



DOI: 10.22363/2312-8313-2023-10-2-183-194

EDN: GMKVZL

Research article / Научная статья

Features of the Formation of the Ideology of the Russian State

С.Ю. Белоконев¹  , И.С. Бурикова², М.А. Коновалова²

Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation,
49, Leningradsky pr., Moscow, Russian Federation, 125468

RANEPa St. Petersburg,
4, Pesochnaya Embankment, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation, 197376

 SYUBelokonev@fa.ru

Abstract. The article provides the psychological and political analysis of the formation of the ideology of the Russian state. For this, the authors applied the methods developed in the Leningrad-Petersburg school of prof. A.I. Yuriev, which allow a systematic description of the psychological phenomena and processes involved in the formation of ideology, its development and transmission to the next generations. Systematic consideration of psychological factors makes it possible to construct an ideology that is closest to the mentality of the population, and to correct it in time.

Keywords: ideology, human project, human nature, mentality, consciousness, intellectual expansion, political psychology, new political reality

Conflicts of interest: The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

Article history:

The article was submitted on 20.01.2023. The article was accepted on 15.04.2023.

For citation:

Belokonev S.Yu., Burikova I.S., Konovalova M.A. Features of the Formation of the Ideology of the Russian State. *RUDN Journal of Public Administration*. 2023;10(2):183–194. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8313-2023-10-2-183-194>

© Belokonev S.Yu., Burikova I.S., Konovalova M.A., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

At the heart of any political ideology, its real foundation is the “human project” — a set of ideas about the human being, his origin, his nature (essential characteristics that distinguish him from other forms of being and inherent, to one degree or another, to all people). It is from the “human project” his rights and obligations, moral norms, ideas about human dignity and social justice follow. All of the above is regulated by criminal and administrative legislation, control over the information space, pedagogical and educational programs, and the political system.

In the history of Russia, different ideologies have been adopted, which are radically opposed to each other by different researchers, or they find many common elements in them. In our opinion, there is one fundamental criterion from which it is necessary to begin the analysis of any ideology. This criterion can be considered the attitude to human nature.

There are ideologies that accept the human nature unchanged, with all its advantages and disadvantages, and try to create a political system that takes this nature into account, controlling its destructive part and stimulating the creative. These are ideologies that seek to “prevent hell on earth”. Such ideologies are now united by the common concept of traditionalism, and this totality includes completely different trends that have never been friends with each other before, and often openly feuded with each other — Christians, Muslims, Jews, Buddhists and even atheist conservatives. It can be assumed that in some historical periods of time, particularly in the perception of the world and man, separating them, retreat before the main principle — the values of human nature and the inadmissibility of attempts to change it (the reasons may be different).

And there are ideologies that are extremely critical of human nature, they set themselves the task of radically changing it for the sake of universal happiness. These are ideologies that seek to “build a paradise on earth” with the help of the most modern social technologies. A good illustration of this position can be the words of Konstantin Merezhkovsky that the impossibility of human happiness is rooted in the very nature of man. In his utopian fairy tale “Paradise on Earth or a Dream on a Winter Night” he wrote: “All kinds of systems have been tried over the past centuries, some several times, all the successes of science, art, technology, the whole complex civilization, the greatest feats of selfless love and self-sacrifice — all this was at the service of man, but nothing could bring happiness, everything was broken about his nature: the latter, obviously, was incompatible with happiness. Consequently,

it was not new systems, not new institutions, not further advances in technology and civilization, nor even new feats of love that we had to look for, no, we had to remake the person himself” [1]. To what extent the supporters of these ideologies can be resolute and radical, it follows from the following words of K. Merezhkovsky: “If this attempt turned out to be unfeasible, then there was only one thing left — to cease the existence of the human once and for all. Leaving him to suffer further would be too cruel”.

In the twentieth century, Russia underwent the experience of a sharp replacement of the ideology of the first type, based on Christian dogmatics, which claims that damaged human nature will return to its original perfection only after the end of the world, with the ideology of the second type, which set itself the task of creating a fundamentally new Soviet man.

Political scientist Dmitry Evstafyev, who argued in his article about the causes of the collapse of the USSR, wrote: “The USSR as a state and socio-economic system was a form of forcing heterogeneous societies, on the basis of which this state arose, to synergistic development and constant modernization of themselves. By and large, despite all the subsequent transformations (Stalin’s, Khrushchev’s and Brezhnev’s), the original fuse of the Bolsheviks — to remake human nature — remained. Yes, this idea of “social modernization” was in many ways a reflection of the Trotskyist “permanent revolution” and in this sense was doomed. Since its authors proceeded from the assumption that man and humanity have unlimited possibilities of development. Alas, man is not only a social being, but also a biological one. The sociality of a person is determined, among other things, by biological needs, and is also largely derived from the history, traditions, and experience of previous generations. Early Bolshevism abolished tradition, threw it off the “ship of history”, subordinated history itself to the tasks of creating a new person. But at the moment when the return to the tradition of Russian statehood began in the Stalinist USSR (In the mid-1930s), the collapse of the concept of “reshaping humanity” became a matter of time” [2].

Professor A.I. Yuryev explained the reason for the failure of Soviet ideology as follows: “... with the slightest weakening of the positions of political consciousness under the pressure of a really existing, but unaccounted-for mentality, empires, republics, unions are destroyed, kings are executed, political regimes that yesterday supported millions and protected the world’s best special services disappear” [3].

Any ideology is based on the mentality of the population, or on its individual parts, otherwise, ideology has no chance of political success. So the communist ideology was based on the peculiarities of the national Russian mentality — on collectivism, on the pursuit of justice, on the search for Truth and readiness for self-sacrifice for its sake. And at the same time, the communist ideology grossly ignored other components of the Russian mentality. Professor A.I. Yuryev wrote: “Mentality plays the role of ‘superconsciousness’ or ‘pre-consciousness’ because, being at the entrance to the stream of consciousness, it does not let anything from the ‘terrible spaces of the Universe’ into it, which threatens consciousness with destruction. Mentality prevents excessive manipulation of consciousness in order to protect it from delusional and super-valuable ideas, jumps and obsessions, products of incoherent and broken thinking, reasonableness. This has always interfered with politics and restored it against the mentality. Since the mentality is connected with the ethnos of its bearer, the ethnos has always been attacked, for example, ‘the struggle against Great Russian chauvinism’ in the 20-30th of the twentieth century” [3].

According to prof. N.M. Rakityansky, “the history of the mentality of the Russian ethnos is conditioned by the adoption of Christianity directly from the hands of the Romaic civilization. Professor B.B. Kolesov writes that the process of Old Russian mentalization is basically the transfer to Russian soil, through the Slavic word, of the main symbols of Christian culture” [4].

Any mentality is formed and developed on the basis of faith. The phenomenon of faith manifests itself in the peculiarities of thinking, expression of will and various unconscious attitudes of people. The spirit of the people and their religion are, in the words of academician A.A. Ukhtomsky, the dominant ethnic mentality [5]. It is religion that generates cultural norms and value regulators of behavior for every nation, as well as the concept of their violation — sin. It connects people to the people.

Russian enemies are well aware of all this, and that is why so much money and effort has been invested in recent years in the fight against the Russian Orthodox Church as an institution that preserves and transmits the Orthodox component of the mentality of the Russian people for centuries. The reason for such a fierce attack is that the dogmas of the Orthodox faith are the basis of the ontological security of Russian people and, according to Professor V.V. Tsyganov, they make it difficult to manipulate consciousness [6]. Thus, the main target of Russia’s enemies is not its political system, economy or statehood at all, but

its mentality, since all of the above is only a derivative of it. The destruction of the dogmatic foundations of mentality, institutions that preserve and transmit them to the next generations, inevitably leads to the weakening of the people and the country, the loss of immunity against the destructive mental epidemics of various utopian doctrines.

Similarly, liberal ideology is based on the peculiarities of Western mentality — extreme individualism, rationality, the desire to continuously expand the boundaries of personal freedom. The resolute conviction of the need to throw tradition off the “ship of history” and create a “new man” unites the communist ideology and the modern liberal-democratic one, and points to their kinship as branches growing from the same root. Professor N.M. Rakityansky, analyzing the American mentality, writes: “Since in the dogmatic system of nominalism, faith is directly oriented to the will, and not to thinking (consciousness), to the extent that the basic tenets of faith form orthodox voluntarism here ... the center of which is also dogma, appealing primarily to practical reason”. He found that “the very dogmatics of Protestantism as the ‘civil religion’ of America, expressed in the values of democracy, market economy, freedom, liberalism, the cult of individualistic self-realization, came into conflict with the original Christian values”. N.M. Rakityansky sees the danger of Western ideology in “such a talent of the English political elites as the ability to effectively implement mental and dogmatic expansion at the global level. So, when the British ruled a certain country, they sought to instill — or at least pass on — to it certain features and properties of their mentality, among which were the English language, insular Protestantism, as well as the Anglo-Saxon concept of bourgeois law, which became an important element of the system of global political control” [7].

Professor A.I. Yuryev believed that at the scientific level, the essence of the liberal-democratic and religious-patriotic dispute lies in the difference of their beliefs, that: 1) there is an exit beyond the limits of sensory experience into the space of consciousness, thought, soul, spirit, or 2) there is no, and all human behavior is determined only by sensory experience, stimulating which you can get the desired behavior. Science, without directly participating in the political struggle, supplies the participants of this struggle with scientific arguments about the nature of man and methods of controlling his behavior.

According to Professor A.I. Yuryev, structurally, the mentality consists of four integral psychological phenomena, which, in addition to values and goals, include the meaning of life and the life force of a person. These are tightly

connected elements. Any study, for example, of values without connection with meaning and goals, is insufficient. But these are the problems of science, which are nothing compared to the problems of the people. The meaning of life, values and goals that have been scattered, and therefore disappeared from upbringing and education, are forcibly replenished by surrogates in the form of laziness, drunkenness, debauchery, unwillingness to defend their Homeland, give birth to children, support the elderly and the sick. The Russian mentality is seriously ill, and therefore the country for many has become worse than a foreign land, more dangerous than the jungle, the great people are shrinking and disappearing from history. A very small part of the population remains carriers of Russian spiritual culture, but the hope is that “people will have to look for internal reserves of protection from the aggressive outside world, and the theory of mentality can help them in this by making it a real tool of self-defense” [8].

Russia has no prospects without a scientific description of the psychology of its political mentality: the way it is, and not the way it was invented by foreign researchers. Russians themselves created the problem of disrespectful attitude to the Russian mentality: writers, scientists, diplomats, actors. ... The political mentality of Russians in Russian literature is an irreconcilable denial of their country — heroes denouncing its “imperfections”. For many years, the domestic Westernized intellectual elite fed on ready-made ideas of Western philosophical thought, which is why the Russian spiritual heritage remained untouched by virgin land. We are going to discover and describe the Russian understanding of man and his dignity, freedom and justice, happiness and the meaning of life. Russian mentality and spiritual culture have all this in their superconsciousness, it manifests itself, as mentioned above, at critical moments of history, but it is in dire need of scientific understanding, description and articulation. Without this, it is impossible to form a new Russian ideology.

Professor A.I. Yuryev in his book “Introduction to Political Psychology” wrote that politics for political psychology is a system of political phenomena organized by the target function of power and capable of realizing all possible psychological phenomena of human impact, accessible to accurate observation and objective analysis [9]. The presentation of politics in the form of a list of twelve political phenomena, systematized according to the similarities and differences of their methodology (statics) and the properties found in interaction (dynamics), is proposed as a model convenient for their psychological description (see Table 1).

Table 1

The system of political phenomena (prof. A.I. Yuryev)

Signs (properties)	Extreme	Accentuated	Direct	Indirect
The goal of politics	The struggle for survival	The struggle for resources	The struggle for territory	The struggle for ideology
Political means	Physical suppression	Economic coercion	Legal regulation	Intellectual expansion
The result of politics	Physical terror	Strikes, crises	Parliament, diplomacy	Literary polemics
Factors of psychological and political destabilization of society	Interethnic conflicts	Social equality	Religious differences	Ideological disputes

Source: [9]

It can be seen from the table above that within the framework of the system of political phenomena, the “struggle for ideology” is referred to as indirect forms of political manifestation, when there is no politics, and all political influence goes into literary polemics and public discussion. Each historical stage had its own tools and opportunities for influence. And it was only in the modern era that all the current instruments of the struggle for ideology — intellectual expansion — were fully formed. Thus, in the course of intellectual expansion, subjects of an indirect form of politics (experts, cultural and artistic figures, journalists and bloggers, civil society, lawyers) create and formulate ideology as a form of political consciousness. Their additional functions are:

1. Political analysis and forecasting.
2. Formation of samples of political behavior of elites (“standards”).
3. Control of the results of political decisions.

A.I. Yuryev describes four extremes of philosophical positions in the field of political theories, depending on the view of human nature and the relationship between man and nature. So, by nature, a person can be social (an optimistic view of a person that elevates him) or asocial (a pessimistic view of a person that lowers him to the level of biological instincts). And the relationship between nature and man is formulated from two diametrically

opposite positions — the ability and inability of knowledge to control nature. In the first case, knowledge allows only an understanding of nature and the world, in the second — management and control over them. Regarding these four pairwise intersecting extremes, the positions of experts and philosophers describing the political consciousness of a person are being built [9]. Formal and informal supporters of these concepts are formed around these concepts, these concepts are reflected in the programs of political parties and political leaders, and the winners of the race of ideologies have an impact on society as a whole. Citizens have the right to agree or disagree with the ideological construction proposed by them. It would be worth saying — “or its absence”, but “a holy place is never empty”, and if the government does not formulate its values, meanings and goals, then someone else formulates them. Citizens, in any case, by virtue of the laws of the functioning of political consciousness, will endlessly strive to fill their consciousness, because this is a natural state of public consciousness — just as it is natural for a person to fill and infinitely develop his individual consciousness. The emptied consciousness is not effective, self-destructive and unviable.

The perception of politics as a purposeful activity working with a political person leads us to an understanding of the consciousness of a political person filled with categories of meaning, purpose and value, and realized in the vital forces and energy that a person is willing to expend to achieve them.

Speaking about the current stage of the formation of the consciousness of a political person, it is impossible to ignore the concepts of globalization and the new reality. A.I. Yuryev, describing globalization, said that there are traditional and systemic views on it. Thus, the traditional point of view on globalization hides its real essence, describing some of its tools, and avoiding pointing out the purpose of these tools. Usually 15–20 completely new socio-political phenomena that globalization creates are listed as its tools. According to E. Castels these include: 1) globalization as a new form of political power, 2) world without borders, 3) transnational civilization, 4) information society, 5) new culture, 6) crisis of nation states, 7) generation gap, 8) network society, 9) innovation, 10) symbolic environment, 11) new knowledge, 12) new education, 13) competition, 14) virtual reality, 15) reprogramming of the future, 16) demographic balance, etc. Externally, it looks like unknowable chaos, inaccessible to understanding and practical regulation. However, this is absolutely not the case — an attempt is being made to leave the system of concepts clearly worked out in the history of mankind, allegedly replacing

it with new global concepts. Using the method of system description of Prof. V.A. Hansen makes it easy to classify them according to the pressure method within an understandable, well-established system of concepts (see Table 2) [10].

The systemic point of view on the instruments of globalization very easily classifies the disordered phenomena of this chaos and discovers their involvement in the long-known classical instruments of the formation of modern society, the state and man. It is not difficult to establish that political power, competition, the crisis of nation-states, transnational civilization are derived from changes in science and civilization, which none of the interpreters of globalization points out, making it unacceptable to discuss and suspect them of forming a “global man” [11].

Table 2

A system of instruments of globalization formed by changes in religion, culture, science and civilization

POLITICS - synthesis of global changes	Changes CIVILIZATIONS Material regulation	Changes CULTURES Perfect reflection
Changes SCIENCES Active and Rational behavior	Active regulation (Life position) - political power - competition - the crisis of nation-states - transnational civilization	Active reflection (Picture of the world) - information society - innovation - new knowledge - virtual reality - new education - reprogramming the future
Changes RELIGIONS Reactive and Intuitive influence	Reactive regulation (Lifestyle) - generation gap - demographic transition - human default - demographic balance	Reactive reflection (Worldview) - world without borders - network society - symbolic environment - new culture

Similarly, the information society, new knowledge, virtual reality, new education, new culture are the product of the cross-influence of science and culture. And again, science and culture are deduced from the discussed disciplines as not involved in globalization. In turn, a world without borders, a networked society, a symbolic environment, innovations, and reprogramming of the future

depend on global changes in two other classical pillars of modern society: religion and culture. And finally, the generation gap, demographic transition, human default, demographic balance are the product of global changes in world religion and civilization.

Thus, civilization, culture, science and religion become the main tools shaping political consciousness and ideology. And the main point of the paradigm chosen to describe the instruments of pressure on social policy is that it reveals the path from changes in religion, culture, science, civilization to changes in a particular person and society. The system of human study developed by Academician B.G. Ananyev and Prof. V.A. Hansen, identifies four psychological substructures in it: the individual, the subject, the personality and the individuality, on which the pressure of global changes is directed [10].

More precisely, the structure of relations between the instruments of globalization is determined by politics, which follows natural changes in civilization, culture, science and religion, synchronizing these changes to the best of its theoretical and power capabilities. In turn, the elements of globalization affect the elements of the structure of the human psyche in pairs, causing changes in the picture of the world (individuality), lifestyle (individual), personality (worldview), subject (life position). Prof. A.I. Yuryev noted that these elements of globalization: religion, science, civilization, culture, exist primarily for and due to control over the meaning of the life of the masses of people (civilization and religion), over values (culture and religion), over the life goals of people (science and civilization), and, as a result, over the level of vitality of these masses of people (science and civilization) [11].

The presence of ideology in society indicates that society and its constituent citizens have not only values and goals, but also the meaning of co-existence in a given territory (of their state). Ideology in terms of social psychotherapy is a resource state for society and public relations, provides an opportunity for self-healing if it is partially destroyed, gives energy and vitality to joint purposeful activity.

The pathos of this article and the reference to political psychology as the key to the formulation of ideological constructions is due only to the affiliation to political psychology of the authors of the article themselves and the understanding that without taking into account political psychology, work on the ideology of the Russian state will be incomplete. However, in this work it is necessary to take part: 1) representatives of social sciences — political scientists, historians, sociologists, teachers, philosophers, etc.;

2) representatives of religious organizations of the main Russian religions; 3) representatives of large industries and industries where the component of the productive forces of our country, the characteristics of the Russian worker and his real capabilities becomes most obvious; 4) representatives of culture, in whose power to formulate the “cultural code” and ideological messages in such a way that they are perceived naturally, beautifully and harmoniously, so that they “responded to the heart” and were accepted as something that we had been looking for a long time and could not find. There is a big, but quite doable job ahead, and the walking one will master the road.

REFERENCES

1. Merezhkovskij K.S. *Raj zemnoj ili Son v zimnjuju noch'* [Earthly Paradise or a Dream on a Winter Night]. Moscow: Izd-vo PRIOR; 2001 (In Russ.).
2. Evstaf'ev D.G. Pro cheloveka. Pochemu my ispytyvaem bol', gljadja na ruiny sverhderzhavy? [About Man. Why Do We Feel Pain when Looking at the Ruins of a Superpower?]. *Literaturnaja Gazeta*. 2022; 52. URL: <https://lgz.ru/article/-52-6866-27-12-2022/pro-cheloveka/> (accessed: 25.12.2022) (In Russ.).
3. Jur'ev A.I. Izbrannye stat'i po politicheskoi psihologii. *Predislovie k knige N.M. Rakitjanskogo "Mental'nye issledovanija global'nyh politicheskikh mirov"*. [Selected Articles on Political Psychology. Preface to the book by N.M. Rakityansky "Mental Studies of Global Political Worlds"]. SPb.: LGU im A.S. Pushkina; 2021. (In Russ.).
4. Kolesov B.B. *Filosofija russkogo slova* [Philosophy of the Russian Word]. SPb.: JuHA; 2002 (In Russ.).
5. Uhtomskij A.A. *Dominanta* [Dominant]. SPb.: Piter; 2002 (In Russ.).
6. Tsyganov V.V. Russkaja civilizacionnaja ideja [Russian Civilizational Idea]. *Informacionnye vojny*. 2007. № 4. (In Russ.).
7. Rakitjanskij N.M. *Mental'nye issledovanija global'nyh politicheskikh mirov* [Mental Studies of Global Political Worlds]. Moscow: Izd-vo Moskovskogo universiteta; 2020 (In Russ.).
8. Jur'ev A.I. Formula mentaliteta peterburzhcev [Formula of the Mentality of Petersburgers]. *Moskva — Peterburg. Rossijskie stolicy v istoricheskoi perspektive*. Moscow — SPb.; 2003 (In Russ.).
9. Jur'ev A.I. *Vvedenie v politicheskiju psihologiju* [Introduction to Political Psychology]. SPb.; 1992 (In Russ.).
10. Ganzen V.A. *Sistemnye opisanija v psihologii* [System Descriptions in Psychology]. Leningrad; 1984 (In Russ.).
11. *Strategicheskaja psihologija globalizacii: Psihologija chelovecheskogo kapitala* [Strategic Psychology of Globalization: Psychology of Human Capital. Study Guide]. Ucheb. posobie. Ed. by A.I. Jur'ev. SPb.; 2006 (In Russ.).

Information about the authors:

Sergey Yu. Belokonev — PhD in Political Sciences, Scientific Director of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Mass Communications, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation (Russian Federation) (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8028-7421) (e-mail: syubelokonev@fa.ru).

Inga S. Burikova — PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor, RANEPa St. Petersburg (Russian Federation) (e-mail: burikova@cspdom.ru).

Maria A. Konovalova — PhD in Psychology, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Russian Politics, RANEPa St. Petersburg (Russian Federation) (e-mail: m.konovalova.spb@gmail.com).

Особенности формирования идеологии российского государства

С.Ю. Белоконев¹  , И.С. Бурикова², М.А. Коновалова²

¹Финансовый университет при Правительстве РФ,
125993, Россия, Москва, Ленинградский пр., 49

²Северо-Западный Институт управления Российской академии народного хозяйства
и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации,
197376, Санкт-Петербург, Песочная набережная, 4

 SYUBelokonev@fa.ru

Аннотация. Статья посвящена психолого-политическому анализу формирования идеологии Российского государства. Для этого были использованы методы, разработанные в Ленинградской-Петербургской школе проф. А.И. Юрьева, которые позволяют системно описать психологические явления и процессы, вовлеченные в формирование идеологии, ее развития и передачи следующим поколениям. Системный учет психологических факторов позволяет конструировать идеологию, наиболее приближенную к менталитету населения, во время производить ее коррекцию.

Ключевые слова: идеология, проект человека, природа человека, менталитет, сознание, интеллектуальная экспансия, политическая психология, новая политическая реальность

Заявление о конфликте интересов: Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи:

Статья поступила в редакцию: 20.01.2023. Статья принята к публикации: 15.04.2023.

Для цитирования:

Белоконев С.Ю., Бурикова И.С., Коновалова М.А. Особенности формирования идеологии российского государства // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Государственное и муниципальное управление. 2023. Т. 10. № 2. С. 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8313-2023-10-2-183-194>