

Andrei Andreev

The Russian mind and the modernization

Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski 4, 257-271

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

ANDREI ANDREEV

Institute of Sociology RAS / Moscow

THE RUSSIAN MIND AND THE MODERNIZATION

Within the last 5–6 centuries history of Russia was a history of modernization. It was initiated by the late Middle Age Europe and should be studied in a broad European context as a part of multifaceted transformation of slowly-developing traditional communities into dynamic “modern” societies. The process was never smooth; it was accompanied by widespread sharp conflicts leading to powerful social explosions. Russia represents no exception, but in its case gradual degradation of the former living standards was especially erratic and painful and in the twentieth century it caused a chain of social disasters. Although Russian society demonstrated impressive results, which transformed Russia into one of the leading world countries, one cannot avoid describing Russian experience in modernization as controversial. The industrialization and transformation into a leading power demanded millions of lives and loss of cultural wealth. On the other hand, its position among the leading world powers appeared unstable. Regular frustrations of modernization and long retreats causing barbaric devastation of resources and diminishing of the achievements became one of the features of Russian history.

Nevertheless, Russian fully sustains the integral social and mental momentum, which can be defined as will to modernization. It is expressed not only in official reports and addresses of senior governmental officials and partisan publications, but also by a trend of the popular mind, which, by the way, has long been demonstrating visible independence from officially supplied instructions, up to and including full aversion.

This research along with others conducted previously allows to claim that the modernization is a national idea which is capable of uniting (and it does unite) the majority of Russians. Although the outcome of the social and economic development is modest, Russian people in general share optimism about prospects of the modernization. As it has been mentioned before, the vast majority of Russians subscribe to the viewpoint that modernization will take the country to a new and far higher (than it was in the past and present) level of development and prosperity and only 1 out of 5–6 polled does not believe in

a positive outcome of the modernization or thinks that its effect will be visible no sooner than teenagers and young adults of the present will be of or close to the age or retirement.

How to modernize the country is a problem as well. This was not discussed in the traditional framework, in which it was believed to be a linear consistent process leading to some ideal result. However, a more detailed analysis shows that different approaches to it are possible. The modern world is far more complicated and diverse and unlike the age or early and “classical” capitalism, this diversity cannot be described by a simple classification of countries and nations into “civilized” and “not civilized”. We will express no interest in theories of radical sense, which have enjoyed much public attentions, such as the idea of provincialization of Europe¹, but it is obvious that the postcolonial world of the twenty-first century will not be able to ignore essential diversity of civilizations, and it means that different approaches to modernization should be considered as well.

Given that fact, the concept of modernization cannot be treated as unambiguous. It is vitally important to understand in particular popular opinion on that matter and *what exactly* Russians will recognize as modernization. We will try to answer that question using the data of surveys and polls conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences and other research centers of Russia.

The analysis of the data shows that the attitude towards the modernization bears a vivid social coloring. In this respect, various views diverge from the neoliberal mentality of the political and economical elites which define the essence of the developmental processes using administrative and financial management as well as creating political discourses. Thus, a survey conducted in the summer of 2010 by the Institute of Sociology RAS shows that a new fetish of the present-day elite, an ambitious convergence of the so-called innovative economy and increasing governmental control was added to the list of the most important ideas concerning the modernization by less than a quarter of our respondents. This is only the fourth or fifth position in the total ranking of priorities. Western liberal concepts of democratic renovation, opportunities for free entrepreneurship and competition received even less support as well as everything that can be traditionally attributed to the set of values of the national-imperial mind (strengthening power of the government, restoration of traditional Russian values, etc.). The first positions on the list were given to much more down-to-earth demands, which can be met by Russian authorities with great difficulty despite the promises and high-profile campaigns for “doing things

¹ Chakrabarti D. (2000), *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton University Press).

right". The first of these demands is real equality before the law. It was ranked first by more than 40% of respondents. The second is fight against corruption, which was mentioned by 28% of respondents. All this is an "elementary task" for a bourgeois-democratic modernization, which Europe and the USA struggled to carry out from the early XVII to the middle of the XX century. In Russia this is still a matter of future.

This priority list has remained stably unchanged for at least fifteen years. What is also important is that it is shared in almost all the social and demographic groups although, of course, the indexes and proportions differ. For example, the older people are, the more appreciation of social fairness they demonstrate, from 27% among the youngest to almost 38% among the 60+ group. Dependency of opinion on innovative economy is not that obvious: it reaches its maximum (30% of respondents) in the age ranges of 31 – 40 and 41 – 50 years. These are people whose youth saw the transition to the market economy. After the age of 50 this number falls and after 60 decreases to 11%. Also, it should be mentioned, that contrary to our expectation, the youngest respondents supported not the 30- or 40-year-olds, but rather 50-year-olds. But the most educated respondents showed strong support of an innovative economy. Among those who work in science or engineering and also among respondents with two academic degrees this index reached 35%. Russians with a higher education are the only massive social group which considers innovative economy more important than social fairness (difference between subgroups can be twice or 2.5 times bigger). It is clear that the result is obvious but it is not that clear when it comes to the opinion picture of types of population. It may seem strange, but large cities with more than one million of population, including megacities, which are symbols of the modern for many Russians, are not among the main supporters of aspiration for modernization in its liberal sense, which dominates among politics and in the mass-media. For example, innovative economy and more opportunities for entrepreneurship and competition are valued here 1.5 times less than the average of the whole sample. These indices reach their maximum in medium-large industrial and college centers with population within 250,000 – 1,000,000.

As all the people in the world, Russians seek wealth, modern conveniences, higher living standards and prosperity. However, according to a number of researches, not only the end matters, but also the means, not just financial equivalent, but also what lies beyond it. In this respect their mindset cannot be considered purely economy-oriented, it also includes a notion of dignity based on values of achievement and education. That is the reason for many Russians to be concerned with the role of the country in the international division of labor. It includes not only financial benefits, but also the matter of their identity and is closely tied with a delicate issue of the whole national identity and the mental

worldview. It in turn triggers the concern over the raw-material orientation, although it is the exports of hydrocarbons, timber and base metals that allow for living standards higher than in most post-Soviet republics. “True”, “successful” modernization, as many Russians think, will let the country earn not by exporting commodities or exploiting the infrastructure or geopolitics, but by creating intellectual products. That is what our respondents firmly insisted upon during the polls.

If we consider Russia one of the leading countries, what real prospects of developments do Russians see? In this respect Russians can hardly be charged with utopianism. The most popular answer is “an energy superpower”, which is the biggest supplier of resources to Europe, Asia and America. Almost 2/3 respondents think that Russia already has that status and as many as 1/3 think that it this status is achievable. In total this makes up more than 93%. Around 85% of respondents think that Russia is or can be a country of “high culture” where interesting and popular music works, books, plays and films are made. Almost the same number of respondents mentioned the unique nature and historical landmarks which can attract a lot of tourists. At the same time, Russian science and technology, industry and education, which are all attributes of a highly-developed country, are estimated on a modest level. The majority of respondents (from 1/5 to almost a third) consider modern Russia’s claim for leadership in these areas unreasonable, with college graduates giving more responses than the average level among all the respondents.

Given the data we may conclude that governmental initiatives to revive research and science-driven technology (close attention to the military industry, state corporations such as “Rosnanotehnologii”, etc.) are viewed with skepticism. What draws special attention is the fact that our respondents gave an extremely bad characteristic to the Russian education system and its competitive advantage which indirectly demonstrates concern for the latest reform in that area. Given by the data, this concern reaches its maximum in large cities with population over 1 million: total amount of negative responses (“unlikely” + “unreal”) exceeded half of the total number of respondents.

In fact, from the very beginning a way to modernization went through several complementary but at the same time alternative historical projects and the list of the project expanded on the course of time. On the list of projects Russia holds its special position which allows us to speak about its originality. But it has been noted that it should not be interpreted as uniqueness (Prussia, for example, developed in the similar way) or hermetic isolation. No modernization is real without constant critical comparison with “others” and taking its first steps Russia tried the experience of other countries with rising interest. Starting from some moment in the past, the West in this or that version is its main source of objectives (it is Poland and Germany in the early XVII, Holland, Germany

Table 1. When discussing the future of Russia which may turn into a leading country, people express different views of its development. What version of Russia's role do you consider most realistic?(one response for each row,%)

	It is already a leading country	It may happen in the future	It is unlikely	It is unreal	No answer
1. Russia is a leading industrial power and successful competitor	19.7	49.5	25.0	5.5	0.3
2. Russia is an energy and commodity superpower supplying resources to other countries	62.8	30.5	5.7	0.6	0.3
3. Russia is a leading country in science, Russian scientists' work and results are used all over the world	28.7	48.1	20.5	2.5	0.2
4. Russia is a country with a state-of-the-art education system and young people from around the world come to study here	18.6	43.4	31.4	6.1	0.4
5. Russian culture is unique, works of Russia writers, musicians and artists are popular in all other countries	44.6	39.7	13.0	2.5	0.3
6. Russia has a unique nature, history and is a tourist attraction	41.1	43.9	12.7	1.9	0.2

and Sweden under Peter the Great, then France and again Germany, and the USA in early years after the Russian Revolution). Russian relationships with Western countries were for a long time disproportional. Russia learned, borrowed, perceived, but its role in creating world cultural entities which could be considered aims of progress was small. However, it is important to mention that Russia kept its historical identity to the full. Although disproportion in the cross-cultural communication was obvious, Russian society was not just affected by numerous Western ideas, but acquired what was needed at every stage of development.

In the Soviet period the West was still seen as a source of authentic experience and a symbol of modernity, but this attitude was complicated by ideological matters. The Soviet mind was tuned to demonization of “western imperialism”, claims to be a vehicle of history and consumerism at the same time with consumerism holding a victory in the end. Attempts to change the Soviet system (Perestroika) followed by its dismantling in early 90s in the twenties century were considered a necessary condition of affinity with the West which had to be best expressed in “return to Europe”. Emotionally, Russians were ready for such a return and sought it. Many political figures and

intellectuals of the West expected Russia to join the liberal-democratic model with no difficult and to be, as H. Timmerman said, 'just like us'.²

But the outcome of that process turned out to be disappointing as too much hope was put into it. Russia responded with a wave of neoconservatism and its main idea was a breakaway from the western ideas which were popular during early days of Russian democracy. By the mid 90s the popular mind supports the idea that with all its advantages the western approach is inappropriate for Russia. In this context the Russian identity is interpreted not as a "curse", but as an enduring core value. As our polls showed, today more than half of Russians (47%, to be more precise) admit with no hesitation, that it is not liberalism, individualism and western democracy what Russia needs, but a sense of community, collectivism and toughly controlled state. Those who refuse to support that viewpoint are twice as few (a quarter of respondents). In fact, the majority of those who support the idea of Russia having a distinctive character appear only in certain age groups, starting from the age of 30; those who are younger, this position surrenders to "westerners". For example, among the youngest the proportion is 31 to 41%. To have a full picture we should point out that a lot of Russians have trouble deciding which side to choose and the share of those who have not decided reaches 28%, and only in large cities it drops (roughly twofold). What about that 14–15% of people living in megacities and cities with population exceeding a million, who join supporters of controversial views on approaches to development? Given by the opinion distribution, every third recognizes the western model as universal, and two out of three join their opponents.

So what separates Russia from the West and contributes to alienation from western experience and values? On the one hand, foreign policy played not so minor role (NATO expansion, military campaign against Serbia and Kosovo breakaway, supporting some anti-Russia powers and regimes), but on the other hand, Russians found that their view on modernization fundamentally differs from that of the West. Emphasis on problems of democracy, creating a "favorable" investment climate and nurturing NGO network loyal to the West gain no support or sympathy among the majority of people. They would like to have something quite different: cooperation in knowledge and technology development, but the western partners showed almost no interest in it. As a result, Russians started to hold a firm belief that Europe treats their eastern partner purely pragmatically in the most narrow and business-based sense. Few of our respondents believe that Europeans can be interested in Russian intellectual products, culture or its ability to counterbalance the world domination of the USA, but almost 60% are sure that all that Europe needs is Russian natural resources.

² Timmerman, Kh. (2009), *Evropa i ee vostok v geopoliticheskom kontekste*, *Mirovaya Ekonomika i Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya*, 10, 2009, p. 106.

Table 2. Russians on possible reasons for Russia-Western Europe cooperation, 2002 – 2009,%

	2002,%	2009,%
Western Europe is interested only in Russia's natural resources	58,5	58,5
Western Europe sees Russia only as counterbalance to the USA	23,2	19,7
Western Europe is interested in cultural and intellectual resources of Russia	20,0	11,9
Western Europe is interested in equal cooperation with Russia	16,7	21,8
Western Europe is interested in promotion democracy and market reforms in Russia	14,0	10,1
Western Europe has no interest in cooperating with Russia	4,5	6,8

NB: Total percentage exceeds 100% because up to two options could be chosen in the poll.

According to the research of last several years, there are two models or Russian identity in the popular mind: 1) Russia is a part of Europe and it is Europe Russia will have the closest ties with in the future as it used to be and 2) Russia is not quite a European country but it represents a specific Eurasian civilization and in the future its political focus will shift to the East. These viewpoints both enjoy popularity, but if several years ago the first one still had 5–6% more, today they are almost equal in number of supporters. The most important aspect affecting the choice of the identity model is, as it is in the integration with Europe, age. Respondents under the age of 35 tend to see Russia as a part of Europe, while older respondents hold the opposite belief.

Along with the growing popularity of Eurasian paradigm, “We” and “They” are also getting another interpretation in the international context and in respect to foreign-policy objectives. The relative shift of political orientation to Europe was caused not by deteriorating Russian opinion on Europe, but by progressing diversification of Russian interests and aspirations. Although in general affection for Europe remained the same (we do not take into consideration political climate here), other directions of foreign policy became more important. Numbers, showing emotional and sub-conscious response to political entities are illustrative: in 2002 59% of respondents gave a positive response to “the European Union”, while CIS received 25% less (just 34%). It is clear that the gap is wide, if not too wide, but seven years later we see a different picture: both numbers showed some growth, but if the first number increased only by 6%, the second surged more than twofold and not only caught up with the first, but exceeded it (72 against 65%). Russian partners outside the European Unions, Europe and the West in general, are also in the ascendant. First, it is Belarus and other Collective Security Treaty Organization allies, and also new Asian

political and economic giants: India, China, Korea, etc. It seems that new soaring skyscrapers push out “Grand Dame Europe” out of the mind.³

At the same time, speaking about prospects on Russia-West relations and the degree of mutual understanding, we should take into consideration not only politics and economy, but also “human” aspect of that matter. Whether Russia will join the West or take its own way, in the end, depends not on personal intentions of Russian reformers, but on how suitable western values and patterns

Table 3. What character traits Russians consider most valuable and what traits they personally have (Respondents were allowed to choose up to 7 answers and it caused the total number to increase 100%)

Valued most by,%	Character traits	You have it,%
70,1	Diligence	72,0
40,3	http://www.multitrans.ru/c/m.exe?a=110&t=1006525_2_1&sc=291 Entrepreneurial spirit, orientation to success	20,1
24,9	Abiding to law	35,4
38,6	Initiative, activeness	26,4
61,5	Honesty	62,8
38,6	Education	26,9
50,6	Professionalism	32,9
34,1	Sense of duty	42,7
30,4	Care	32,1
10,1	Self-sacrifice	10,3
23,0	Not prone to conflicts, tolerance	21,6
8,2	Submission, obedience	7,8
11,8	Rationalism, pragmatism	9,5
34,7	Dignity	40,3
18,0	Team spirit	13,3
38,1	Respect for others' rights	30,7
11,6	Ability to adapt	12,7
39,9	Readiness to be responsible for oneself and relatives	48,4
20,1	Practicality	19,3
12,5	Responsibility for country matters	3,0
0,4	No answer	0,6

³ Gorshkov M., Krumm R., Petukhov V. (eds) (2010), *Padeniye Berlinskoi steny: do i posle. Rossiyanе o vneshnepoliticheskikh protsessah proshlogo i nastoyashchego* (Moscow, Ves' mir), 2010, p. 50–73.

for most Russians are. This, in turn, prompts scholars to think again about the uniqueness of national as well as all-Russian mind, how similar cultural and psychological profiles of Russia and the West are.

First, we will take a look at qualities which Russian consider most valuable and find in their nation. Table 3. presents opinion distribution on some character traits, which evaluate human capital in the context of modernization.

According to the chart, Russians consider diligence, honesty and professionalism the most valuable character traits. They are on top of the list of 20 traits and leave others far behind. Diligence and honesty are not only the most valued traits of “an ideal person”, but also the traits that our respondents in most cases consider personal. As for professionalism, the numbers are a little lower. If it was considered the most valued only by every second responded, it was acknowledged as personal only by every third. The average positions are taken by traits which together make up reliability: a sense of duty, responsibility for oneself and relatives, care, abiding to law. Here we can also find education, dignity and respect for rights of others. Our research does not confirm a popular myth about obedience and endless patience as attributes of Russian identity. These traits are named as values rarely and only 1 out of 12 consider them part of his personality. At the same time it should be mentioned that a number of traits responsible for interaction, cooperation, communication and adaptation are not seen by Russians as priorities and are rarely considered personal. Given by the numbers, in general Russians are not very practical, partly because they are not prone to pragmatic, rational thinking and behavior. Finally, an important trait such as entrepreneurial spirit should be mentioned. It belongs to the acknowledged societal values. It is definitely not the top priority, but still it was named among others by more than 40% of respondents. However, only half of them named this trait as personal. The lack of it is the most highly-criticized by Russians and it allows us to conclude that in this respect Russians in general do not like this state of affairs. How fair that is is another issue. Obviously, we cannot know if self-esteem of each respondent is adequate, but one may think that if every forth or fifth out of those who think they posses entrepreneurial spirit had it for real, it would be enough to speak about “driver of self-development” in Russian society.

This hierarchy is also reflected in upbringing. Diligence is the first on the list of upbringing objectives. 88% of respondents named it as the top priority – the highest number among large European (including Ukraine, our “relative”), Asian countries and the USA. Furthermore, as many as 80% of respondents would like to teach their children responsibility, which is not bad, although the number slightly lower than that in Japan, Eastern Germany, Scandinavian countries and Italy, but higher than in the USA, Great Britain, France, and China. Resoluteness and tenacity as key traits for success were marked by

almost half of Russian respondents and yet Russia is again behind Japan, Germany and Finland, but is followed by many other countries. It is hardly a surprise that Russians tend to consider tolerance and respect less important things to teach than Europeans or Americans, but their attitude to generosity is really not that evident. Unlike popular belief in “Russian soul”, modern Russians are hardly altruists and only one out of five would like to teach it to his children, while in England, France and Japan it is more than 50%, and in the USA, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Brazil and some other countries the number is within 30–40% or slightly higher. Russian indifference to religious upbringing makes a contrast to a formal strengthening of positions of Orthodox traditionalism. According to a poll, in the USA, India, Brazil, Republic of South Africa and even countries of a post-Christian Europe religion plays a much bigger role.

Here we should recall a research conducted in 2000, which aimed at comparing Russia and the West using psychosemantic reconstruction of worldview. The West “was played” by Germany, where a similar research had been conducted a year ago. Later we applied the same method in different contexts, which enriched the comparison. One of the most interesting findings of this research is a strong motivation to value the mental area, including knowledge and education. It was expressed in emotional reactions to the whole semantic list of concepts from these areas. For example, “to learn” prompted a positive reaction of more than 96% Russian respondents and only 75% or German ones, while the word “science”, correspondingly, 96.5 and 81%, the word “intellectual” – 98 and 88%.⁴ The number of reactions expressing positive feelings about the notion of soul is higher for Russians than Germans: 97% against 78%. Today, a decade later, a statement can be made that Russians almost have not changed in this respect. For example, positive responses to the word “to learn” on 2010 were given by 91%, “science” – by almost 93%, and “soul” – by more than 93%. All the concepts from this semantic cluster induce much more positive reaction than notions connected with moneymaking and consuming (thus, the word “to save” provoked a positive response from only 65%, and in 2010 – from 67% of respondents). And yet popular mind is going through some changes in its mental content, but these changes affect not so much balance between material and spiritual values, rather than so-called “axiology of time”. As far back as in 2000 we discovered distinctive projectivity of the Russian mind: of the three main temporal modalities Russians chose the future as the most attractive (90% positive responses), the present as the least attractive (74%) and the past held intermediate position (84%). For the sake of comparison it should be stated, that Germans were focused on the present and at

⁴ Andreev, A. (2008) *Rossiiskoe obrazovanie: sotsialno-istoricheskie konteksty*, Moscow, Nauka, 2008, p. 280.

the same time for them the present and the past looked better than the past, which received 43% of positive responses. However, the Russian value system changed during the last decade. Although Russian society is still mainly future-oriented, the present came closer to the future in this respect: if the difference between the numbers for these notions was 16% in 2000, now it reduced more than twofold and is 7% (85 against 78%). At the same time the image of the past has significantly faded, if compared not only with the future, but also with the present. These changes can be interpreted as a more realistic mindset and behavior, an indicator of attempts to succeed right now without postponing it until “a happy sunny tomorrow” comes and without seeking refuge in fruitless nostalgia for good old days that were allegedly missed. While the political and some of intellectual elites sometimes tend to think about modernization for the sake of modernization, an “ordinary man” has a different mindset which sees it as a means of achievement of more fundamental values. So what benchmark do Russians want to use to settle their life? What is the “meaning” of that life and, consequently, what attributes that meaning to the modernization? For at least fifteen years we monitored life aims of our respondents, giving them carefully selected pairs of alternative statements on values, from which they had to choose just one.

First, we would like to bring into view statements which were discussed by the overwhelming majority of respondents. There were two such statements. One of them was “Family ties and friendship are the most important things” won support of 81.5%, while the alternative “Public recognition and success are most important things” – just 18%. The second was the following: “A man should try to have a clear conscience and live in harmony”. This was also supported by 80% with 20% of respondents challenging it. They found access to power and influence on others their major value. This number was significantly higher just in the youngest group of respondents (under 20), which can naturally be explained by lack of experience. A long fight between the personal and the collective seems to have ended with victory of the former over the latter. It shows that for Russians of the present day the focus of their life is their personal universe. The “outer” world should be comfortable enough to sustain peace of the “inner” one. Undoubtedly, modern Russians are individualists and to a greater extent than people in the West. But this is not individualism of market entities; it is rather a peculiar interpretation of freedom. In general, freedom is one of the core values: most of our respondents (more than 56% among all and up to 2/3 in big cities) agree that life has no meaning without it and, therefore, they rank it higher than prosperity. There is no reason to doubt that the idea to realize freedom through political rights, which dominates the Western liberal culture, resonates with Russians as well. The poll shows that 40% share this belief, although it is still a minority, but for 60% of Russians freedom is close to what

in the Russian language is denoted by the word **volya** and presumes no outer control and regulations, when one can be one's own master.

Given by what has been stated and also by some results of the research, it is clear to see that attempts to meet the objectives of another stage of modernization by integration with the liberal West will not cause enthusiasm as it happened in the majority of Western Europe countries. Moreover, it can be foreseen with a share of confidence, that attempts to enforce that approach will cause psychological disturbance and, consequently, inner resistance (what forms it can take is another question). At early stages of modernization, when Russia lacked own necessary experience and socio-cultural resources, orientation to western models (adapted to some extent, of course) was inevitable, although it was met with discontent by a large part. However, at this point such resources have been collected and today's situation is fundamentally different. Certainly, it is another discussion for another time, but some important points have been mentioned. Among other things it is working motivation, their inclination to complex work and what can be called labor loyalty.

It is difficult to deny that for some reasons getting closer to the West for Russians was disappointing, and too much hope had been pinned on it. Russian society responded with a wave of neoconservatism marked by a breakaway from democratic ideas of the initial stage. The mid 90s saw a fundamental change of values, notably not ideology-wise, but on the subconscious level and in the worldview. The uniqueness of the Russian mind, which used to be considered disadvantageous, is now a privilege. Our poll and the following study of the emotional responses reveal that today the popular mind consolidates around Russian values. And in this respect it first should be noted that the word "Russia" and "Russian", which is close related to it, have gained a greater emotional significance. The fact that it is perceived with greater warmth rather than "America", "Europe", "the European Union" or "Asia" can be taken for granted, but it is not so: as far back as in 2000 we pointed out that the word "Russia" prompted more positive responses among Russians than the word "Germany" among Germans (94 and 85% correspondingly). It is even more interesting, that the notion of "Russia" provokes slightly more positive responses than implicit personal values such as "Me" and "We" (in 2010 it was 96% against 94.5 and 92 percent correspondingly). The word "Europe" is also surrounded by a trail of positive associations. However, in general they are less bright and consistent than those with the word "Russia". And, by the way, frequency has slightly dropped (from 83 to 76%), if compared with the year 2000. Young respondents (up to 21 years old) are more favorable to Europe. In this group positive rate reached 90% and almost reached the rate of positive associations with the notion of "Russia" (in contrast, in the over-sixty group the level of sympathy is did not manage to reach 2/3). But it can hardly categorically

Table 4. Which concepts on the list induce rather positive feelings, and which – negative,%

Concepts	Rather positive	Rather negative	No answer
1	2	3	4
1. Efficiency	91.3	8.1	0.6
2. Immigrants and visitors	38.6	60.9	0.5
3. Reasoning	81.2	18.1	0.7
4. The European Union	56.4	41.9	1.7
5. The past	74.6	24.9	0.5
6. Russia	95.7	4.1	0.2
7. Soul	95.3	4.4	0.3
8. The court	28.3	71.1	0.6
9. The West	48.1	51.3	0.6
10. We	92.1	7.5	0.3
11. Asia	43.7	55.6	0.7
12. The present	77.9	21.8	0.3
13. Europe	76.5	22.9	0.6
14. Tempo	78.3	21.1	0.6
15. Modernization	74.5	24.9	0.6
16. Differences	56.5	43.1	0.4
17. The future	85.1	14.6	0.3
18. Me	94.5	5.2	0.3
19. Risk	51.9	47.7	0.4
20. Russian	95.0	4.6	.4
21. Globalization	42.8	55.4	1.8
22. Individualism	60.9	37.9	1.1
23. Patriotism	90.5	9.0	0.5
24. To save up	67.1	32.5	0.3
25. Science	92.9	6.7	0.4
26. Democracy	74.5	25.0	0.5
27. To study	91.1	8.6	0.3
28. the USSR	74.2	25.3	0.5

denote as a demonstration of a specific “pro-European” position. The youngest tend to demonstrate the greatest openness to the world. They also more frequently produced positive reactions to “Asia”: the rate in the under-21 group exceeded the average by around 8%. At the same time, the survey shows that it is the youngest population that reacts most negatively to the concept of “globalization”.

In the framework of discussions on Western models and their applicability to the modernization in Russia special attention should be drawn to the rate of negative reactions to the concept of “the West”. In 2000 this word was positively perceived by 46%, and negatively – by 53% of respondents, but ten years later – by 48 and 51% correspondingly. The differential, as we see, is not very big, but it is of stable character. The most influential aspect causing rank-order (complying with the law) fluctuations of this parameter (which are considerable) is the age. The distribution is the following: in the two youngest groups of 18–21 and 22–27 the pro-and-contra balance is definitely positive (which should not be confused with unconditional readiness to walk the way of the Western thought on the modernization in Russia). Among the middle-aged group of 28–50 the positive-negative ratio of reactions to “the West” becomes almost equal. Then it goes in the “negative” area, thus the sixty-plus group again gives us the same proportion as the youngest group does (63 against 36%) but reversed in sign.

Over the period of contemporary history of Russia at least three approaches existed and competed in the Russian mind. These approaches determined the cultural and ideological types of modernization: liberal and oriented to the West, Soviet and the most obscure and still forming genuine Russian one, which may vary from national-democratic to authoritarian. Enough has been stated about the first two variants and their ratio (we certainly mean the popular mind, not the elite power houses and corporations). It should only be stated that strengthening of genuine Russian identity greatly affects the attitude of Russians to the Soviet legacy. It is indicative, that the rate of positive responses to the acronym “USSR” in ten years decreased by as many as 12%. If in 2000 it was perceived with slightly more feeling than the word “Europe”, then by 2010 it had been lost. Nevertheless, to dismiss the Soviet legacy would be precipitate, because although much effort has been invested in its discrediting, in general people are not inclined to see it only in black. Favorable reaction to the Soviet past is widespread, except for the megacities, where popular opinion is split in halves. The most loyal age group, as one can expect, is the eldest generation, especially those who are over 50. Among these only every 1 out of 9 or 10 thinks of that period negatively, while 85-90% of their peers feel nostalgic about it. However, positive attitude to the USSR is also steadily reproduced in younger groups. Starting from the age of 22, it distinctively overrides the negative. And only among the youngest, those who were born not

earlier than 1989–1990 and can only know anything about the USSR by word of mouth the reverse trend (only moderate of a 4% decline) can be fixed. Indeed, restoration of any consistent version of a Soviet model is hardly possible, but, given by the popular mood, it is natural to suppose that it will not vanish without a trace and its elements will be used for developing a new stage of modernization just as the Soviet system could not ignore czarist legacy, although for obvious reasons it was not inclined to do it.

Русское сознание и модернизация

Статья написана на основе данных социологических исследований и посвящена изменению российского менталитета в контексте модернизации. Анализируются массовые представления о «правильной» модернизации. Показано, что они расходятся с представлениями политических элит. Особое внимание уделяется складывающимся в российском самосознании образам Запада и представлениям о том, насколько отношения с Западом способствуют успеху российской модернизации. В этом контексте прослеживаются новейшие тенденции в динамике российской идентичности.