

**CONTEMPORARY THREATS OF THE LOSS OF SOCIO-HISTORICAL MODELS  
OF RUSSIAN THINKING SYMBOLIC PROGRAMS AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN MODERN RUSSIA**

**Zhanna V. Andrievskaya<sup>1</sup>, Sergey G. Voskoboynikov<sup>2</sup>, Tatiana V. Shchukina<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, zhandan3@gmail.com

<sup>2,3</sup>Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, Voskoboynikov1968c@yandex.ru

**Abstract.** The article is devoted to the analysis of modern threats to the loss of the cultural identity of Russian thinking and social behavior of Russians (in the broad sense of the word), as well as to the promotion of constructive measures aimed at protecting Russian cultural identity, primarily in the sphere of its "soft power", within the boundaries of which it will be necessary to form the level of a nationwide independent cultural stratum capable of pushing the "mass culture" of the West to the periphery of Russians' interest. Particular attention is paid to the position of the methodology of science, known as the "principle of correspondence", stating that the new is the heir and successor of the old, and not its denier, denoting the logic of the evolution of any activity and any tradition.

**Keywords:** integration, culture, globalization, socio-historical symbolic programs, social behavior, democracy, alternative globalism

**For citation:** Andrievskaya Zh. V., Voskoboynikov S. G., Shchukina T. V. Contemporary threats of the loss of socio-historical models of Russian thinking symbolic programs and social behavior in modern Russia. *State and Municipal Management. Scholar Notes. 2022;(2):222–227.* (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2022-1-2-222-227>

**СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ УГРОЗЫ УТРАТЫ ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКИХ МОДЕЛЕЙ  
СИМВОЛИЧЕСКИХ ПРОГРАММ РОССИЙСКОГО МЫШЛЕНИЯ  
И СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПОВЕДЕНИЯ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РОССИИ**

**Жанна Викторовна Андриевская<sup>1</sup>, Сергей Георгиевич Воскобойников<sup>2</sup>,  
Татьяна Владимировна Щукина<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Южный федеральный университет, Ростов-на-Дону, Россия, zhandan3@gmail.com

<sup>2,3</sup>Донской государственный технический университет, Ростов-на-Дону, Россия,  
Voskoboynikov1968c@yandex.ru

**Аннотация.** Настоящая статья посвящена анализу современных угроз утраты культурной самобытности российского мышления и социального поведения россиян (в широком смысле этого слова), а также выдвиганию конструктивных мер, направленных на защиту российской культурной самобытности, прежде всего – в сфере своей «мягкой силы», в границах которой потребуются формирование уровня общенационального самостийного культурного пласта, способного отеснить «массовую культуру» Запада на периферию интереса россиян. Особое внимание обращается на положение из методологии науки, известное как «принцип соответствия», фиксирующий, что новое есть наследник и преемник старого, а не отрицатель его, обозначающее логику эволюции всякой деятельности и любой традиции.

**Ключевые слова:** интеграция, культура, глобализация, общественно-исторические символические программы, социальное поведение, демократия, альтернативный глобализм

**Для цитирования:** Андриевская Ж. В., Воскобойников С. Г., Щукина Т. В. Современные угрозы утраты общественно-исторических моделей символических программ российского мышления и социального поведения в современной России // Государственное и муниципальное управление. Ученые записки. 2022. № 2. С. 222–227. <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2022-1-2-222-227>

The situation that has been formed by now can be called "globalization" [1]; in this regard, it is usually said that the world is becoming more and more interdependent and mutually related. At the same time, it is often forgotten that this globalization itself is a unidirectional expansion of the Western economy and culture into societies of a traditionally non-Western type with their own socio-historical models of development. However, it is widely known that "after the end of the "Cold War" with the fall of the Berlin Wall, following perestroika, the world witnessed a series of epoch-making events, in particular the end of an era characterized by confrontation between two opposing blocs" [2]. It is the collapse of the Soviet Union that is the starting point from which the formation of a unipolar system is essentially counted, in which the Western countries carry out their aggression against the economies and cultures of the rest of the world; in particular, globalization and urbanism have made the spread of slums on Earth unprecedented in history [3], and these slums themselves are an economic and cultural appendage of the population of countries included in the "golden billion": it is no coincidence that different countries are involved in the process of globalization on an unequal status and the unequal provision of their national interests [3]. This creates clear threats to local cultures, including Russia and its characteristic socio-historical models of symbolic programs and social behavior, which is the key issue of this article, written with the use of methods of synthesis and analysis in their precise, authentic sense. Namely, in the sense of combining and decomposing some wholes into their component parts with the accompanying identification of the relationships between these integral objects (with a special fixation of the fact that any organic whole is always "more" than its constituent parts, and is never subject to reduction in the full palette of its properties, – the thesis of modern holistic philosophy and methodology).

**The background of global culture – the phenomenon of "mass culture".** There remains an extremely small number of researchers – and this minority is just the most naive – for whom the news is that "in the process of globalization, the leading role belongs to the West, which invented a culture suitable for everyday consumption – mass culture" [4, p. 154]. This modern Western mass culture – it would be more accurate to call it a "surrogate culture" – does not arise from scratch, not from "a blank page"; leaving aside individual historical "bends" on the path of its development, it should be pointed out that its genesis was once initiated by the post-war discourse of the Western world, and, according to the plan, should have brought freedom and independence to people; naturally, in the "halfway" of its development, its goal was transformed into liberalist slogans, sexual revolution, pseudo-culture ("hippie", with its characteristic drug addiction slogans), etc.; it is difficult to believe that this process was spontaneous, that is, artificially "disordered" ("free") in nature: in the construction of these phenomena, an artificial, man-made effect is manifested – one way or another, explicitly or implicitly, which arouses a certain socio-philosophical interest in this group of cultural phenomena.

This surrogate culture, known as "mass culture", builds up samples of postmodernist creativity, which blurs the distinction between good and evil – destroying the relationship between absolute good and absolute evil, this postmodernist creativity breaks ethically absolute coordinate axes in the minds of people, establishing totally relativistic models of personality and relationships between people, exposing the worst in moral and ethical terms of behavior and activity as privileged – and these are examples of murderers, swindlers, manipulators, homosexuals, escaped imprisonment, narcissists, psychopaths (and even psychopathic doctors!), and other parts of all this unhealthy shameful postmodernist "broth" in which Western artists "marinate" the consciousness of citizens – both of their country and countries involved in the process of oppression of morality and ethics, its decay and "philosophical deconstruction".

However, this problem is actually much deeper than it might seem at first glance, because *postmodernism is a denial of Hegel's heritage, and the situation of postmodernism is a problematic situation*; as if "stuck" at the stage of denying *Hegel* himself, postmodernism does not generate anything constructive, but only develops the potentials of those traditions that were laid down in the starting points of Hegel's thinking, only antagonistically switching "metaphysical gestalts", replacing, for example, centrism with the so-called "principled pluralism". As a consequence, overcoming the problematic situation of postmodernity should follow not simply the way of "denying negation" – according to the logic of *Hegel* himself – but by actively constructing new classics that could absorb all the best from what was presented in these previous traditions – including postmodernism.

As a result, this new classics must remove, preserve, maintain and critically expand the old traditions, absorbing all the best from them, and discarding all the worst (as for *Hegel* himself – the worst in his totalitarianism of his thinking, the presumption of his system's comprehensive coverage of the entire human universe activity and human culture, etc.). At the same time, it should be pointed out that the thinking of *Hegel* is totalitarianism and violence, the thinking of postmodernists is based on the denial of *Hegel* – there is arbitrariness and disorder, the synthesis of *both is freedom as variably regulated ordered activity*.

Thus, the legacy of existing cultures and civilizations will embark on the path of constructive development only with the emergence of a "new classics" that will absorb the best from those traditions that exist at present. At the same time, in Russia, this new classic will have to preserve our distinctive socio-historical symbolic programs and models of social behavior that are characteristic of the activities of Russians and have been forged over the millennia. These are the very socio-historical symbolic programs and models of social behavior that are threatened by the "weathering" of the very surrogate culture offered by the Western world in its worst, muddled, ethically dusted with the lowest postmodern models.

**The initial frame of dialectical synthesis.** It is already known from Western philosophical traditions that dialectical synthesis – in this case, the synthesis of Hegelian philosophy with the philosophy of postmodernism – should be characterized by a number of functional properties, including such functional (constructive) restrictions for the forms of the "new classics" as:

- (1) dialectical retrodution: "a new period in the history of science begins with *a return movement* that leads us to an earlier stage of cognition": [5, p. 153];
- (2) correspondence principle: the coverage and removal of what was previously present in the "body" of traditions, its large-scale synthesis on alternative grounds;
- (3) feasibility principle: opening new horizons: "this model, or project of an object should open up new opportunities for practice, i.e. would be realizable by these available methods": [6, p. 74].

As a result, in the current state of the situation, such a synthesis, which we could oppose to the decaying and degenerating tradition of postmodernism, should in a constructive way unite modern world philosophical traditions and absorb all the best of them, while discarding all the worst.

In this regard, the modern threats of the loss of models of socio-historical symbolic programs of Russian thinking and social behavior can be stopped by the formation of such an intellectual, mental and spiritual world for Russians – and, in the future, for the whole world – which would have been developed several steps forward compared to the world poisoned by the vicious practices of postmodernism, and, first of all, in the sphere of "soft power". "The non-commercial nature of culture is recognized by the international community, but how can it be protected? What kind of culture is being taken care of? At a time when economic globalization is driving the spread of consumer culture around the world, many local and distinctive cultures have proven to be "weak." This is the reality": [3] – in this sense, our Russian culture must by all means get ahead of the steps of the development of world culture, overcoming the sick situation of postmodernism.

As a result, it is required to set a kind of "patterns" for forging a new tradition, which could serve as a basis for the subsequent evolution of thinking in general, and from positions that are protective for Russian culture with its characteristic models of socio-historical symbolic programs of Russian thinking and social behavior; this synthesis should be a new level of development of thought, from the height of which the vicious and unhealthy postmodernist practices would be overcome; without overcoming the situation of postmodernity, it will hardly be possible to reverse the dominance of the Western world in the sphere of "soft power", and otherwise we are in danger of losing original patterns of social behavior, and their place will be taken by aestheticized and romanticized examples of the worst moral and ethical sense (mass murderers, swindlers rogues, impostors, manipulative cowards, homosexual psychopaths, etc.). It is clear that the synthesis of the legacy of *Hegel* and the postmodernists themselves (that small, but apparently essential of what is there in general) can be exclusively creative in nature; mechanical combination of elements alone is indispensable.

In this case, a coupling of two components is required:

- (1) "new classics" in ethics, philosophy, aesthetics, etc., which will free up space for new, healthy samples of socio-historical symbolic programs and social behavior (at the level of global culture);
- (2) the core of Russian culture with its characteristic models of socio-historical symbolic programs and social behavior (at the level of local-Russian culture).

In the systemic unity of these two elements – the emergence of a synthesis of *Hegel's* thought and *postmodernism* as a thesis and antithesis in a certain new dialectical unity, and the consolidation of Russian culture in a new light and context – one sees the prospect of overcoming the threats of losing models of socio-historical symbolic programs of Russian thinking and social behavior, and on the other hand, the further growth of the branches of world culture according to exhausted templates of post-modernism does not promise anything constructive for world culture.

**Measures to preserve Russian culture.** The preservation of the original, internal socio-historical symbolic programs of Russian thinking and social behavior, needs measures that should ensure its sustainable reproduction and enable its positive (in the ideal case, sustainable) development for some – at least the medium-term perspective. It is noted that "today the Russian society is experiencing a clear deficit of spiritual values: mercy, sympathy, compassion, support and mutual assistance – a deficit of what has historically made us stronger at all times, something that we have always been proud of" [7, p. 252]. Such social and historical symbolic programs as Russian love of freedom; search for freedom ("free will"); eschatologism: the value of moral and ethical retribution – posthumous (in the "Kingdom of God") or even lifetime; Russian flatland vigilance; "Russian hospitable reception" and "Russian tableful" (not reduced to mentally deviant behavior, that is, deviations or everyday drunkenness, as they often try to expose in Western pop culture); special Russian maximalism, monumentalism and gigantomania; extreme ("all or nothing"); Russian sweep and expanse – for example, as opposed to Western niggling; the bookish character of Russian culture and the culture of thinking reading of fundamental classics; the phenomena of the "Russian soul", "breadth of the Russian soul", "cordiality" – and, accordingly, such qualities of Russians as daring, maximalism, sociability, uncompromisingness; hospitality; spontaneity; cardiocentrism and cordiality (a Russian person "thinks with his heart, not with his mind," "the claims of reason have their limits"); panetism (the inevitability of ethical assessments from judgments) – and this list is by no means complete, these socio-historical symbolic programs, and the value and semantic cores embedded in them, are currently under attack by the all-consuming mass culture of the Western type, which turns any event and action into pretentious and pompous, and, precisely by this, a completely meaningless incoherent set of "clips", which nowadays often does not lend itself to rationalization at all in certain terms of common sense, but is generally illogical.

As a result, the national culture in its current form must absorb the social and historical symbolic programs that we inherited from the ancestors of our multinational Motherland, and its "products" (in the words of our Western partners), and set their normativeness among young people on the basis of the "new classics" in philosophy, and on a constructive, creative basis, forming the best ethical, moral, aesthetic, professional attitudes (professional – in the sense of the professions of doctors, military men, teachers, entrepreneurs, etc.).

The "new classics" in the field of ethics and philosophy should make it possible to normalize and standardize the consciousness and thinking of Russians – and, more broadly, around the world in a ratio approximately corresponding to:

- (1) in a formal sense – the aspect of the "new classics";
- (2) in the content aspect – the aspect of original cultures.

That is, drawing of "products of soft power" and the corresponding formatting and rationing into the formation, a new classic is taken in the aspect, at the level of concepts and categorical grids-formal aspect, and the content that would be distributed among the cells – according to *forms* as in accordance with the specifics of these local cultures – is a content aspect.

Thus, taking as a basis the categorical and archetypal grids of the "new classics" of ethics, philosophy, aesthetics, these grids should be filled with normative meaningful models based on Russian culture – including, first of all, those given above (Russian love of freedom; the search for "free will", eschatologism: the value of moral and ethical retribution, ... panetism etc.), and personify these norms in lofty

images of the defenders of the Fatherland, the wise Teacher (high Mentor), the Doctor, etc. – and endow these personified samples with qualities forged by Russian culture and nurtured in its depths for centuries and millennia, in contrast to the sick world of samples of social behavior and socio-historical symbolic programs found in the “works” (“products”) of Western “soft power”. At the same time, the categorical and archetypal grid, which will be taken as the formal basis for constructing norms, will be forged in the depths of the “new classics”.

The formation of the level of a nationwide independent cultural stratum capable of pushing the “mass culture” of the West to the periphery of Russians’ interest cannot *completely* follow a destructive path – by discrediting the “content” that is imposed by Western “soft power” (although such content is absolutely obliged to be present especially in relation to the promotion of non-traditional same-sex marriages and adoption of children in the context of this kind of “non-traditional” institutions): the products of our culture should exactly overlap, and not just cover, the requirements of modernity – both in the ethical sense (as far as classical Russian drama is concerned) and in the technical sense (in which Western cinema has undoubtedly succeeded).

Products of Western “soft power” – genre in their essence – are most often simply flawed in their ethical-value and moral-semantic aspects, they do not give the feeling of fundamentality that Russian thinking is aimed at. Western, mostly immoral, products are most often destructive: destroying and violating certain norms, for example, rejection of the absolute grid of good and evil (as, for example, in the famous TV series “LOST”, in the end of which one of the survivors remains mass murderer and manipulator), they offer nothing in return except “naked” denial, and direct a person’s thoughts to deny norms and rules.

The response moment in defense of Russian culture can serve as ethically-centered and morally-oriented products of soft power (which, at the same time, in the technical aspect should not be inferior to the products of Western culture), aimed at *developing traditions, norms and rules, and not at denying them*: in this case, the principle of correspondence is again brought to the fore – the new must preserve and develop the old, and not be build on its ruins (the old history that our country has already gone through is building a new world on the destroyed building of the old; in this respect, the methodological principle of correspondence is fair in relation to any and every activity and any and every tradition, indicating directions for finding ways of their evolution – the new is the heir and successor of the old, and not a denier of it).

**Conclusion.** Thus, measures to stop modern threats to the loss of Russian models of socio-historical symbolic programs of Russian thinking and social behavior affect processes that are much deeper and broader than competition in the field of technical equipment in the production of video products; they relate to the very foundations of human thinking – both the Americans and Europeans themselves, and, which is critical for our study, – the Russians.

These foundations require the construction of thinking at the level of the “new classics”, which would be able to synthesize the heritage of Hegel’s thinking – as well as the whole of German classical philosophy, both *Marx* and *Feuerbach* – with the legacy of postmodern thought, the so-called “Post-non-classical philosophy”. This synthesis should overcome the totalitarianism of Hegel’s thought with its attempts to fit everything and everyone into its own “system”, as well as the slackness, indiscipline, disorder of postmodern thought with its articulated, underlined and accentuated anti-systemism (*Nietzsche’s* essays, the experience of *Deleuze* and *Guattari’s* “Thousand Plateaus”, arranged in a rather arbitrary order, devoid of the “classical” logic of the placement and distribution of material in its treatise “version” – in the same order in which *Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel* and others).

In this regard, it will be necessary to develop a new format of philosophizing – which would guarantee orderliness (assuming the systematicity of classical philosophy), but at the same time would allow for non-linearity of reading and interpretation (taking into account the anti-systemicity of postmodern writing). Setting such a format is a matter for the future of philosophy, and not only in the narrow, Western sense, but in the sense of a kind of global-classical approach to writing philosophical texts.

In this philosophical attitude, the world is on the verge of a revolution that will affect all spheres of life of global humanity, and will be aimed, among other things, at preserving local diversity – its *formal canon* will be supplemented with specific material, and a vicious “surrogate culture” (“Mass culture”) will be pushed aside from the cultural agenda of the global society by genuine culture.

## Список источников

1. Самыгин С. И., Любецкий Н. П., Гафиатулина Н. Х. Социальное здоровье российской молодежи в эпоху глобализации. М., 2020. 235 с.
2. Vilasi A. Intelligence, Globalization, Complex and Multi-Level Society // *Open Journal of Political Science*. 2018. № 8. Pp. 47-56.
3. Zhang Y. Another Possible World—Reading Yuezhi Zhao, *Communication and Society: Political Economy and Culture Analysis* // *Chinese Studies*. 2018. № 7. Pp. 251-258.
4. Сулова Т. И. Глобализация: к вопросу идентичности русской культуры // *Век глобализации*. 2010. № 2. С. 154-162.
5. Фейерабенд П. К. Против метода. Очерк анархистской теории познания. М.: «АСТ», 2007.
6. Щедровицкий Г. П. Знак и деятельность. – М.: Восточная литература (издательство), 2005. 463 с.
7. Путин, В. В. Прямая речь [Текст]: в 3 т. / Владимир Путин. – 2-е изд. – М.: «Звонница-МГ»: Новый ключ, 2016. – Т. 1: Послания Федеральному Собранию... – 412, [4] с.

## References

1. Samygin S. I., Lyubetsky N. P., Gafiatulina N. Kh. Social health of Russian youth in the era of globalization. Moscow; 2020. 235 p. (In Russ.).
2. Vilasi A. Intelligence, Globalization, Complex and Multi-Level Society. *Open Journal of Political Science*. 2018 (8): 47–56.
3. Zhang Y. Another Possible World—Reading Yuezhi Zhao, *Communication and Society: Political Economy and Culture Analysis*. *Chinese Studies*. 2018 (7): 251–258.
4. Suslova T. I. Globalization: on the issue of the identity of Russian culture. *Vek globalizacii = The Age of Globalization*. 2010 (2): 154–162. (In Russ.).
5. Feyerabend P. K. *Against the method. Essay on the anarchist theory of knowledge*. Moscow: "AST"; 2007. (In Russ.).
6. Shchedrovitsky G. P. *Sign and activity*. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura (publishing house); 2005. 463 p. (In Russ.).
7. Putin, V. V. Direct speech [Text]: in 3 volumes / Vladimir Putin. – 2nd ed. – М.: "Zvonitsa-MG": New Key, 2016. – Vol. 1: Messages to the Federal Assembly ... – 412, [4] p. (In Russ.).

## Информация об авторах

Ж. В. Андриевская – канд. психолог. наук, доц. ЮФУ;  
 С. Г. Воскобойников – канд. ист. наук, доц. ДГТУ;  
 Т. В. Щукина – канд. ист. наук, доц. ДГТУ.

## Information about the authors

Zh. V. Andrievskaya – Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor of Southern Federal University;  
 S. G. Voskoboynikov – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of Don State Technical University;  
 T. V. Shchukina – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of Don State Technical University.

**Вклад авторов:** все авторы сделали эквивалентный вклад в подготовку публикации. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

**Contribution of the authors:** the authors contributed equally to this article. The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Статья поступила в редакцию 06.05.2022; одобрена после рецензирования 21.05.2022; принята к публикации 23.05.2022.

The article was submitted 06.05.2022; approved after reviewing 21.05.2022; accepted for publication 23.05.2022.