

SCTCMG 2019
**International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural
Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»**

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AS
INTEGRAL SOCIETY**

Vladimir Bukhantsov (a)*, Marina Komarova (b)

*Corresponding author

(a) Irkutsk State University, Irkutsk, Russia, bukhantsov2005@mail.ru, +79642219925

(b) Irkutsk State University, Irkutsk, Russia, komarina2012@mail.ru, тел.+79149045537

Abstract

The authors study the transformation of Russian society as ongoing changes in the world-system. Today, China and India have come to the forefront of world history. They have achieved phenomenal results in economic development, have been forming new economic structures. In general, they create contours of a new “integral society”. S. Glazyev, following P. Sorokin, introducing the term “integral society” provides the most coherent picture of this new world as a characteristic of advanced transformational processes. Integral society rejects liberal globalization; its main tools are military power and financial resources. For new leaders of social progress, convergence of the market economy, market self-organization, and strategic planning, attributes of the socialist economy, are an accomplished fact. The state plays a new role being an integrator of socio-economic forces and social groups. Reincarnation of the state takes place in the form of various national models. The ideology undergoes profound changes in social and environmental values. The authors come to the conclusion that Russia needs to make its own delinking, develop its own strategies, make its own decisions. The country has everything to “break away from the capitalist system” as a periphery of the world-system and build an integral society.

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

Keywords: Integral society, delinking, convergence, transformation, world-system.



1. Introduction

Modern Russian society has transformed for several decades. It is possible to single out both objective and subjective development trends. The common goal and general direction of movement result from transformations of potential goals of social subjects into their meaningful or non-reflective practices. Among politicians and scholars, there are two general directions in relation to social transformations: spontaneous liberal-Westernistic and reflexive-conscious ones represented by neo-Marxists, supporters of the third way. Glazyev (2018) suggested his own plan for social construction whose basis is social processes as a specific civilizational cultural phenomenon in which the modern world is closely connected with the world-historic. In leading countries, we can observe formation of a new historical reality - integral societies described by Galbraith (2018) and Glazyev (2018). The article aims to identify trends that make it possible to consider an integral society as a current social reality.

2. Problem Statement

The task is to identify trends and characteristics of social development which make it possible to talk about the qualitative uniqueness of a new society.

3. Research Questions

The subject is an integral society and its development in the Russian Federation.

4. Purpose of the Study

The aim is to prove possibility and need for transition to conscious construction of a new society.

5. Research Methods

The research is based on the subject-spatial (activity) approach insisting on variability of the laws of social development, need to identify and study subjects of the transition believing that the researcher depends on his place in the sociocultural field having four main aspects (ideas, ideologies, myths, utopias, values; norms, rules, stereotypes; interactions; resources). It assumes to rely on systematic, comparative and logical methods.

6. Findings

The post-Soviet social development period of the Russian Federation initiated by Gorbachev's awkward reforms and continued by anarchic-bourgeois transformations of the Yeltsin era and more or less successful restoration of Putin's "zero" public order, has largely lost its dynamics.

Indeed, the pace of economic growth is in the zone of error. The social environment is characterized by the expansion of the poverty layer, including at the expense of the working poor. Democratic processes are marginalized against the backdrop of strengthening central power.

At the same time, social changes which may cause new qualitative characteristics and a new quality of society are occurring. Aggravation of the ideological and ideological struggle is one of the indicators of deep (tectonic) socio-economic and party-political shifts.

Two development models can be distinguished as cognitive matrices.

The first one is the liberal-democratic utopia which has taken deep roots in the artistic and intellectual community encouraged by that part of the domestic bourgeoisie which was formed as comprador clerks of the global financial elite. The liberal tradition is preserved due to its anti-scientific, but pronounced quasi-religious character through adherence to the scientific Western texts as secret knowledge. For about thirty years of its evolution, the Russian liberal thought couldn't give anything but Gaidar (1995) postulates: "to change the social economic system, restore social and cultural unity with Europe, move to the "Western" path, create Western institutions in Russia, powerful incentives for self-development, innovation, business, rapid economic growth" (p. 17).

Liberal Westernism in Russia is born out of the idea that Russia is a backward part of Europe.

It was difficult for supreme power of post-Soviet Russia to determine itself. "According to the state leaders (Yeltsin, Putin, Medvedev), Russia focuses on the Western liberal-democratic model of development. However, the real picture is far from the declared development scheme. However, public opinion, programs of the leading Russian parties have an anti-Western orientation. "Russia is Europe," states V.V. Putin at European forums. In Muslim countries, he sometimes states that "Russia is a Muslim country" (Akayev, 2012). On December 12, 2012, Vladimir Putin made a statement about Russia as a special civilization: "We must take care of the unique experience of our ancestors. Russia has been developing for centuries as a multinational state (originally it was), a state-civilization, held together by the Russian people, Russian language and Russian culture" (Putin, 2012, par. 4).

"Meanwhile, this controversial image of Russia is its real situation associated with western and eastern vectors of sociocultural development. There is a theoretical model that treats Russia as Eurasia, a country that absorbs Asian (or Asian) and European values. However, the old Muslim basis of Russia is also obvious" (Akayev, 2012, p. 160).

On November 2, 2018, Vladimir Putin said about "the unique Russian civilization not claiming to its exclusiveness", while the fundamentals of Russia as a civilization are predetermined by traditions, inner spiritual culture, history, self-consciousness (Putin, 2018).

It is clear that this worldview frees from copying the European (Anglo-Saxon) experience, but creates a lot of problems, including cognitive ones. Any deviation from the "Western faith" requires intellectual independence and civil courage.

For many years, Glazyev (2018) has been advocating the concept of Russia as a special civilization along with Indian, Chinese, European ones. The monograph "Charge to the future: Russia in new technological and world economic structures" became a result of his thoughts. Certainly, his ideas formed under the influence of Dmitry Lvov are of interest or shared by many theorists and practitioners (Sergey Bodrunov, Viktor Ivanter, Robert Nigmatulin, Boris Titov, etc.).

The concept of an integral society is intended to identify the development path for the modern economy and the world as a whole. The former economic order is being destroyed.

Perhaps its main prerequisite was justification of the special mission of the collective West and its various historical avant-gardes which date back to the Antiquity. A new impetus to the philosophical and ideological division of peoples was given by the pre-adamism (Morrow, 2011) which allowed for racist ideas about the peoples (O. Ammon, J. A. de Gobino, J. Lapuzh, Chamberlain X and others). Since the main weapon in the organized struggle of the peoples is the state, it becomes an object of attacks (open conquests or justification of its secondary role in social relations in the new, neo-colonial era). African, Asian, Latin American, and new European countries considering themselves democratic fit into the logic of neo-colonialism: independent entities with external attributes of international sovereignty whose economic system and political course are determined from the outside (Nkrumah, 1966).

There is nothing new in the US claims to world domination. The nature of American messianism, "Americanism" is in its ramification, thoughtfulness and unshakable quasi-religious belief in its exceptional role (Huntington, 1981). Americans believe that they are a nation chosen by God, having a divine mandate to spread their noble democratic institutions throughout the world plunged into darkness "... We are Americans, we continue to believe that we are a powerful nation ... there was something in our genes which gave us an opportunity to become great" (Baily, 1968, par. 9).

It is clear that the course of the young reformers who grabbed power in the wake of the anti-Soviet revolution was initially aimed at turning Russia into the neo-colonial periphery of the collective West. The apotheosis of Russian loyalism was disgraceful speech of Yeltsin (1992) in the US Congress on June 17, 1992:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to US President George Bush, the American people for the invaluable moral support of the Russian people. We are responsible for success of our transformations both to the Russian and US citizens, humanity. Today, America's freedom is protected in Russia. And if the reforms fail, we will have to pay many hundreds of billions of dollars to somehow compensate for this loss. (par. 11-12)

That is why the role of the concept of sovereign democracy developed by Surkov (2006, 2019) cannot be underestimated. On November 20, 2006, Surkov (2006, 2019) anticipated the future Munich speech of the national leader, and the full reversal of the Russian Federation to its true civilizational self-determination.

Along with Russia, a number of states claimed about their rights to act in the interests of their own people rather than in the interests of the transnational (centered around the American establishment) elite. These states have a powerful cultural and civilizational basis, a rich history and original culture: India, China, Iran, partly Korea, Japan, Indochina. There were some rebels in Europe: Hungary, Austria, Romania. One can notice increasing subjectivity of some interstate associations. They are forced to maneuver and play on contradictions in the most western pro-American structure of the world-system. The experience of semi-great countries (Japan) is extremely interesting. Being a military-strategic customer of the USA, Japan is searching for new strong partners (Puzynya, 2017). Thus, the geopolitical picture of the world is changing. There are new strong players. In addition to their particular civilizational identity, China, India, Korea, Japan have entered or are entering into a new technological and economic structure that changes

society. Before our eyes, an integral society is developing. In 1988, Tiryakian (1988) exclaimed: “Sorokin foresaw a wind of change in modern Russia and China?!” (p. 6).

In 1960, Pitirim Sorokin published his work “Mutual Rapprochement of the United States and the USSR to a Mixed Socio-Cultural Type”: Western leaders assure us that the future belongs to the capitalist type of society and culture. On the contrary, the leaders of the communist nations believe in the victory of the communists. I think that if humanity avoids new world wars and can overcome gloomy critical moments of modernity, an integral society will be dominant. This type will be intermediate between the capitalist and communist systems and lifestyles. It will unite positive values and be free from serious defects of communist and capitalist societies (Sorokin, 1992). Galbraith and Menshikov (1988) and their prominent Soviet proponents said about the convergence of systems. However, in the nineties, the country was “seized” by other prophets, orthodox liberal gurus which predetermined its long-term degradation: “When the Soviet Union collapsed, followers of Hayek, Friedman, and Samuelson rushed there; the price control was abolished and industrial production collapsed causing to a humanitarian catastrophe comparable (in terms of the impact of the doctrine on life) with hunger in Ireland or the Versailles Treaty” (Galbraith, 2018, para. 8).

This “integral” society is developing born in the great Eastern countries where the market economy, market self-organization and strategic and indicative planning are being combined. It is formation of the managed market economy. Liberal globalization, power of world money, is drowning. The models of the new world economic structure are being developed under the shadow of the state which takes various forms. These are strong states that have survived reincarnation. They are striving for true sovereignty being integrators of various social and economic forces and social groups. Money has become a tool for economic development, a factor of economic growth. Central banks are turning into development tools. The era of the Washington Consensus in Big Asia is over. There are changes in labor relations - social (socialist) values are being restored. Ideology is dominated by social values, environmental awareness, and social justice.

For thirty years, the economic growth rate is three times higher than the world average which makes it possible to form the Asian cycle of capital accumulation.

In general, we can talk about a new integral society, a new world economic structure, an integral state.

Unfortunately, Russia looks one-sided. On the one hand, the Russian Federation has returned to the world as a global military superpower. On the other hand, the country does not have its own concept of delinking, the concept of “abandonment of the capitalist system which presumes own strategies, decisions, and institutions” (Amin, 2014, par. 1).

The country which managed to combat the financial oligarchy uses non-national financial resources to implement its policies. At the same time, Vladimir Putin began to speak about elements of socialization, social justice as main values of Russian society. If so, a turn towards an integral society in Russia is inevitable. Moreover, the Russian provinces and national republics did not abandon traditional values.

Thus, there is only one path for the Russian Federation as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multi-structured state and a civilization. It is the path to an integral society based on social justice, patriotism, love for homeland, mutual enrichment of cultures. The sovereign statehood and the managed market

economy will become a basis for the integral society. It is time to stop being afraid of the ghosts of Soviet socialism, its achievements and return to social construction management.

7. Conclusion

The authors proved the hypothesis about the need and possibility of transition from chaotic transformation to conscious construction of an integral society using foreign experience.

References

- Akayev, V. H. (2012). On the need to develop a new concept of national policy. *Humanitarian South of Russia*, 1, 159–167.
- Amin, S. (2014). *The "collapse" of modern capitalism and the audacity of the left*. Retrieved from: <http://www.intelros.ru/readroom/alternativi/al2-2014/25157-shlopyvanie-sovremennogo-kapitalizma-i-derzost-levyh.html>
- Baily, Th. (1968). *The mythmakers of American history* Retrieved from: <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/3707228/the-mythmakers-of-american-history-thomas-a-bailey-coachknet>
- Galbraith, J. K. (2018). *What predicted the economy of the XXI century John Galbraith*. Retrieved from: <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/freeconomy/cht0-naprorochil-ekonomike-xxi-veka-djon-gelbreit-5bdedc24228e4f00aaa64142>
- Galbraith, J. K., & Menshikov, S. (1998). *Capitalism, socialism, coexistence*. Moscow: Progress.
- Gaidar, E. (1995). *State and Evolution*. Moscow: Eurasia.
- Glazyev, S. Yu. (2018). *Charge to the future: Russia in new technological and world-wide structures*. Moscow: Book World.
- Huntington, S. (1981). *American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press.
- Morrow, J. L. (2011). *Pre-Adamites, Politics and Criticism: Isaac La Peyrère's Contribution to Modern Biblical Studies*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ocabs.org/journal/index.php/jocabs/article/viewArticle/61>
- Nkrumah, K. (1966). *Neocolonialism. The last stage of imperialism*. New York: International publishers.
- Putin, V. V. (2012). *Message from the President to the Federal Assembly*. Retrieved from: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/17118>
- Putin, V.V. (2018). *Russia resists the New World Order*. Retrieved from: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/59013>
- Puzynya, N. (2017). Japan-India Strategic Partnership in the Field of Security in the Indo-Pacific Region. *Izvestiya of Irkutsk State University. "Political Science. Religious Studies"*, 21, 42–48
- Sorokin, P. A. (1992). *The Man. Civilization. Society*. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Surkov, V. (2006). *Nationalization of the Future*. Retrieved from: <http://surkov.info/nacionalizaciya-budushhego-polnaya-versiya/>
- Surkov, V. (2019). *Putin's long state*. Retrieved from: <https://politikus.ru/articles/116858-vladislav-surkov-dolgoe-gosudarstvo-putina.html>
- Tiryakian, E. A. (1988). Sociology of Dostoevskiy: Pitirim A. Sorokin. *The World and I*, 9, 580.
- Yeltsin, B. N. (1992). *Speech in the US Congress: "Lord, bless America And Russia!"* Retrieved from: <https://mediamera.ru/post/25615>