

# **THE POLITICS AND CULTURE INTERACTION IN THE CONTEXT OF NARRATIVE PRACTICES AS A MECHANISM OF THE IDENTITY SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION**

**Nikolay Baranov**

Chair professor, international relations Department  
North-West Institute of management branch of Ranepa, St. Petersburg  
Chair professor, political institutions and applied political studies  
Department, St. Petersburg state University  
E-mail: nic.baranov@gmail.com

## **Abstract**

The object of this research is the identification of political and cultural trends in modern Russian politics which are aimed at constructing the national and state identity of Russians. It is argued that Russian policy is built on the basis of the national past, applied, depending on different circumstances, to the present. Nevertheless, while remaining basically a country with dominating conservative values, Russia absorbs those features of a foreign political culture that at this stage of development are the most appropriate to the needs of society and which society is able to adopt, and rejects such features for which it is perceived that the majority of Russian citizens are not yet ready. Thus, the formation of narrative practices characterizing the continuity and coherence of Russian policy in modern conditions is not yet finished. Identity is considered as a political category determined by a person's values, emotional perception of socio-political reality, as well as rationally motivated interests and needs. The emphasis is placed on the macropolitical identity, including the national-state identity, which is the object of the state and interest groups targeting, the policy of the identity formation and construction. The author tried to justify the formation of a civil political culture and world, which appeared due to technological and social changes to be taking place in the country, and which will contribute to the change of the existing conservative paradigm, where the formation of national-state identity of the Russians takes place.

**Key words:** *political culture, cultural paradigm, cultural and value-based conflict, national-state identity, political identity.*

### **Introduction**

In the early 1960s, American political scientist Gabriel Almond began to use the term political culture to identify the system of symbols, beliefs, and values that make it possible to determine the situation in which a political action takes place. Since then, in the political studies of modern societies, cultural approaches indicate the increasing importance of culture for political practice. The result was a “cultural paradigm, suggesting the dependenceN. Fedotova, S. Chugrov, 2019, p. 397). The authors of the fundamental work *Modern Political Science: Methodology* focused on the incompleteness of the cultural paradigm of political science as a general concept of cultural influence on politics and as a specific theory of cultural research of a particular policy.

The cultural and value conflict between Russia and Western countries, which was clearly manifested in the 2010s, initiated interest in the political and cultural studies that underlie the emerging interstate relations. Lack of understanding of modern Russian politics, sometimes even surprising, shows the socio-cultural differences between Russia and most European countries. This can be seen as a different set of narrative practices through which the social practices of continuity and coherence are provided by the narrative. In relation to the study of modern Russian political features, the term “national narrative” can be applied. By this O. Yu. Malinova means the semantic scheme of historical narrative that describes and explains the genealogy of the community believed to be a nation, establishing connections between events. These types of scheme, in her opinion, “set the templates for the interpretation of specific episodes from the past, acting as a crucial mechanism of social construction of identity” (Malinova, 2015, p. 6).

After the large-scale events of the late twentieth century, which became the basis for the formation of new nation states, the academic environment is increasingly turning to the category of identity. This phenomenon is studied by representatives of social and political sciences in order to find answers to the questions of modern social development in the context of global challenges and threats to nation states. To a greater extent, the problem of identity is relevant for transforming societies undergoing periods of “gathering of the nation”, which are at the stages of a new state formation, providing for the unity of citizens around the national idea. Therefore, the issues of self-identification acquire national importance due to the strategic significance of the choice of each within the parameters set by political institutions.

The democratic vector of development, which has become a priority for the majority of the modern states, involves the formation of a person with an active citizenship, which radically affects the policy of identity. Under these circumstances, according to E. Paina and S. Fedyunina, “membership

of a nation is determined by moral and political loyalty to a national community, unified civil identity and separation from other members of the shared cultural heritage” (Pain, Fedyunin, 2017, p.49).

In recent years, the concept of identity has become widely used in political science studies, which “is explained by the potential it has for understanding the motivation of social and political behavior, as well as for constructing public policy tools and practices on this basis” (Russian Arctic, 2016, p.4).

In political science, the questions of identity are studied in the works of Rogers Brubaker, Erik Erickson, Charles Tilly, I. S. Semenenko, E. V. Morozova, V. V. Lapkin, L. M. Drobizheva, S. V. Ryzhova, S. S. Savoskul, K. S. Gadjiev, V. A. Achkasov, O. V. Popova, O. Yu. Malinova among others. In the 2010s, encyclopedic and monographic editions were published under the editorship of I. S. Semenenko: *Political identity and Identity Politics* (2011, 2012) in two volumes and *Identity: The Individual, Society and Politics*. (2017). These works revealed the terms and ideas conceptualizing identity as a category in political science, and enriched the experience of identity, with systematic consideration through the prism of political analysis as a factor of social and political changes of the present.

The aim of this current work is to identify political and cultural trends in modern Russian politics, aimed at constructing the present by referring to the chain of historical events, confirming the close relationship in the political and ideological context. The policy built on the basis of the national past, applied, depending on various circumstances, to the present, to a large extent forms the national and state identity of Russians.

### **Identity as a political category**

Identity as a scientific category is studied in different fields of the social sciences and humanities. The American sociologist Rogers Brubaker writes that “the term identity proved highly resonant” (Brubaker, 2004, p. 30) in the 1960s, and was a consequence of the “mass society” problems and the youth revolution of the time. E. Erikson described identity as “a process located at the core of the individual and yet also at the core of his communal culture, a process which establishes... the identity of those two identities” (Erikson, 1968, p. 22). That is, in identity, according to the American psychologist, combine two principles, personal and social. In addition, Tilly defines identity as “an actor’s experience of a category, tie, role, network, group or organization, coupled with a public representation of that experience; the public representation often takes the form of a shared story, a narrative.” (Tilly, 1996, p. 7).

Political science is primarily interested in the formation of political identity, as well as identity policy implemented by various actors in the

group, local, regional, national or supranational interests. According to Semenenko, “the use of the identity concept in political analysis is designed to solve the problem of theoretical and methodological synthesis of the complex foundations of the social activities of value, determined by the spiritual guidance and moral attitudes of the human, the emotional, given his mental warehouse, and rationally motivated interests and needs” (Semenenko, 2019, p. 447). The identity concept defines a person's place in the social community, as well as the motivation of individual choice in certain socio-political conditions.

The concept of “political identity” is multifaceted. Thus, Popova believes that it “describes the installation of the political consciousness of an individual or social group in relation to the institutions of government, political leaders, relevant issues related to political issues” (Popova, 2002, p. 253). In accordance with the ideological and political orientations, the individual is identified with certain political communities that differ not only in ideological grounds, but also in political claims and interests. Anchored at the collective level, political identity determines individual and group political behavior.

Due to the fact that political identity is used to study party identity and electoral behavior connected with social and ideological priorities of the individual in the political process, Malinova introduces the concept of macropolitical identity, which refers to identification with a wider community and presupposes the presence of solidarity over borders related to political and ideological preferences. In her opinion, “this term covers all the bases of identification of the reviewing community present in the public discourse, and allows for the analysis of emerging semantic conflicts” (Malinova, 2010, pp. 90-91). Macropolitical identity can be considered as the basis for such concepts as “civil-state (national-civil) identity”, “Russian identity”, “political nation”. The macro-political identity also includes nation-state or national identity, as it is influenced by the state and interest groups, the policy of formation and construction of identity (Semenenko, 2011, p.11).

A kind of political identity is civil identity, for which the theme of citizenship is decisive. Civil identity is manifested in the commitment of citizens to the principles and norms of the laws of the state and democratic political representation, awareness of their civil rights and obligations, responsibility, personal freedom, recognition of the priority of public interests over narrow groups. Some researchers correlate citizenship with the nation, believing that it is “national identity that turns out to be political – the very frame of reference that regularizes the self-determination of the individual in this world” (Panov, 2011, pp. 47-48). Drobizheva points out that “ideally, civil identity is a collective identity, binding ethnic, social,

economic, socio-cultural communities that interact in the composition of the political nation” (Drobizheva, 2018, p.104). At the same time, “national identity can be interpreted as self-identification with a set of ideas associated with the nation-state community, with obligations, rights in relation to other members of this community and to the state, allowing the individual to relate himself to it” (Semenenko, 2009, p.11). In this context the citizenship or national affiliation is the primary factor, while the identity is the secondary factor.

The essence of identity politics is to convince people of the need for solidarity in order to proclaim the unity of the group and is related to the involvement of minorities in the struggle for the protection of the rights of communities disadvantaged in social status. As noted by Morozov and Semenenko, “identity politics has become a mechanism of self-organization of new political subjects within the framework of their struggle for recognition of difference for new alternatives of development in different areas of social life” (Morozov, Semenenko, 2015, p.173).

Subjects of identity politics are the state, political parties and other actors of the political process, including non-governmental, involved in the formation and maintenance of national, civil and other forms of macro-political identity, practices of targeted action and interaction between the government and interest groups to shape the overall values and guidelines for the development of the political community (Semenenko, 2019, p. 454).

A unified political identity is most helpful to the state, which has a variety of resources to influence public consciousness, popular politicians and public figures, well-known scientists, representatives of the expert community. In the context of the information society, it becomes possible for less well-known people, using modern communication technologies, to influence the identity politics. At the same time an important detail should be noted: without the support of society, without people's faith in the declared values, it is impossible to carry out a general solidarity mobilization in order to unite the nation or part of society.

Identity politics includes symbolic politics, educational and cultural politics, language politics, and memory politics. National researchers note a highly important role of an expanse of the identity politics, especially in deeply divided societies, social policy and politics in the field of interethnic relations. In the conditions of a new state, identity politics is actively used as a tool of implementation of the state development strategy (Semenenko, Lapkin, Bardin, Pantin, 2017, p.58).

### **Interaction of politics and culture in the Russian context**

In the context of modern Russian politics, as in the politics of many other states, there are the political and cultural foundations, the traditions

inherent to the people in the sphere of state power, their embodiment and development in the modern context, influence on the conditions of formation of the future policy. Russia turned out to be the country that, failing to become a successful market economy and not completing democratic institutions, due to the usual extensive development and strong effective enlightened and personalistic government managed to achieve some success, thus giving rise to other countries that have not coped with the liberal-market and democratic reforms, hopes for successful development in another, not liberal democratic paradigm.

In scientific discourse, political culture is most often considered as a political dimension of the cultural environment in a particular society, as a characteristic of the behavior of a particular people, the features of its civilizational development. In this sense, political culture expresses the movement of the traditions inherent in the people in the sphere of state power, their embodiment and development in the modern context, the impact on the conditions for the future policy formation.

Political culture is formed over decades and centuries. It is the result of cognition of objective political processes and corresponding conclusions. Therefore, without studying its genesis, formation, dynamics of internal differences and integrity, the analysis of the political culture specificity is impossible. The specificity due to the peculiarities of historical development, allows us to speak about the special genotype of the Russian political culture. Thus, the formation of statehood was greatly influenced by the Veche culture of Ancient Russia, the specifics of which consisted in the rejection of innovations that threatened the established order and rules, in the focus on the local world's reproduction. Echoes of such archaic character still exist.

Russia's geographical location between Europe and Asia has had a major impact on Russian society. The country has found itself at the intersection of two socio-cultural types: European or personality centric, which focuses on freedom and natural rights of the individual, and Asian, or socio-centric, which focuses on society, group, state. At the same time, the interaction of these two socio-cultural types in Russian society is very peculiar: it contemplates not only the interweaving and mutual enrichment of both types content, but also a continuous struggle between them. Arising on this basis, dualism, duality, inconsistency and conflict of political culture is most prominently reflected to this day in the confrontation of Westerners and national loyalists, the Western model of development and the model of the original path of Russia. T. I. Zaslavskaya proposed culturally to recognize Russia as "a marginal member of the European family, as far as it occupies there about the same place as Pluto in the Solar system" (Zaslavskaya, 2004, p.63).

Both domestic and foreign researchers write a lot about Russian uncertainties regarding Russia's self-determination. Thus, describing the Russian ambivalence during the first years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the French historian and political scientist H  l  ne Carr  red'Encausse noted, "Russia was torn between the European mission, to which it continued to aspire, but which she was passed, and the opportunities open to her in Asia" (Carr  red'Encausse, 2010, p. 3). As an epigraph for her research, the French researcher chose a quote from the work of N. A. Berdyaev: "Russia needs to be aware of yourself and the West, North-West, connector of two worlds, not divider" (As quoted in d'Encausse p. 5).

Another French researcher Arnaud Leclercq, specializing in geopolitics of Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries, emphasizes that "every time Russia aspired to be just a European power, it experienced disappointment and lost its position as a strong state capable of controlling the destinies of the world. On the contrary, whenever it managed to find a balance between Europe and Asia, Russia was at the peak of its power" (Leclercq, 2014, p.25).

According to Singapore politician Bilahari Kausikan, "the Eurasian idea in its modern incarnation is the most recent swing of the historical pendulum after the almost catastrophic experiments on Westernization of "shock therapists" in the early post-Soviet period." B. Kausikan states: "the fate of Russia is to be considered "Asian" in the West and "Western" in Asia" (Kausikan, 2016, p.33).

The specifics of Russia's role and place were also determined by the vast geopolitical space in which peoples with different types of cultures coexisted. Under these conditions, a pronounced statist orientation of political culture was formed. According to E. Batalov, in Russia the state is perceived as the backbone of civilization, the guarantor of the integrity and existence of society, the organizer of the whole life (Batalov, 2002, p. 7-22). In the absence of civil society, this perception reflected the real role of the state, not only in tsarist times, but also in the Soviet period, when it was necessary to keep the victory of socialism in the capitalist environment (The capitalist environment refers to the rest of Europe). Without a strong state to achieve international recognition, it was impossible, so the Bolsheviks' government did everything possible for the statist orientation of Soviet political culture. In the post-Soviet period, the statist tradition was weakened, but it soon resumed with the strengthening of the role of the Federal center, which was the reason for the strengthening of the vertical of power.

The State-centricity results in sacralization of Supreme power, i.e. its persistent perception as authorized by inhuman forces. The invariable attribute of the leader's image in the mass consciousness is not the ability to

coordinate positions and reach a compromise, but the ability to impose one's will. The leader appears to be the main object of paternalistic expectations, aided by the enduring historical memory of "benefactor fathers" drawn from the Russian political tradition. As a result, there was a belief that only on the sovereign, his mind and enlightenment depend the welfare of the country.

The history of the Russian state is closely connected with Orthodoxy. The Orthodox Church was the spiritual support of the Russians, opposed the Muslim East and the Catholic West. The Orthodox faith played an important role in the formation of ideas about the Russian greatness, its scale, patriotism and devotion to the Fatherland, the special way of Russia, which became the most important components of the political consciousness of Russians. The Russian Orthodox Church actively participates in the political life of the country, supporting moral, from its point of view, initiatives of the political authorities aimed at strengthening the traditional values of the state.

The nature and direction of general cultural orientations reveals the place of political phenomena in the structure of values of the individual, group and society. The significance of worldview orientations lies in the extent to which a person's choice of political positions depends on his or her preferences for individual or group values. Thus, Russian history shows, in contrast to the Western states, which experienced the impact of capitalism, that the inhabitants of our country for centuries focused mainly on the norms of communal collectivism. It embodied the priority of the interests of the family, community, estate, group, class, state, society over the goals and values of the individual, the needs of the individual. "The values of order, stability, and sustainability in the Russian "project" are associated with the idea of community, symbolic unity in the collective unity of "we", noticed Glebova (Glebov, 2006, p.68). Such collective unity in the conditions of modern confrontation with the leading Western powers is the guarantor of political stability and sustainability of power.

Due to objective circumstances, connected with the international subjectivity Russia will always feel the need for a strong, effective state, which cannot but affect the political culture. In a democratic state, power is limited by citizens defending a private or group interest and acting within the framework of civil society. Therefore, antistatism in political culture should not be aimed at the destruction of the state, but at limiting its expansionist tendencies, overcoming paternalistic expectations and developing the ability to self-organization.

From the point of view of A. Akhiezer, "society cannot ensure its existence in an increasingly complex world without involving an increasing number of people in the process of dialogization. The central task of political science in post-Soviet society is to find the ways to reproduce liberal culture,



the socio-cultural foundation of which is still weak, thus improving society and the state, contributing to the achievement of a basic consensus, overcoming the split between all elements of moral schematism. And this requires a certain moral ground – primarily the development of humanism (which at the time were not accepted by the spiritual elite of Byzantine culture), the Christian idea of love, the displacement to the periphery of the culture of aggressiveness, hatred, the belief that “the world lies under the sway of the wicked one”, renouncement (the latter was actively derived from the Byzantine heritage)” (Akhiezer, 2002, p.74).

### **Russia's attempts to get out of the "historical rut"**

The disappointment in the Soviet way of life in the late 1980s-early 1990s led to the need of perceiving of values that are not typical for Russian society, but attractive in terms of their implementation in real life, revealed. However, the inability of the practical application of these values, both for subjective and objective reasons, pushed society to the value based priorities that were habitual, confirming the relevance of D. North's theory of path dependence (North, 1997, p.130), which explains the institutional changes by the society's system of values, informal norms and rules that have deep roots in the people' lives and are associated with the stereotypes of the large groups of population behavior.

Nikolayeva calls such a trend in the development of Russian society “archaization” – changes that are accompanied by the revival of social relations and forms typical for the earliest stages of social development. In her opinion, the processes of archaization explain the growing popularity of the concepts of Auzan’s “historical rut” in modern Russian economic science, North’s of path dependence. At the same time, neither culture, nor traditions and mentality serve as the determining factor, but the renewal of “archaic economic relations, entangling like a web all economic and distribution processes” (Nikolaev, 2016).

The open-mindedness to archaic models of perception of the world U. G. Nikolayeva connects with the anomie of Russian society after the crisis of the 1990s. In Russia, the archaism is exacerbated by the fact that the government is pleased to support the desires of the mainstream population, and often deliberately forms such sentiments, operating with loud statements: “revival of the great power”, “restoration of national traditions”, searching for a “special way”, acquisition of “high spirituality”, etc. In the context of high-tech propaganda, primarily television, a cultural and ideological matrix is imposed on the public consciousness already prepared by anomie, and with all the necessary images of “friends” and “enemies”, “patriots” and “traitors”.

We can agree with the researchers who raised the following question: is it really necessary for Russia to accept all the liberal values that are currently confessed in the West, and “whether Russia is able to propose its own model, with equal levels of freedom and prosperity, but a more rational approach to moral values, which would not contradict the aspirations and culture of the majority of its population?” (Lukin A., Lukin P., 2015, p. 381). According to M. Ya. Gefter, Russia cannot measure its evolvement only with the Western type of development, but it is forced to consider the world experience, within which giant contradictions and faults are combined with the universality that we need (Gefter, 2000, p.74).

Another reason for the appearance of the conservative demand existing in Russian society is a reaction of society to the anti-Russian policy of Western countries. Any actions taken by the West against Russia, which seem to be unfair from the Russian point of view, form the basis of the authoritarian trend of the country, which actually caused the mobilization against the West, rallying the government and the society, . It is necessary to agree with G. Yavlinsky who thinks that “If, after the end of the cold war, Western countries had included Russia in the existing world order on terms that would have been perceived by the Russian political class and the majority of citizens as worthy”, the attitude to power, historically formed in the Russian public consciousness, would have been different (Yavlinsky, 2015, p.69-70).

The post-Imperial syndrome that gripped the Russians after the Ukrainian events, aimed at uniting the “Russian world” as opposed to the West, largely acted as a consolidating factor between society and the government, minimized the demands of citizens within the framework of domestic policy. Zubarevich believes that “support for Putin's policy of “collecting Russian lands” will remain for a long time, this is a value choice of the vast majority of Russians, regardless of where they live” (Zubarevich, 2016).

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century there was a transformation of the Russian political system dominated by the influence of the conservative trends, shared by a large part of the population and implemented both in foreign and domestic political practice. This vector of its development was implemented in the policy of President Vladimir Putin, who, according to Lukin, matches social and political ideals as a set of “dominant ideas about what should be the power in the country and what policies the government should pursue” (Lukin A., Lukin P., 2015, p. 277).

We can agree with opinion of the Russian scientist that “it's not V. V. Putin who created an authoritarian regime in Russia, but the post-Soviet political culture and unsuccessful reforms brought him and his authoritarian program to power” (Lukin A., Lukin P., 2015, p.341). A special role in this

program is assigned to the state as it reduced the influence of civil institutions.

Russia began to implement a great-power policy regardless the Western states before the invitation to the club of world powers that determines the fate of the planet. This policy, which is supported by the majority of the population, was not a revelation to the West, because, according to Kissinger, “its policy has pursued a special rhythm of its own over the centuries” (Kissinger, 2014, p.49).

The offensive policy of the authorities with their socially conservative positions, political failures of the liberal opposition forces, their inability to reach an agreement in the confrontation with the authorities led to a decrease in the demand for liberal ideas and democratic practices in the political regime. As a result, the dominant factor in the citizens' self-identification was the policy aimed at recreating the Great Russia. The support of compatriots, which has manifested itself in recent years, enlarges the overall state policy based on historical justice, great-powerness, the uniqueness of the Russian way and patriotism. Moreover, such a policy is correlated with the expectations of the population, which mostly supports the political power that implements it. Auzan describes this situation as readiness for self-restraint in exchange for belonging to a Great Power”, which the Russian economist associates with the return “to the traditional Russian state contract, when people relate themselves to the state and its capabilities” (Auzan, 2014).

It is hard not to agree with Fan, who believes that “each of the stereotypes common in mass culture and consciousness, a special way, great-powerness, special Russian mentality, unity, is a product of mythologization and ideologization of reality. These stereotypes, as elements purposefully formed Imperial ideology, simplify and replace the reality, preventing the understanding and solution of problems of society in all their complexity” (Fan, 2016, p. 255).

At the same time, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, characterized by openness to global change, the thesis of great-powerness faces a problem. Thus, according to Tulchinsky, “in modern society the greatness of a country is determined not so much by the size, resources and military power, as its ‘prestige’, the appeal for ‘new people’, the human capital, which is the development trend of society” (Tulchinsky, 2014, p. 117). Indeed, the need to create decent living conditions in Russian society is increasing, which indicates a decrease in the importance of great-power consolidation of society and power. The need for change is proved by the results of the surveys. Thus, the analytical center of Yuri Levada gives the following data: more than a half of young people aged 18 to 24 years old (53%) surveyed in

September 2019 expressed the willingness to leave for permanent residence abroad (Emigration moods, 2019).

It should be noted that the content of cultures of the past is used by Russian authorities carefully selecting only things that legitimizes the existing political regime (Fan, 2016, p. 247). However, the conservative filling of the social and political space in modern Russia, associated with the appeal to historical values and familiar political institutions, provides stability in the short term. To change the situation, it is necessary to form a political system with an open social environment, effectively functioning political institutions, a developed civil society and a modernized political elite. And after the geopolitical processes of recent years, it became obvious that the democratization of the political system is not the area of interest of external actors. Only Russians – citizens who care about the effectiveness of institutions and practices in Russian politics, can accomplish this feat. At the same time, we can agree with Malinova who claims that “in many respects formal character of the declared values is the main obstacle for constructing a new historical narrative capable of binding the past with the present and the future” (Malinova, 2015, p. 176).

### **Conclusion**

In the context of globalization, researchers' ideas about culture are changing. Thus, according to the fundamental UN report on human development published in 2004, culture is understood as subject to change multidimensional space of interpersonal relationships in which people define themselves not only through ethnicity but also through language, class, political views, civil role (Pain, Fedyunin, 2017, p. 99). The ongoing political and cultural changes give reason to believe that in modern Russia a civil culture, which will be of a mixed nature, can be formed, as it is impossible to move forward, denying everything that was created by previous generations. The main sources of such culture can be modern political practice, which through legal acts will acquire a legitimate character; Western political culture, which is a source of necessary values; national tradition, correcting the emerging political culture. Civil culture will contribute to the change of the current conservative paradigm, within which the formation of the national and state identity of Russians is carried out.

Russia is a country that is looking for its way in the 21st century. The development vector for a country is the defining category for its characterization as a modern or archaic state. Inozemtsev calls Russia the “outdated country” moving in the wrong direction, not in that chosen by successful countries, but “on the wrong side of the road” (Inozemtsev, 2018, p.24). Despite such an unattractive image, described by a fairly consistent opponent of the government, it should be noted that changes are taking place

in the country, and these changes are associated with the socio-cultural perception of the reality by the majority of the population. Building a future in an information society is impossible without considering the interests of the younger generation, which is increasingly less focused on traditional values and supports those that truly respond to the needs of effective development. The political authorities have to consider this opinion and adjust the cultural and value orientations. Therefore, progress towards modernity is the only way to preserve the country as a mature entity in the modern world.

### **Acknowledgments**

The research was financially supported by the grant of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research No. 19-011-31616 "State policy in the field of identity formation: conceptual foundations, technologies and prospects", 2019.

### **References**

- Akhiezer A. Specificity of Russian political culture and the subject of political science (Historical and cultural research). *Pro et Contra*. 2002. No. 3. Pp. 51-76. (in Russian)
- Auzan A. A. "Willingness to self-restraint in exchange for belonging to a great power." 29.10.2014. Available at: [https://globalaffairs.ru/ukraine\\_crysis/Gotovnost-k-samoogranicheniyam-v-obmen-na-prinadlezhnost-k-velikoi-derzhave-17065](https://globalaffairs.ru/ukraine_crysis/Gotovnost-k-samoogranicheniyam-v-obmen-na-prinadlezhnost-k-velikoi-derzhave-17065) (accessed: 21.09.2019).
- Batalov, E. Political culture of Russia through the prism of civic culture. *Pro et Contra*. 2002. No. 3. Pp. 7-22. (in Russian)
- Berdyaev N. A. *Sud'ba Rossii: opyty po psihologii vojny I nacional'nosti* [The fate of Russia's experiments in psychology of war and ethnic]. Reprint edition (original edition was published in 1918). Moscow, Filosofskoe obshchestvo SSSR publ., 1990.
- Brubaker R. *Ethnicity without groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Drobizheva L. M. Russian identity: discussions in political space and dynamics of mass consciousness. *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya* [Polis. Political studies]. 2018, No 5, pp. 100-115. (in Russian)
- D'Encausse Helena Carrera, *L'Empire d'Eurasie. Une histoire de l'Empire russe de 1552 à nos jours*. Paris: Fayard, 2005. (Rus. ed. d'Encausse, Helena Carrera *Evrazijskaya imperiya istoriya Rossijskoj*

- imperii s 1552 g. do nashih dnei. Translation from French by A.A. Peshkova. Moscow, Rossijskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya publ., 2010.) Translation into English was made by the author.
- Erikson E.H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. - N.Y.: Norton, 1968.
- Emigration moods. Yuri Levada Analytical center. Available at: [https://polit.ru/article/2016/01/17/four\\_russians/](https://polit.ru/article/2016/01/17/four_russians/) (accessed: 26.11.2019).
- Fan I.B. Mass consciousness in the bonds of imperial culture: the construction of traditions. Rossiya v poiskah ideologij: transformaciya cennostnyh reguljatorov sovremennyh obshchestv [Russia searching for the ideologies: the transformation of the value regulators of modern societies]. Edited by V.S. Mart'yanov, L.G. Fishman. Moscow. Politicheskaya enciklopediya Publ. 2016. P. 239-264.
- Gefter M. Ya. Rossiya. Dialogi voprosov. [Russia. The questions' dialogues]. Moscow, Utopos publ., 2000. (in Russian)
- Glebova I. I. Politicheskaya kul'tura Rossii: obrazy proshlogo i sovremennost'. [Russian political culture: images of the past and the present. Moscow, Nauka publ., 2006. (in Russian)
- Identity: The Individual, Society and Politics. An Encyclopaedia. Executive editor Semenenko I.S. Moscow "Vesmir" publ. Moscow 2017.
- Inozemtsev V. Nesovremennayastrana: Rossiya v mire XXI veka [Non-modern country: Russia in the world of the XXI century] Moscow, Alpina Publisher publ., 2018. (in Russian)
- Kausikan B. The End of the Cold War. Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn', 2016, No. 2. pp. 28-40. (in Russian)
- Kissinger H. World order. Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History, Penguin UK, 378 p. (Rus. ed. Kissinger H. Mirovoj poryadok. Moscow, AST publ., 2015.)
- Leclerc A. Russkoevliyanie v Evrazii: Geopoliticheskaya istoriya ot stanovleniya gosudarstva do vremen Putina [Russian influence in Eurasia: Geopolitical history from the formation of the state to the times of Putin]. Moscow, Alpina Publisher publ., 2014. (in Russian)
- Lukin A.V., Lukin P. V. Umom Rossiyu ponimat' [Understanding Russia mentally] "Ves mir" publ., 2015. (in Russian)
- Malinova O. Yu. Relevant past: Simvolicheskaya politika vlastvuyushchej elity i dilemmy rossijskoj identichnosti [Symbolic politics of the ruling elite and dilemmas of Russian identity], Moscow, Politicheskaya enciklopediya publ., 2015.
- Malinova O. Yu. Symbolic politics and construction of macropolitical identity in post-Soviet Russia. Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya [Polis. Political studies]. 2010, No 2. Pp. 90-105. (in Russian)

- Modern political science: methodology: Scientific publication] / Executive editor Gaman-Golutvina, A. I. Nikitin. 2nd ed., revised and updated. Moscow, Aspect Press publ., 2019.
- Morozova E. V., Semenenko I. S. Dynamics of identity development in the modern world: some trends. Problemy nacional'noj bezopasnosti Rossii: uroki istorii i vyzovy sovremenosti. To the 70th anniversary of victory in the Great Patriotic war. Proceedings of the international scientific and educational conference, May 22-26, 2015 / executive editor A.A. Zajcev. Krasnodar. (in Russian) Tradiciya publ., 2015. Pp. 171-175.
- Nikolaeva U.G. Shall Russia face new middle Ages? Nezavisimaya Gazeta. 2016. October 25. Available at: [http://www.ng.ru/stsenarii/2016-10-25/9\\_6843\\_middleages.html](http://www.ng.ru/stsenarii/2016-10-25/9_6843_middleages.html) (accessed: 21.09.2019).
- North D. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. [Rus. ed. Instituty, institucional'nye izmeneniya i funkcionirovanie ekonomiki. Moscow, Fond ekonomicheskoy knigi "Nachala" publ., 1997.]
- Pain E., Fedyunin S. Naciya i demokratiya: perspektivy upravleniya kul'turnym raznoobraziem [Nation and democracy: perspectives of cultural diversity management]. Moscow, Mysl' publ., 2017.
- Panov P. V. National identity: variants of social construction of the world picture. Identichnost' kak predmet politicheskogo analiza. Moscow IMEMO RAN, 2011, pp. 47-51.
- Political identity and identity politics: In 2 volumes Vol. 1: Identichnost' kak kategoriya politicheskoy nauki: slovar' terminov i ponyatij [Identity as a category of political science: dictionary of terms and concepts] / executive editor I. S. Semenenko. Moscow, Rossijskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya (ROSSPEN) publ., 2011, (in Russian)
- Political identity and identity politics: In 2 volumes Vol. 2: Identity and socio-political changes in the XXI century. Executive editor Semenenko I.S. Moscow Rossijskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya (ROSSPEN) publ., 2012 (in Russian)
- Popova O. V. Politicheskaya identifikaciya v usloviyah transformacii obshchestva [Political identification in the conditions of society transformation]. St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University publ., 2002. (in Russian)
- Rossijskaya Arktika v poiskah integral'noj identichnosti [The Russian Arctic searching an integral identity]: collective monograph. / Executive editor O. B. Podvintsev. Moscow Novyj hronograf publ., 2016. (in Russian)

- Semenenko I. S. Concept of identity in the study of politics. *Sovremennaya politicheskaya nauka: Metodologiya: Nauchnoe izdanie* [Modern political science: Methodology: Scientific publication] / Executive editor Gaman-Golutvina, A. I. Nikitin. 2nd ed., revised and updated. Moscow, Aspect Press publ., 2019. Pp. 446-463. (in Russian)
- Semenenko I. S. Dilemmas of national identity: political risks and social gains. *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya*, 2009, No 6. Pp. 8-23. (in Russian)
- Semenenko I. S. Identity in the subject field of political science. *Identichnost' kak predmet politicheskogo analiza* [Identity as a subject of political analysis]. Moscow, IMEMO RAN, 2011. Pp. 8-12. (in Russian)
- Semenenko I. S., Lapkin V. V., Bardin A. L., Pantin V. I. Between state and nation: dilemmas of identity policy in the post-Soviet space. *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya* [Polis. Political studies], 2018, No 5. Pp. 54-78. (in Russian)
- Tilly Ch. (ed.). *Citizenship, Identity and Social History*. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 1-17.
- Tulchinsky G. L. *Rossijskaya politicheskaya kul'tura: osobennosti i perspektivy* [Russian political culture: features and prospects]. St. Petersburg. Aletejya publ., 2014. (in Russian)
- Yavlinsky G. A. *Periferijnyj avtoritarizm. Kak ikudaprišla Rossiya* [Peripheral authoritarianism. How and where did Russia come]. Moscow, Medium publ., 2015. (in Russian)
- Zaslavskaya T. I. *Sovremennoe rossijskoe obshchestvo: Social'nyj mekhanizm transformacii* [Modern Russian society: Social mechanism of transformation.] Moscow, Delo publ. 2004.
- Zubarevich N. Four Russias and a new political reality. *Polit.ru*. 17.01.2016. Available at: [https://polit.ru/article/2016/01/17/four\\_russians/](https://polit.ru/article/2016/01/17/four_russians/) (accessed: 21.09.2019).