

## Modernity, Memory and Political Caring on the Longue Duree of Social Transformations in Russia

Vitaly V. Penskoi, Tamara I. Lipich, Pavel A. Olkhov and Elena N. Motovnikova  
Belgorod State University, Pobedy St. 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

**Abstract:** In study results of research of socio-political events and ethic and political structures in Russia in XVI, the beginning of the XVIII centuries are stated. The large-scale modernization undertaken in Petrovsky Russia as researchers of study believe was followed by preservation enough archaic social institutes which foundation was laid during an era of the Russian Middle Ages and simplification of social structure of society in general. This modernization was continuation of that tradition of political care of unity of the Russian world which was modern both in Moscow and in Petrovsky Russia. This tradition remains during all subsequent periods of social transformations in Russia, except for the short-term excesses of historical unconsciousness coming at the time of revolutions of the 10-20th and the beginning of the 90th of the XX century.

**Key words:** Russian history, modernization, social transformations, social memory, political care

---

### INTRODUCTION

The vivid current of the Russian history at the end of XX, the first decades of the XXI centuries forces all of us, contemporaries of this history to raise a question of uniqueness of the occurring events possibilities of the general, ontologic understanding of those social transformations which happen to the multimillion people of Russia. Except tools of the historiographic analysis and historical imagination at the disposal of the researcher are social memory in which space hopes for updating, religious resistance and aspiration to vital openness, “eternally matron’s” (N. Berdyaev), Russian responsiveness. There is no need to retell archetypic meanings of this memory, “the Russian idea” which attention was paid by the best Russian thinkers from A.S. Pushkin to N.Y. Danilevsky, V.S. Solovyov, N.A. Berdyaev, A.S. Lappo-Danilevsky, A. Toynbee or L.N. Gumilev (Lipich, 2012; Olkhov, 2011; Paquette, 2000; McNeill, 1990; Mackenney, 1993).

In the opinion, the appeal to ethic and political aspects of this memory to historical traces of political care which made itself felt in the historical past of the country is actual. The period of updating of the Russian history when all a little noticeable manifestations of public life underwent large-scale modernization is very productive for this purpose, probably, one of the most eventful. Still, were its ontologic foundations that much shaken?

### MAIN POINTS

“Long” XVI century of the Euroasian history (by analogy with “the Long Middle Ages” of Le Goff and

“time of big duration”, “La Longue Duree” F. Brodel) began in the 10th g of the XVI century and came to the end at the end of the XVII century. It is some kind of “axial time” of a historical modernist style. Discovery of America together with the beginning of an era of Great geographical discoveries and the European colonial expansion, shift of an economic life axis of the same Europe from the basin of the Mediterranean Sea on the Northwest, “revolution of prices” and “military revolution”, the begun loss process by the East of former world leadership and its gradual transition to the West, etc., all this testified that “the mole of history” (K. Marx) accelerated the work. Multiple social transformations time got the most unexpected both character and a shade in Russia.

Arisen at the end of the XV century. The Russian (Moscow) State represented “a scrappy blanket” at the beginning. The social structure which yet did not become numb, flexible could react quickly to the changing conditions, social elevators worked rather effectively, existence of various models of social behavior created certain prospects for the political competition and a choice. The power of existence of the Russian state was very far at the beginning from a monolith and represented a conglomerate of the groups “parties” connected from within territorial, related and the patron client communications. The grand-ducal power acted as some kind of Supreme arbitrator both in relation to these “parties” and to the society, guaranteeing it a certain level of the rights and freedoms inherited “from old times”.

However, “long” XVI century was according to the apt remark of R. Makkenni, “an age of expansion”, the requirement in which for political elite of Russia was essential (Mackemey, 1993). The friable not structured and not put in a rigid political and hierarchical and legal framework organization of society and its institutes could remain successfully for quite a long time. But, the Russian State arose in the territory of not the most favorable from the economic point of view (adverse in comparison, suppose, with Western Europe, climate; extreme poverty on the natural resources, first of all non-ferrous metals, major for development of economy; poor soils; the rare and small population, besides disseminated through the considerable territory). Insufficiency of resources caused that circumstance that according to the Russian historian N.N. Pokrovsky, the control system was based on interaction and the section of powers between the state and society. Without having physical capacity to control everything, the central power shared the powers with “earth”, attracting to the solution of administrative tasks primary socio-political structures country and city (“posadsky”) communities, corporations the sluzhily (“ex-military”) people on the fatherland (“city”) and so forth. External expansion could give in hands of the grand-ducal power necessary resources for strengthening of this unsteady vital environment (Penskoy and Penskaya, 2008).

Russian historian Alekseev (1991) stated an interesting hypothesis according to which since the end of the XIV century in the Moscow principality the “territorial military” state was created. However, in such system there was always a danger that interests of the power and “earth” can disperse. On the agenda before the Moscow authorities there was a modernization problem modernization which concerning first of all the military sphere, inevitably involved transformations in political, economic and, naturally, social spheres. The time of troubles became the first “call” which announced need of modernization old Moskovia at the beginning of the XVII century endured the deepest crisis which nearly ruined both the country and society. From experience of the Distemper the ruling elite of the Russian State took out strong belief in need of changes and changes, first of all in the military sphere. The old military machine which showed the insufficient efficiency in the years of Livon war discredited itself in days of the distemper. In the years of Smolensk war of 1632-1634, the first serious experience of military transformations on a new, European harmony was derived. This experience formed the basis of military reforms of the 2nd half of XVII, the beginning of the XVIII centuries. Military reforms caused also the others. Need to find means for the maintenance of new army

caused need of the “military and fiscal” state (for the analysis of the processes connected with modernization of the power in our opinion as it is impossible more the concept of “military revolution” approaches of Roberts (1967) and the interpretation of “the military and fiscal state” offered by Henshall (1992). The Russian society which is brought up on idea of service to the state which was perceived as a certain protective cover, the cocoon guaranteeing a survival and preservation of habitual versatile forms of life and consciousness (Kamensk, 1999; Hosking, 2001), eventually, after some resistance was compelled to agree with such transformation the sad image of the distemper still was always on his mind.

Construction of the military and fiscal state inevitably involved also the large-scale social transformations interfaced to change of the status of all primary social groups or “ranks” of the Russian State.

It is remarkable that together with formalization of “service” also process of short circuit of ranks in their specialized framework comes to the end: the four-part structure of the late Moscow society including from now on four “ranks” estates “consecrated” (clergymen)“, “sluzhily” (the nobility, military and bureaucratic element), “trade” (a merchant and craft element, the posadsky population) and “zemledelatelny” (various categories of the peasantry) finally formed. In the most general terms, this structure will be extremely steady and will keep the existence up to the beginning of the XX century. This stability was some kind of conservative reaction to requirements of modernization: the care of “new” led to that “old” opposition and became simpler. Considerably the quantity of social groups and layers decreased; merge of social groups was followed by equalizing of that had higher social status, with those which status was significantly lower (the destiny of the Russian peasantry in this plan is most characteristic and sad). Thus, opportunity to change the status remained through military and bureaucratic establishments.

## SUMMARY

Research of social transformations which happened and occur in the history of Russia, assume the appeal to social memory, its archetypic meanings which the historical proved in various forms of political care of the uniform state (territorial, military and fiscal, etc.).

Historiographic specification of this memory historical traces of political care which made itself felt in the historical past of the country is actual. It is very productive for this purpose, probably, one of the most eventful the period of updating of the Russian history XVI the beginning of the XVIII centuries when all a

little noticeable manifestations of public life underwent large-scale modernization and were steady its ontologic foundations.

There are all bases to claim that the large-scale modernization undertaken in Russia in the 2nd half of XVII, the beginning of the XVIII centuries was followed to a certain extent by preservation enough archaic social institutes which foundation was laid during the Middle Ages era and simplification of social structure of society in general.

### CONCLUSION

Social transformations in Russia need of the XXI century reconsideration through certain hermeneutic-historical mirrors, mirrors of social memory and political care. Looking in these mirrors, we, perhaps, will see new theoretical model of social transformations in the latest Russia, however, being annoyed little by little with dim metaphysics of models as if preceding history. We will consider in them something much more important, the best: not subselement historical meanings without which public service and self-standing is impossible, new organization always modern to itself societies. The Russian idea, imaginable in its social concreteness, allows to raise a question of deep existential sources the practical social updating in Russia the XVI-XVII centuries as archetypic in relation to our time.

### REFERENCES

Alekseev, YU.G., 1991. All-Russia Sovereign. Novosibirsk, pp: 5-6, 239.

- Henshall, N., 1992. *The Myth of Absolutism: Change and Continuity in Early Modern European Monarchy*. Routledge, pp: 256.
- Hosking, G.A., 2001. *Russia and the Russians: A History*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp: 752.
- Kamensk, A.B., 1999. *The Russian Empire in the XVIII century: Traditions and modernization*. M., pp: 27-28.
- Lipich, T.I., 2012. *Formation of national consciousness in the Russian literature and philosophy of the first half of the XIX century. Ethnoses, the nation and ethnicity in the Russian civilizational space. Cultural and historical paradigms and epistemological paradoxes*. Belgorod, pp: 53-65.
- Mackenny, R.S., 1993. *Sixteenth Century Europe: Expansion and Conflict*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp: 425.
- McNeill, W.H., 1990. *A Life*. Arnold J. Toynbee (Eds.), Oxford University Press, pp: 346. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=acls;idno=heb03068.0001.001>.
- Olkhov, P.A., 2011. *Dialogue and History: existential aspects of historical thinking in the XIX-XXI centuries*. M.: Scientific Book, pp: 232.
- Paquette, G.B., 2000. *The Impact of the 1917 Russian Revolutions on Arnold J. Toynbee's Historical Thought, 1917-34*. *Revolutionary Russia*, 13 (1): 55-80.
- Penskoy, V.V. and T.M. Penskaya, 2008. *Authoritarianism sources in Russia*. Belgorod: Polyterra, pp: 174.
- Roberts, M., 1967. *The Military Revolution, 1560-1660*. M. Roberts *Essays in Swedish History*. London, pp: 195-225.