists and public people hold the opposition towards the liberal policy in the society development in the Russian conditions. Many researchers, as one of the key condition required to be corrected in the modern settings, call “the private ownership domination”. Nikitin (2006) writes: “in the context of new development of productive forces based on mass computerization of all spheres of human activities and application of human effective technologies, it is becoming obvious that the ownership (not the private one) is reaching its limit as the basic ground for the social development?”. The results show the low productivity of the vector in the development to be chosen and it is documented with the unprecedented scale of the society disintegration. The organic element of the current state of the social order is becoming bureaucracy and corruption, violence and criminality. As the special focus in the government activity should be the policy oriented to meeting the requirements of those who produce material security and spiritual benefits. All these should be in basics when identifying a new vector for further development of Russia.

The decisive factor in the democratic society, that is included into the social development paradigm, is the civil society formation and it is the point to discuss among many researchers and practitioners. The civil society and the democracy are two sides of a coin. It is known that in the civil society inherently there is self-voluntary basis that is coming from the society itself. It forms the need of self-contained individuals to be united to protect the ownership and other vital democratic values. As many experts think, the State role in this process is very high. In this case in what the voluntary basis is and what role is given to the State? It is clear that the State as a communion of individuals (people’s union) through the selected representatives should promote the formation of a civil institution system with the aim to increase the efficacy of own power and to establish the democracy.

However, in Russia, the State historically had domination over the civil society and subordinated it. At the dawn of the XIX – XX centuries Kluchevskiy (2001) highlighted the issue about the relations

between State and Society. He writes: “State as people’s union draws its power in people’s power and grows together with it, influencing well growth of the latter. It is the original and natural relation between State and People. In the same time external threats or unwise actions from high authority can impose on people excessive hardship, dampening people’s labour, needed for support and development of national potential. Then, the strength of feeling is developing to the detriment to people’s potential and if people can not find the way out from this position, in State there is the breakdown” (Kluchevskiy, 2001). It is obvious that in modern Russia the described situation reflects in general the nature of the relations between the State and the Society and shows how intensive they are.

Firstly, the State does not have a decent adequate opposition. In conflicts the society agents can not have the opportunity to defend their rights because of the lack of voluntary basis. Secondly, mono-polarity of the policy-making composition of the society devalues a party as a political power unit and as a mediator between the State and the Society. In this vein, the centuries-old traditions proceed to be high over the society significant values. Thirdly, in the society there is a low level of loyalty to the State. Thus, according the study of Levashov (2007) 74 % of the population of Russia reckons that the State does not fulfill its obligations towards the society. During the years of the radical economic reforms the Russian society could not establish the resilience understanding among the population that the reforms conducted meet the interests of the majority. The radical economic reforms have led to divestiture and the changes done did not ensure the increase in the rate of the level of living and the quality of life (Zumakulov, Kумыков, Khubiev, & Atabieva, 2017). “Russia is turning to be a country of the dramatic social contrasts, growing antagonistic relations and contradictions” (Levashov, 2007).

Nevertheless, as we reckon, in the Russian model of a civil society, based on the peculiarities of the historical development, should be organized the high level of pro bono basis from the part of the State. In the western countries the civil society was developed naturally through self-organization and self-controlling and this process was developing for centuries in parallel with a law-based State and with its direct support. In conditions of Russia the situation is much more complicated. The interaction between civil institutions and power-based structures will be developing tensely. This state is objectively conditioned. Bondaletov (2010) fairly states: “the new paradigm of the civil society concludes not in generous conceding from the State side the particular rate of private interests to the society itself . . . , on the contrary, the society itself reached a certain level in the development is becoming able to develop individually without the State intrusion”.

We agree with this thought and we add that the conception of two social forces interaction is of critical importance. Moreover, the role of States does not exclude self-organizing nature of a civil society. On the contrary, legislative regulations towards repository of the power, for instance, at the municipal level, and also the mechanisms able to facilitate and launch a group- and citizenship-formation processes based on division in preferences (ownership forms, political self-identification, values and etc.) are becoming the key factors in structuring groups based on the interests. And these groups, in their turn, are becoming the social base for a civil society. In experts’ opinion, a number of interest-based groups tend to be increasing to the extent of the society social development and democratic values implementation.

The main obstacle in a civil society development in Russia is the society disintegration and sharp social contrasts, exclusion in terms of wealth and territory; fragmented situations and weak cooperation of

civil structures. In this vein, there is the necessity to correct the development direction. Particularly, it concerns the ideology among the medium-class owners. Today there is much talk about a business role in this process, but principally people talk about trade business. Meanwhile, the main source of owners' class was and still is the industrial business and the industrial economy in general. These fundamental grounds can be escaped by the economy of future.

In this context, the burning issue is to force the oligarchic capital of Russia through taxing and other methods to work for the society social needs. This capital, in opinion of experts, "has no justification from neither economic nor political nor social points of view" (Zhukov, 2004). The first faces of the State time and again voiced the call towards the business – to be socially responsible – but we have not still seen any results. The relevant parameter is the economic humanism that implies investments in expanded innovation-based production, recovering of profession working skills based with the aim to provide people an opportunity en masse to get qualification and get a job. This is obvious benefit for all and primarily for high finance. And in this matter the State role of control and monitoring should be decisive.

The vector of further social development of Russia should be stronger due to the regional aspect. Essential disproportions and caused by them social contradictions between the center and regions have become distinct in modernization processes. Polarization of the economic life and the difference in allocating the productive forces, non-uniformity in the social development, the significant divergence in demographical processes dynamics, in education and training, in health care, in social infrastructure, population incomes, unemployment, poverty and inequality – all these issues are typical to the Russian regions, in our view. Apart from that there is observed the lack of the national sectoral policy in Russia and in its regions, there are no adequate guidelines to take conceptual and strategic decisions (Kumykov, Khubiev, Atabieva, & Vindizheva, 2017). Existing formal regulations (legislations, proclamation and decisions) are not provided with the adequate monitoring system and, as a result, these regulations are broken, the population often resorts to non-formal rules, to the traditional value system (Kohler, Gunya, Tenov, & Chechenov, 2017).

In conditions when the commercial capital is dominant, the Russian regions that were in not-far past industrially developed and intellectually rich now are in a depression. Vast majority of the regions are deprived the real productive industry and this situation will continue. The evidence to it is the fact that the debt of the Russian regions, according to the data on 2014, amounted to 1.5 tr. rubles.

The example of the social antagonism at the regional level is the Northern Caucasus, the traditionally labour-exporting region. Many experts state that the main conflict reason is worsening the social-economic conditions in interaction between the people living there. The market system, instead establishing relations, has led to incoherence between land-territories included into the region that resulted in imbalance in the economic structure. Here, as it used to be, are not large industrial production and hence there is no direct source able to create the medium class, a driving force for main economy players. Vast majority of the population face the social and economic marginalization and non-access to the basic social values. The complexity of this economic situation is underpinned with the following indicators: a proportion of rural population is over 60%; the level of endowment-based budget is about 70%; population incomes 2 times lower than the national average (Eskina, 2011). The data introduced reflect the situation of 2011, but the dynamics is at the same level nowadays, the unemployment level remains critical. With the average

unemployment index in the country of 13.4 %, practically in all republics of the Northern Caucasus this index is over 20: in Ingushetia – 51.8, in North Ossetia-Alania – 33.4, in Dagestan – 31.2, in Kabardino-Balkaria – 28.2, in Karachaivo-Cherkessia – 22.4. All these numbers create the idea that the local authorities, as well as the federal governance, misunderstand the danger of this situation. Meanwhile, the most mobile part of the Russian population, inter alia young specialists in different professional fields, are forced to find a job beyond their native region.

The evaluative paradigm of the regional changes is strengthened with the category “local self-governance”. The social base to ensure the interaction between the State, a civil society, and local self-governmental institution comprises harmonically developed economy and the social policy. The institute of full-fledged self-governance is becoming the organizational platform of a civil society and a grant of the social security. This field of the social practice is also referred to the very first importance in the Russian reform-based time. Coincidentally, the issue that deals with local self-government holds an important place in the national social theory and in the social practice of modern Russia. A great attention to this issue was done by the president in his speech at the official meeting with the heads of the federate entities. The general discussion was about the local self-government but the talk directly deals with the issue on division between the powers – regional and local ones. Here we do not tend to debate the disparities hidden in terminology what is the regional power and what is the local one; both cases include the power but different-level power. Along with it “local self-governance” as the president thinks – it is a repository of people’s responsibility ... it is a professional political school that instills the key competencies to those who are entering the political realm; the ability to negotiate with different social and professional groups; to convey clearly the ideas to people; to defend the rights and interest of the electorate” (Putin, 2012).

These words do not require anything to add, particularly from the point to comprehend that a self-governance is a variety of power. In this case we face the interpretation of known and perennial theory – governmental theory of self-governance.

Historically this theory saw in a local self-governance a transferring a part of Governance challenges in the interest to the Governmental Authority goals to a local community. In the light of the Governance it is difficult to disentangle between Governance challenges and local self-governance. If it is so, if the challenges set up before the State and self-government bodies are equal and in order to solve them the State delegates some responsibilities, then, in fair opinion of some experts, the State hardly refrains from interfering into to self-governance competencies that a local community possesses.

Nevertheless it should be noted that the organizational role of the State, as we reckon, does not exclude a self-organizing idea of a local self-governance, as ta civil society in general. On the contrary, the legislative regulation of authorities at a municipal level, and also the mechanisms facilitating the group formation process and citizen associations based on preferences (ownership forms, political self-identification, values and etc.) are becoming the social base for a civil society. Moreover, to fulfill self-organizing function the legislation base is required that allows them to function legally and openly.

The RF Constitution includes core provisions about a local self-governance, its purpose, idea and fundamental guarantees. Experts generally agree that a local self-governance should be considered as one of the constitutional framework of a civil society, as its important institution. Particularly, according to Article 12 “self-governance bodies do not consist of the system representing the Governmental Authority”,

thereby one of the fundamental principles of the self-governance theory is enshrined. As seen, the State does not impede citizen's initiatives and their organizational forms. This provision ensures, on the one hand, the independence of self-governance bodies, but on the other hand, opposes them to a local administration or other Government entities.

The idea about disengagement of local self-governance bodies and Government Authorities is reflected in Article 8 of the RF Constitution. Thus, paragraph 1 under Article 131 says that "the structure of self-governance bodies is defined independently by population" and it is realized "with account historical and others traditions". We reckon that these constitutional provisions provide extensive rights to citizens for creating public structural institutions, which would function within the historical traditions *inter alia*. At the same time the Constitution determines the role of the State in providing the function of self-governance. The State really matters through what means self-governance is implemented and what results are achieved. This attitude is expressed in giving to a local self-governance body the power competencies. Thus, paragraph 2 of Article 132 says that the self-governance bodies are empowered "some State powers supported with some material resources and finance, if needed, to implement them". With the aim to support the interaction with local self-governance institutions, the State takes the responsibilities to exercise these powers. Moreover, the State ensures the right for self-governance bodies to juridical protection, to reimbursement required to take measures as needed to solve problems. *Pro bono* basis of self-governance is expressed in providing the right to take decision independently in solving issues of local character, at a level of municipal institutions, which act on behalf of a government institution.

The key constitutional principle is the principle of freedom in economic activity applied through the rights, freedoms and responsibilities of the population. "Citizen without ownership does not have the motherland" as Pythagoras said. Economic and social rights comprise the particular group in the system of rights and freedoms and in its content they are equal to civil and political rights and freedoms.

In this respect we note that at present researchers and experts rightly pose the problem dealing with medium class development as an economic foundation for self-governance and a civil society in general. In an environment free from large industrial production and business on its basis, the most important factor for the medium class formation in regions remains agriculture, in particular, land. It is clear that a lingering issue concerning legal regulations on land relations in regions, particularly in Kabardino-Balkaria, is needed to solve within the legislation base. For the overwhelming majority of rural people the land will become the single ownership source through which they will become sovereign owners in their own country. When a rural person works with it, increases and protects, then, there will be a need to unite in the common interests. Only in this case the rural population will possess the economic freedom and become full-fledge member of the civil society that will be based on the local self-governance concept.

7. Conclusion

In summing up, the analysis over the social-economic and social-political changes in the post-soviet Russia showed obviously that the modern state of the social-economic development of Russia and its regions underlines as the first-order challenge the necessity to update the strategy of the society development. For this there are all appropriate pre-conditions, among them are material and intellectual society resources, active public forces, the level of civic awareness and etc. The focus should be done on

the cross-cutting universals: a level of living, quality of living, equality, justice, freedom, humanism. All these universals are able to accumulate around all value parameters of the human existence, providing all-around development for a human being and for the society progress in general.

The foregoing research data demonstrate that there is no perception in the society that the social identity plays important, consolidating role and this fact should be thoroughly considered in the development strategy. The regional aspects in ongoing changes reveal the tendency to societal value reduction in terms of the nation-State identity needed in civilian reality on a social scale for all Russian society. Achieving the social and nation-State identity means to collect the constituents of the society identity. It is obvious that the Russians only passing through “the stage of identity” will understand the true sense and the logic, which are to take to move forward to the progress. In this case the social ideal will spread out as desired and needed and the redneck masses will stand up for the national interests. The foregoing material including data on the structural elements of a regional society, the civil society institutions and self-governance illustrates the beginning stage in their formation. The protection function towards the citizen social rights can be fulfilled by these society institutes only in appealing to the State or in close interaction with it.

References

- Bondaletov, V. V. (2010). Civil Society and Public Control: problems in implementation. *Human Capital*, 10 (22), 19-31.
- Chirkin, V. E. (2010). *Civil Society, the State and Socio-economic Rights (elements of interconnections). Constitutional Rights and Freedoms of Individuals in the Context of Interaction Between Civil Society and Law-governed State*. Retrieved from: https://ria.ru/person_Vladimir_CHirkin/.
- Erahtin, A. V. (2010). Is Civil Society Possible in Russia? *Bulletin of the Russian Philosophical Society*, 4, 76-82.
- Esquina, L. B. (2011). *Human Rights in the Northern Caucasus: background and conditions for implementation. The relationship of a civil society and practice of human rights implementation in the Northern Caucasus*. Moscow: Pobeda.
- Fedotov, V. G. (2005). *Good Society*. Moscow: Obshestvo.
- Kanarsh, G. Yu. (2006). *Power Privatization Problem in Russia. Knowledge. Understanding. Skills*, 3, 14-24.
- Kapustin, B. G. (2004). *Essays on the History of Western European Liberalism (XVII-XIX centuries)*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kohler, J., Gunya, A. M., Tenov, T. Z., Chechenov, A. M. (2017). Institutional-based Study towards Issues of Sustainable Development of Mountain Areas. *Sustainable Development of Mountain Areas*, 8, 152-161.
- Kluchevskiy, V. O. (2001). *Notebook with aphorisms*. Moscow: Publishing House EKSMO-Press.
- Kumykov, A. M., Khubiev, B. B., Atabieva, Z. A., Vindizheva, A. O. (2017). Ethno-social Processes and Interfaith Relations in the Northern Caucasus. *Theories and Problems of Political Studies*, 124, 1-9.
- Levashov, V. K. (2017). Civil Society and Democratic State in Russia. *Socis*, .1, 12-14.
- Nikitin, V. A. (2006). On the Paradigm of Social Development of Russia. *Knowledge. Understanding. Skills*, 2, 79-91.
- Novgorodtsev, P. I. (1991). *On the Social Ideal*. Moscow: Obshestvo.
- Paips, G. (2000). *Property and Freedom*. Moscow: Obshestvo.
- Putin, V. V. (2012). *Russia is Concentrating. Landmarks*. Moscow: Obshestvo.
- Zhukov, V. I. (2004). *Social paradigm of Russia development: possible models of social modernization*. Moscow: Russian State Social University.
- Zumakulov, B. B., Kumykov, A. M., Khubiev, B. B., Atabieva, Z. A. (2017). Socio-philosophical Aspects of Regulation of Social and Legal Relations in Russian Society. *Scientific Journal Humanitarian of the South of Russia*, 209, 32-36.