

THE PROTOTYPE of SOCIALISM in RUSSIA VERSUS SPENCER'S LIBERALISM: THE HISTORY of NATIONAL MENTALITY

Demyanenko N.V.¹

Silnova E.I.²

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the important problems of extending of socialistic idears in Russia. But Russian sociological works, the article is dedicated to English sociologist H. Spencer's historical works. Being an adept of positive philosophy, Spencer included sociological and political problems in analisis. He researched in details the reasons of socialistic idears and uncovered negative influence of it in society. The existing societies of socialistic type results from the transformation of communal collectivist relationships into dominating and universal ones, based on social-and-psychological and mental succession. This transformation is possible under the circumstances of external factors predominance. But internal circumstances of the society of such model assigned with intentional behavior, accustomed to the society behavior and recurred constantly due to its existence are more important. The presence of community relations in ancient Greco-Roman societies, medieval "free" towns and some modern countries does not necessarily lead to the establishment of socialistic relations. It is internal mental-and-psychological traditions of the development of the society that cause inevitable consequences: the unification of business corporation structure, the government staff increase, the leading role of the party. These consequences could be observed in the Soviet Union. The conditions for the formation of the society itself are its social-and-psychological characteristics. They may be varied only in form but not in their essence. This is the conclusion of the authors of the article, in which the prerequisites of the socialist regime formation in Russia of the XX-th century are examined.

Key words: Spenser, society, sociology, traditions, socialism, positive philosophe, socialistic ideas.

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr. The Russian State University for the Humanities, Ivanovo,
Demyanenko1@rambler.ru

² Assoc. Prof. Dr. The Saratov State Social-Economic University, eis82@mail.ru

Introduction

In the XX-th century, when Bolsheviks came to power in 1917, the social order harshly changed in Russia. The capitalism, just come into being, was successfully replaced by the socialism, which had been the dream of many master-spirits of mankind during many centuries. The understanding of the best social order as the form of the joint life of people, which would promote the development and the prosperity of the state to the utmost, was always connected with the socialism, and this social order was realized in Russia.

Everybody thinks that the socialism became possible due to the Marxism, which was the ideological basis of the Soviet state. But in this case we lose sight of historical succession of the social order in its social-and-psychological and mental aspects. We shall accept it as the hypothesis that the former social order influences much the further changes of the state structure. It happens due to the definite steadiness of archetypical collective values. For example, the existence of rural community in Russia predetermined and made easier the transfer to the socialism, as its nature suppose the presence of the collective people living experience, the predominance of a collective over an individual.

In this work we proceed from the understanding of the socialist regime as an absolutely special historical phenomenon. That is why we have several aims: to observe social-and-psychological background of the socialism origin in the Russian society on the basis of Russian and European philosophers and sociologists views; to show the influence of traditional psychology of Russians upon the socialist regime realization, in other words, to show the succession of the social order type depending on the national character and mental ability; to discover the conditions of historical experience succession of collective people living in ancient and modern societies and the perspectives of their functioning in modern Russian civilization.

There are two important factors to be taken into consideration, as the scientific approach to the investigation of a society is impossible without them. The first one includes social-and-psychological characters of a single person, which is the

“building material” for a society. N.I. Kareev, the Russian sociologist, considers that as there is physical bond between the cells in the organism, there is mental bond between individuals in the society. That’s why one should apply for mental factors of human life in order to explain social phenomena (Кареев Н.И., 1897: 60.). The second factor deals with the principle of organization of a large amount of people into a single whole, “the unity en masse”. A.A. Zinoviev, the Soviet researcher, suggests to consider “a crowd” as its conglomeration (Зиновьев А.А., 1994: 16).

Theoretical Background

The experience in comprehension of the history of social ideas is presented both at west and native philosophical thought. Russian philosophers were looking for the optimal kind of changing the Russian traditional society into another one and suggested possible modifications of the development of the country, trying to avoid extremes of the capitalism and the socialism in them. Thinking over the western experience of the social order development, our philosophers aspired to find such ways of the development which would be right for Russia, Russian culture, turn to traditional cultural wealth, take the peculiarities of Russian mentality and way of life into consideration, and wouldn’t be the blind repetition of the models, thrust on from the outside.

The first projects of the best state structure appeared in the medieval Europe. Having been written in the genre of the social Utopia, they became the theoretical prototypes of the social order. The authors of these works cherished a hope of the mankind about the specially created “paradise nook”, in a sense of the kingdom of God, where the human life would get careless character under perfect satisfaction at last (Мор Т. 1954; Кампанелла Т., 1952).

The social Utopia supposes the most perfect existence organization, in which everyone could find plenty of goods and means for consumption both of financial and mental purposes, at the most favorable conditions for the personality evolution, the best relationships between people, etc. In other words, as the social Utopia we mean everything that narrow-minded awareness can imagine as the supreme blessing of the human life.

The authors of medieval European Utopias began to speak about the commune as people's community, mostly approached to the principles of the social equality. T. Moore mentions in his "Utopia" about the legendary "communism" of early Christian communities as forerunner of the social order, based on the community of goods. In such a way there appeared the identical concepts "communism" and "socialism", which pointed to the communal nature of people's living.

Moore's "Utopia" had its own social premises. There was considerable progress of commodity-money relations, the crisis of statute labor system of management and the necessity of harmony of different classes of in the society in England in the XV-th – the beginning of the XVI-th centuries. The "limiting" theory of "common profit" over the "private profit" primacy appeared against a social background of everybody's tendency to become rich. England hadn't had the period of feudalism decay and capitalist system rise at that time yet. But there was a very contradictory ethical idea of humanistic individualism. This theory combined the recognition of every person's right on earthly blessings and achievements and the necessity of private property, property and class differences supremacy in the society. Thereby, working-people as a whole were prevented from happiness and equality attainment. Under the class differentiation presence the freedom of individual's behavior, which became the obligatory principle of living thanks to individualistic ethics, helped a forehanded person to attain selfish ends harmful to other members of the society without any limitations. Trying to neutralize the last ones, Moore rejected the principle of personal happiness attainment with the help of his own efforts and opposed collective-communal principle to it. The author of the Utopian theory stated that if private property prevailed in the society, there would be inequality in distributing social and free goods among people. That's why "Utopists have no private property" (Mop T., 1998: 55.).

Indeed, private property was considered to be the source of social disasters for a long time, but its elimination doesn't form any social order. Property relations don't have much influence in a new society. They are only the condition to form the social order, which will be organized thanks to people's activity, under the laws of

social development. As for social inequality, it is justified by the Russian philosopher S.L. Frank. He believes that the inequality “is put” thanks to the cosmic law of real inequality of people according to their abilities, energy, industry. It is the stable law of the Universe (Франк С.Л., 1996: 84.).

Having rejected the private property and the individual principle of happiness achieving, Utopists realized the necessity to achieve personal happiness with the help of labor in common of all members of the society, in which public property dominates. In other words, Utopists should follow the principle of collectivism and community. Utopists themselves proved the new ethic principle, basing on the nature: it “invites mortals to help each other in order to live merrier”, but it also “orders” everybody not to neglect his advantages and at the same time not to do harm to others (Моп Т., 1954: 213-214.). The laws in the Utopia prescribed the common duty to work for everybody, to organize the social production and fair distribution of life facilities produced among the families of the Utopists. The originator of the theory thought that it was the right way to achieve the combination of personal blessings and social ones in the society-commune of the Utopists.

But making the Utopian ideal a reality in the Soviet Union turned out to be problem and not so positive as it was expected. Mass psychology of people, in contrast to individual one, doesn't want to recognize the means of negative results from positive ideals and good intentions. Moreover, mass consciousness justifies any victims for wonderful prospects. The consequence of such fatal principles of social psychology is that large masses of people are not able to listen to the voice of mind and to learn a lesson from historical and personal experience, to realize the immediate causes of their social position. That's why the crowd easily becomes the victim of any that is to say “saving” demagogy and make other people victims as well.

One can find in any Utopia that the reality of commune life is the exploitation of people by somebody and different forms of social and economic inequality are not destroyed but changed and intensified in certain ways. The English sociologist H. Spencer noticed that the society, in which all people are brothers, was the tempting dream in all times. The attempts to go away from the existent regime, in which

struggle and competition dominate and bring many disasters, are natural and inevitable. Seeing the inequality everywhere, those who suffer and those who sympathize them try to find the regime they would consider to be right (Spencer H., 1896: 694).

Moore's criticism of private property and individualism and the opposition of public property and new ethic principle of communal collectivism to the first two concepts was the greatest event in the ideological life of Europe. It influenced greatly on the further development of the liberation ideas in the history of mankind. The ideas of socialism with their state tutelary character were actively spread in the U.K., Germany, France and Russia in the middle of the XIX-th century. So, there is no country in the world, which will be insured against the social regime. But in spite of the communist ideas having been spread in Europe, the social regime was not realized there in its classical type.

Main Text

The founder of English positivism and organic theory of society, H. Spencer, being an irreconcilable opponent of socialism, oppose a strengthening of socialists' influence in the end of the XIX-th century. He denied the communist way of life from the point of view both justice and benefit. He considered socialism to stop the development of a highly developed state or to turn back the development of a less developed state.

He thought that socialistic order supposed the strongest centralization, hierarchy of status and led to the decrease of individual freedom. Spencer connected the fast penetration of state socialism idea into the legislation of European leading countries with the concept "future slavery". Most of all Spencer was afraid of the fact that the socialistic order supposes to solve all contradictions and problems, arising in the society only in a state way. "Future slavery" is nothing but the system of "governmental guardianship", which leads to the constant growing of omnipotence and interference of government.

Spencer was convinced that socialism in any form means slavery. He considered the labor under compulsion to be the characteristic of slavery. The degree

of slavery depended on the fact of how much a slave had to give back and to leave to himself, and at the same time the question “Who is the master: a person or a society?” was not of great importance. In the case if a man was to give back all his labour to a society and to get from the total property only the part, which was determined by the society, he was the slave of the society (Спенсер Г., 1894: 26.).

Another founder of the theory of Utopian socialism, the Italian T. Campanella, also proclaimed the essential communist ideas: the absence of private property, the obligatory labor for everybody, the social organization of production and distribution, the working education of citizenry (“Labor is the point of honor”). The philosopher thought that to live in community didn’t contradict human nature as it was based on the “renunciation of egoism” by means of junction to public property and on the “love to community” and Motherland (Кампанелла Т., 1952: 45.). We shall come back to the idea of love below. We are interested in another important problem about which the authors of Utopias made hints: the well-to-do life of the community, satisfaction of people’s needs led to the overpopulation in consequence of which the inhabitants were to settle the neighboring islands constantly.

Being guided by the observations of the social reality, empirical case and simulating the given situation, we come to the inevitable conclusion: as soon as it is managed to create favorable living conditions for a definite amount of people on the separately taken area artificially, spontaneous unchecked population upsurge will invariably take place. That’s why in the Utopias there were providently directed special functions for the inspectors responsible for sexual selection and birth rate. But as the birth rate always passes ahead of finding the conditions for favorable existence for the increasing amount of population, population explosion will take place in any specially created enclave for citizens’ unconcerned living.

English sociologist H. Spencer studied the problem of population, applying to any society, but he paid special attention to the “artificially happy” one. He considered that first of all there would be balancing between the amount of population and means for living. All social functions also aim to balance (demand and supply, cost on goods, etc.). Functional balance causes structural division of labor (occupations). There should be balance in the field of management as well as in

industry, which also provides for so-called demand and supply: the balance between the wish to power and the one to be under somebody's supervision. The full balance will be achieved only when "the human nature and the society organization will become of those kinds that the individual will have no other wishes except those ones, which can be satisfied without going out the outside of his own activity, and the society will impose no other constrain except of those, to which individuals will obey voluntarily" (Spencer H., 1896: 707). So, a strong society must balance and control itself in such a way as it happens in any healthy organism.

In contrast to the problem of population explosion, typical for the socialism, the English positive philosopher put forward the common law of species life. According to this law, benefits, got during the period of immaturity, must be inversely proportional to achievements (it is the principle of the family), and during the period of mature profit must be directly proportional to the achievements (it is the principle of society). The survival for the society and the animal species depends on the right correlation of these complementary principles. Socialistic society inclines to the extreme. That is the law, which can be used concerning only the family: when getting means for living is inversely proportional to labor. The doctrines of collectivists, socialists and communists don't recognize the difference between family life and social one. They suggest to establish the family regime of economic protection for the whole community, sometimes in a full extent. In that case the society falls into decay, because the least worthy members appear and the most worthy ones disappear. Spencer is a staunch supporter of the fact that tutelary state regime is disastrous for the society (Spencer H., 1896: 691).

Modern social differentiation promotes the further development of the society. Only due to this fact it becomes high competitive. It is one of the main principles of Spencer's liberalism. P.G. Mizhyev says that if one follows his own interests and feelings, the specialization of professions in the society will strengthen and the level of freedom will increase (Мижнев П. Г., 1904: 100).

Variants of fantastic, idealistic preferences for social order are examined on the examples of Utopian socialism theories. But one shouldn't forget that these theories had their realization in antiquity, when the community existence was

inevitable and organic type of social life, for example, the life of Graeco-Roman world.

So, the main type of social life, within the limits of which the every-day life of people took place in the ancient world, was the city state. This Greek word is often translated into Russian as “a city”, but this interpretation is so approximate and abstract, that the essentials are outside of it. The city state, or as the Romans called it «civitas» (literally: «civil community»), was not an ordinary settlement, accumulation of houses and people, architecture-designed area, civic centre of a definite area. It is not enough to determine the city state as the unit of administrative-political organization of population. The Greek city state or the Roman civil community is a character, centre point and the best expression of the ancient world. The Greeks and the Romans didn't think about national or racial identity in modern ordinary sense, but they divided the whole world into civilization zone and barbarism one. The civilization zone was a kind of a city state organization, and that's why it was the highest form of existence. The barbarism zone didn't know the life of city state and was the form of barbarians' living.

The historian G.S. Knabae points out that the Roman civil community is the only place where a man feels his unity with other people on the basis of law, his safety from outward enemies and gods thanks to the protection of founders and forefathers of the city. It is in the community where a man is included into the generic process, which is uninterrupted succession of births and deaths, determining the human place in the continuous existence (Кнабе Г. С., 1986: 21.). Besides, the values, without which the life loses its significance, are also realized in the community. These values include the following ones: personal self-dependence and an opportunity to assert his/ her rights within the limits of the law; the body of laws, protecting the person's dignity according to his/ her status; the faithfulness to the duty, which is constituent of the ethical guarantee of legislation execution; reverential duty to gods, the Motherland and nationals, and the energy and will to discharge his/ her obligations, which are called “civil valor”.

The ancient world is an early undeveloped stage of the history of mankind, the European one, at least. According to its management, forms of labor and

production this world was poor and primitive. The land had been the basis of wealth and the source of life during its whole history. A real, enjoying full rights citizen of city state or community was, as a rule, a land owner, and, first of all, he lived due to yield of this land. Yield was brought from an estate to a city, where it supported the life of a family. Slaves also used yield, and the population on duty paid with yield the most part of taxes. Any deviation from this general, world generating system was morally inadmissible and dangerous. Only the state of rural owners was truly worthy: the land was the property of a community and united people, who cultivated it, into an indivisible group. The main thing about such community type existence is the citizens' solidarity. It can be displayed as an obligatory mutual aid under natural disasters, cult community, communal property, joint meal in ceremonial welcome. It was the some kind of citizens' community in its every day materially industrial life.

In spite of the successful community existence, Graeco-Roman world didn't reach socialist regime establishment. Evidently, community way of life in Rome was assigned impartially due to the scarcity of productive forces (even under favorable conditions). That's why the conservative morality, ancestry precept respect, the perception of native history as the encyclopedia of communal virtues were the pledge of the city state survival as a whole. First of all it referred to Rome because the Romans were more closely related with the land than the Greeks. Rome from the very beginning was an agricultural community with strictly regulated rules of its members coexistence. So, the communal way of life in the ancient world was assigned by impartial circumstances of materially insufficient existence, and it is the necessary step for the further development of the society. But it doesn't necessarily lead to the socialism, for which the factors of higher economical level and density of population are rather important.

G.Spencer says that a community is a peculiar feature of non-developed societies with insufficient material resources. Elaborating higher social forms little by little, social evolution in future will certainly keep many lower ones untouched. Groups of people, which adapted to inclement climate in one place or to the places inaccessible from the outside and unsuitable for living in small groups, will join small communities with simple organization in future. Besides, in future, when

superior races will occupy all vast spaces, which are the best according to their climate and territory, minor nationalities will go on living in less suitable ones (Spencer H., 1896: 707). Thus, difficulties of living, inclement climate and the simplicity of organization make the community life the most suitable for definite societies.

The question is: if the community way of life has indisputable advantages and it is justified by a long period of existence in ancient societies, could it be realized in modern society conditions? What are the character of modern communities and the tendencies of their development? Do modern communities facilitate social regime change?

The historical example of people's communal living is a kind of a corporate farm, named «kibytsy», which were organized in Israel. To understand its essence, one should make a short excursus into history. «Kibytsy» appeared in the end of the XIX-th century and were looked like paramilitary settlements enclosed with barbed wire. The inhabitants of these settlements cultivated the land of neighboring Palestine, which was colonized by them, in common. As time went by, they began to engage cheap man power of landless Arabian fellahs and became agrarians. Critical competitive struggle, which is common for capitalism, arose between these agrarians and new coming ones and led to the formation of different types of cooperative keeping of agriculture.

Joint cultivated of land in desert and semi desert region under definite climatic conditions was traditional one but it didn't lead to the socialization of relations in the society. A.I.Edelman notes the true essence of «kibytsy» is only covered under the mask of socialism. In fact, these rural communities were founded artificially to settle Jewry on the territory, which was thrilled from Arabian neighbors, and to banish Arabian farmers forcedly (Эдельман А. И., 1985: 72, 74.). We can speak on the pseudo socialistic nature of «kibytsy», in which the individual form of exploitation was changed into collective one. V.I.Lenin denied socialistic nature of «kibytsy» as a cooperative form of labor and way of life: «cooperation in capitalistic state is a collective capitalistic institution» (Ленин В.И.: 374.).

The thought about artificial rationally organized joint people's life, which is subjected to a definite aim and occurs on a definite territory, suggests itself. The community as a characteristic of any ethnic group is known to have existed in ancient societies, including Jewish one. In ancient times there appeared the whole system of religious injunctions, which were considered as the forces of the past. The faithful thought that these forces subjected to themselves people's will and behavior. The peculiarity of religious traditions is that they become the main feature of a definite ethnic religious community characteristic. The traditions of Judaism also developed and consolidated in its integrative and regulative functions, producing sometimes illusive illusions on individual's protect ability thanks to community life. Strictly regulated conditions of existence promoted such illusions appeared as these "conditions" were impossible out of the community. A.I.Edelman says that Talmudic Judaism strengthened social oppression due to the requirements of every person's humble obedience, isolation and submission to communal interests (Эдельман А.И., 1985: 29-31.). It is undoubtedly that "the freedom of will" is limited with the choice between good and evil, labor and punishment, life and death. Therefore, a person may be deprived of active creativity under difficult life circumstances, which are also caused by social conditions. Thus, it was a typical tendency for a part of the Jews to overcome national scantiness, to release from religious-communal life and even try to join neighboring peoples. (Эдельман А. И. 1985: 38.). It should be noted that a gradual diminution of the amount of «kibytsy» takes place nowadays.

Therefore, examining the example of Jewish rural communities, we can make sure in their special character of creation and functioning. One shouldn't lose the sight of corresponding qualities of population, which is converted into collective form of existence due to the traditional practice of social regime. Moreover, communities' presence doesn't lead to the modification of society's type. The social character of communities can be combined with the capitalistic forms of economics.

Being an opponent of socialism and a community, G.Spencer affirms that socialists wanted to reestablish the social order, which would be controlled by the community. In such a way, a personality wouldn't belong to himself/ herself and would have no right to get profit due to his/ her abilities. He/ she would belong to the

state, which supports him/ her and controls his/ her labor. This would require, in its turn, to have a more numerous and complicated bureaucratized administration (Spencer H., 1896: 694).

Spencer considers, "Such social order would correspond to the army organization. There would be a civil regulation as a military one, which would establish the same seniority in industry as in the army. The rule in both cases is the same: you must do what you have to do and get your ration. Implicit obedience is necessary both for maintenance of order and successful work. That's why it should be supported due to strict arrangement" (Спенсер Г., 1898: 694). The communities, which existed in reality and Utopian ones, are the evidence of strict norms and hierarchy relations in such groups.

Thus, the problem is not to create theoretically any ideal living conditions for people in future and increase the number of Utopias, but due to the observation and getting empirically given facts of living in the countries with the communist way of life to find out what common to all mankind phenomena got favorable surroundings there and established such type of society. Thinking in such a way we invariably come to the fact that the most of people have to live and work as a single whole. They have to create the standard communities and associations from them. There is metaphysical experience of understanding the life of different social associations in native intelligent thought.

Russian social-and-philosophy thought wasn't secluded and separated. It keenly caught the most important new ideas and tendencies, which appeared in the west, including H. Spencer's naturalistic positivism, and aimed to comprehend and develop them, overcoming the one-sided and abstract approaches to the social reality and taking into consideration the specific nature of social existence.

The Russian leaders of Slavophilism (Russian cultural nationalistic movement of the XIX century) stated the problem of the community as a historic form of people's existence and a special social association in the middle of the XIX-th century for the first time. These leaders were Russian philosophers, the followers of cultural and historic meanings of Slavonic-Russian people. They appealed to

theological and historico-philosophical arguments and generalized centuries-old collective experience of people's inhabitation on the example of a peasant community as a fundamental principle of mental and social evolution, which presented "mental Slavonic way of life".

Slavophiles (Russian orthodox personalities of the XIX century) related a peasant community to the beginning of "«sobornosti» (wide community)", "free community", which were the characteristics of the East Church life and of community self-government social relations developed in a Russian land community. The Slavophiles' historical social ideal was connected with before Peter's the Great Russia, which was the unity of self-government people and the autocratic tsar. Slavophiles' ideas were based on personal and social origins harmony in a state, on the idea of gradual social reforms, national problem of mental renaissance.

According to the Slavophiles' ideas «sobornost» can be defined as "the unity en masse", given to people theoretically and appeared in reality under the circumstances of value relations. In fact we speak about the human substance like-mindedness and within the limits of mental existence archetypes, which were formed on its base and are stable in their inner matter. It is important to rethink the community соборность as an ideological factor of collective people's living, which became the condition of prevalence of social basis of life in Russia in the XX-th century. The economical principle of community association living became the basis of Marxist theory, which accompanied socialist reforms in Soviet Russia. This historical fact has made us to turn to social-and-psychological conditions of society and its character organization due to which we get just the order we get but not any other one.

In history a peasant community as a form of social conduct finished its existence. But as people's essential nature is rather steady we can suppose the communal character of peasantry's way of life, which was dominant, continues its influence on mental and social-and-psychological character of modern people, mediating by itself mass consciousness and social order. What is the character of national mentality and what personal qualities are formed and supported by a peasant community? How does a community social form make conform to socialism?

In the works of A.S.Khomyakov, who was the founder of Slavophilism, we can find out that the community is the guide of aboriginal cathedral principles, which were inherited and kept by Russian people (Хомяков А.С., 1994). A.S.Khomyakov supposes that only common people in comparison to the privileged stratum keep mental character and moral peculiarities of nation. That's why Slavophiles link the hopes of mental renaissance of Russia with the cathedral psychology of Russian peasantry and its communal way of life. The way of life is defined with the belief in Orthodox values, mutual aid in labor, mutual help, mutual economical and social interests. The Russian philosopher S.L.Frank also pointed out that Russian world outlook contained pronounced "WE-philosophy", and that was its main originality (Франк С. Л. Русское мировоззрение, 1996: 160.).

A.S.Khomyakov placed great historical mission on a rural community. Though it was influenced by the European formalism, it could keep entire morals with its inherent "internal true". The thinker gives the characteristic to a peasant community and emphasized "the mutual virtues of a peasantry world", which were unknown to the world history and which astonished foreigners as well. These virtues were "a consolatory example to nations and exemplary": "noble humility, gentleness combined with strength of spirit, inexhaustible patience, ability to self-sacrifice, true justice and profound respect to it, strength of noose and faithfulness to traditions" (Хомяков А. С. 1995: 231-232.).

But because of the social character of a community "personal virtues didn't develop in a peasant world in such a degree in which mutual ones did it". A.S.Khomyakov supposes that the imperfection of a community is in lack of "enlightener origin", education in its west meaning, "imperfect understanding of Orthodoxy by the most of Russians and lack of *определяющий* consciousness in every Russian citizen". But there is a way out: if we combine the west "education" with Russian mentally retarded "enlightenment", we'll have an opportunity to overcome the crisis of the world civilization and restore a new culture (Хомяков А. С., 1995: 243).

It should be noted that the social ideal in Russia, including Slavophiles' one, during its long history was alien to national insularity and ethnocentrism. On the

contrary, it called upon to place narrow selfishness (both personal and national ones) under the problems of mental renaissance.

The problem of people's internal life as a main factor of social evolution requires special attention. Slavophiles gave prove to the state's sidetrack with respect to the religious life of a society and opposed it to the legally lawful existence of Orthodox thought and communal way of life. A.S.Khomyakov rejects the west fully enlightener view on Russian people as on raw material that needs processing. The point is that Russian people has their own resources of self-education. That's why the thinker declares religious self-comprehension of Russian peasantry and its communal way of life as a fundamental principle of future development of the world civilization.

Modern researcher of Slavophilism, V.I.Kholodniy, is quite right when he says that the basis of A.S.Khomyakov and other Slavophiles' thought is the interpretation of people's traditional psychology and way of life as a revival source of evolutionary process. Understanding and explaining the cathedral faith of Russian people as spontaneously developed substantial immateriality, A.S.Khomyakov asserts the idea of theoretical and real way of life combination. In other words, the aim of Slavophiles' movement is to join the life and the knowledge, to enlighten consciousness and place people's way of life on a reflexive level of understanding (Холодный В.И., 2004: 141).

I.S.Aksakov, in addition to A.S.Khomyakov, gives his own characteristics of Russian behavior, which could be formed under the influence of communal way of life during many centuries: «Russian nation is not giddy or light-headed,...it doesn't fly into a rage being offended in his sense of honor; it doesn't flare up because of wrong words; it doesn't fall for war fame passion, it doesn't like to swear or to be enthusiastic, it doesn't tend to false delight and theatrical effects; this nation is brave, wise, cheerful, and it differs from others with its inclination to peace and long-suffering. This nation is mostly common, and it doesn't have political ambition or tendency to occupy something or somebody ...» (Аксаков И.С., 1891: 141).

Another Slavophile, K.S.Aksakov, considers “brotherhood, wholeness and communal way of life” to be the merits of Russian nation’s existence. The thinker asserts the conception about Russian nation as “a wise society, which has moral will” and “deep beliefs”. He denies the thought to take up Russian nation as an unconscious mass of people.

As a matter of fact, at all times Slavonic tribes had been living according to the laws of “moral truth”, when “not under compulsion but due to the life itself everything, which contradicts truth, is extirpated, and every thing is given its limit and order. The dissension, which can happen because of human imperfection, is put in order due to the life again” (Аксаков К. С., 1889: 12.). Under the concept “life” K.S.Aksakov means people’s communal way of life in a peasant community. The free “land” period, or communal existence, is known to put on trial constantly either because of people’s internal imperfection or due to endless attacks of warlike neighbors. The ancestors of modern Russian nation could keep moral communal way of life and establish State system (Аксаков К. С., 1889: 13,17).

As the Soviet researchers A.Galaktionov and P.Nikandrov notice, K.S.Aksakov, being “faithful to his idealistic conception of “internal freedom” placed economical and political problems of the country and real interests of serf peasantry under moral-and-religious problems. He supposed the peasants’ well-being was provided with the community fully enough. The community in this sense was a moral “unity of people”, who refused from their egoism” (Галактионов А. А., Никандров П. Ф., 1970: 251).

Slavophile Y.F. Samarin notices the special role of Christianity and Church, which brought mental relations, consciousness and freedom into ancient Slavonic onset. Christian consciousness contributed to the development of personal egalitarianism and sacrificial nature of the community in the sense of possessing authority rejection on the community level. Y.F. Samarin considers the Slavonic communal way of life to be based not on the personality’s absence but on its free and conscious renunciation of absolute power in which connection renunciation is shown as “the supreme act of personal freedom and consciousness” (Самарин Ю. Ф., 1996: 442, 432).

But H. Spenser, who examined this problem, said, that such people's renunciation of power led to natural abuse of community management: "Controlling the lands, the capital, means of transportation and communications on the community's confidence and having all military might and police at their disposal, rightly organized officials, who are mostly remarkable for their aggressive egoism, ... would obligatory start to gain profit from other members of the community" (Spencer, 1896: 694). Thus, referring to a weighty opinion of English sociologist, we come to the conclusion on the economical exploitation community's accommodation.

Slavophiles, including Y.F. Samarin, insisted on the religious basis of community's existence, as it is the Church that promotes enlargement and consolidation of Slavonic community, its animation (Самарин Ю.Ф., 1898: 442, 431). But his contemporary A.I. Koshelev cast doubt on traditionally top-heavy emotional content of his like-minded persons, their bias of views and peasant community's idealization. He had the following question: how can Orthodox cults, ceremonies and Orthodox doctrine influence the social and mental life of people essentially A.I.Koshelev considered that the community was to disappear soon as it disappeared in the West in the beginning of the Middle Ages. But A.S.Khomyakov believed that "the whole civil world can develop" from Russian community as the main cell (Кошелев А. И., 87, 34). Admitting A.I.Koshelev's opinion we should accept that the community's origin is a permanent phenomenon. It exists under the condition of non-developed property law, as it was mentioned above.

In fact, it is not necessary to place the community life values under Christianity ones. In Slavophiles' time there was no absolute Orthodoxy among people, but respect to others and altruism, compassion and mutual aid, in other words educational experience accumulated by the community, was keeping and imparting across the generations. It is impossible to imagine that any immoral human actions would be left without people's appraisal in the community life, which was social by its character. A person was rewarded or he/ she got general condemnation accordingly. The discredit of centuries-old moral people's experience can happen in a moment. It may be observed during large-scaled transformations in the society.

A peasant community during its existence was self-supervisory and self-controlling apparatus of the State. There was social control of people against each other in such a community. A.S.Khomyakov is right, saying that Russian nation, in comparison with the West one, could keep a peasant community as the heritage of ancient life. In the course of time the fact of natural relationship in the community changed into the necessity of moral, human relationship generally. Nevertheless, in the XIX century the community was seen as atavism, the obsolescent form of people's living: the diminution of cathedral origin began to take place.

In ancient times the community way of life was justified with hard physical conditions for living and natural conditions. Further, in Slavophiles' times, the community life became an obstacle on the way of economical development of the country. The fact that the peasants' question arose in the beginning of the XX-th century and couldn't be solved for a long time indicates the forced retention of peasants in the community. It isn't a secret that peasantry during the whole history of Russian state was its "internal colony". We can't speak on voluntary joining into communities because people were joined into them with a view of economical exploitation.

We suppose that the community origins in Russian life, regarding management and economical control over the society, were favorable for the establishment itself. Moreover, monarchical State system and patrimonial aristocratic elite gave the community an opportunity of a definite, well-ordered, and safe existence. In any case, we can speak on a traditional form of social conduct for the essential part of population, which appeared in Russia. Being inspired with different feelings, Slavophiles examined Russian reality of their times, which hasn't become out of date till nowadays. This fact is the evidence of sufficient stability of social processes in Russia either on the consequence of chronically non-solving internal problems or due to the events which happened one and a half century ago but they are in one temporal universe with the present ones. The second circumstance is contrary to the dialectical law of universal evolution and change as it shows the repeatability of social problems of the past and the present. At the same time it is the evidence of the hypothesis on slow changes in the psychological national character.

The question of rather great amount of people communal living is topical now. The psychology of the society and a person himself, who is built up under these social circumstances, follows that question. Slavophiles lost the sight of this fact when they mixed the phenomenon of Russian community with religion and morality. This is not a surprise that this phenomenon got one-sided and idealized interpretation.

The positive appearance in Slavophiles' work is the manifestation of mentally-complete potential of the deepest layers of human mentality. We mean self-understanding of human unity, cathedral solidarity, which was very expressively presented in Russian national character.

The problem of people's existence historical form and the length of its period define the character and mental qualities of nation. They also specify the type of the society, which is "stubbornly" formed in spite of meliorative reforms and even revolutionaries. That's why it is important due to the observation and getting empirically given facts of living in the country to find out what common to all mankind phenomena got favorable surroundings in Russia and established the modern type of society. The question on traditional communal people's psychology on establishing another socialistic social and political regime in the country remains open.

One should take into consideration integral qualities of a person as the main participant of social processes and temporarily lose sight of inspiring influence of religion on people's communal life. On the other hand the same human unity – the community – can be examined not as an abstract "unity en masse" but as the concentration of large masses of people into a single whole, which obey to self-organization on their own immanent principles. It becomes evident that in any large amount of people, which forms the unity, the hierarchy of persons and groups necessarily appears, and any hopes on social equality become fiction beforehand. To make sure of this fact we can examine the distribution of roles in a group of children and teenagers. In such a community there is "an authority" and a small group of persons who glorify the leader and promote to strengthen his position.

If we reject economical hidden motive of a peasant community existence in tsarist Russia and look at this community as a great number of real people, we'll see a certain amount of them, who are to live together because of their common activity, area of living, etc. Slavophiles idealized the community attributing the qualities of absolute good to it. In fact, the community gave both positive and negative examples of people's relations to each other. The true nature of such communities is always the same: an attempt of the individual to occupy and strengthen his own positions in a group, to hold some space, to secure himself, to obtain means of subsistence.

We can't set aside the question about the image of personality in the community and about the correlation between collective and individual in social existence because it defines the qualities of a single person. Slavophiles attempted to form a certain ideal of a personality of future, who would be integral in his/ her cognitive, moral and social functions and would originate from the communal life. But it was K. Marx who pointed to the "imbecility of country life", which includes complacency. It is the quality that "lulls" all positive impulses of a man to the main principle of life – the principle of self-actualization. Slavophiles' tender emotions on integral communal personality seem to be the idealization of patriarchal, mentally retarded, uncultivated personality, who is suppressed by a group, everybody's egalitarianism, economical exploitation.

Slavophile Y.F.Samarin agrees with the statement of K.D.Kavelin that the Slavs didn't have a personality as there was no personal consciousness because there were no personality collisions between each other. Family way of life also protected the community because it calm a man and made "a weak stay-at-home" from him (Самарин Ю.Ф., 1996: 424-425). A.S.Khomyakov also mentions a family and common character of Russians pointing out the "home-keeping" by implication. I.S.Aksakov summarizes his position on this question more resolutely: "Our personality is weak, ...Russian society suffers from lack of moral energy, personal moral development of its members. We need a personal good will for the prosperity of civil life" (Аксаков И. С., 1891: 167, 163). Thus, there were communal relations and predominance of related origin: the community successfully kept itself but didn't develop in moral and will sense.

Russian philosopher of the XIX-th century V.S.Soloviev strictly examines the principles of social life, the two directions of social ethics – “abstract beginnings” of individualism and community. He considers the full realization of this or that beginning doesn’t exist, it is impossible. One-sided domination of the community suppresses the peculiarities of personal forces and characters, takes away their activity freedom and development and thus takes away from the society itself, which consists of oppressed persons, the completeness of real contents. When the individualism dominates the definite beginning of life is carried to a single person, and social unity is only the surroundings and the auxiliary means to satisfy personal requirements. As a result, “the society’s existence is fully destroyed” (СОЛОВЬЕВ В. С., 2001: 119).

V.S.Soloviev fairly notices that individualism and the community don’t have real attitude towards moral norm. They are neither evil nor good, but they can become both. It depends on how and where they are stated. So, individualism with its personal beginning domination is evil, if a personality is deprived of ideal matter. Individualism is good if a personality has the best matter and asserting itself, realizes a certain common idea, which suggests universal solidarity. Thus, true individualism requires “internal community”. Just as it, the community is good when social unity can unite possible wealth and completeness of life matter, which is impossible without a personality’s development. Thus, true community is inseparably linked with true individualism (СОЛОВЬЕВ В. С., 2001: 120).

A.S.Khomyakov, on the contrary, provides the community with the category of high morality and altruism and insists on the fact that the unity in Russian community is the following: “all members, personalities lose themselves”, not an individual but “the community is a moral person” (ХОМЯКОВ А.С., 1900: 116.). Later Russian philosopher S.L.Frank Позднее русский философ С.Л.Франк, delimiting from naturalism of positivist views on the society with their social atomism also speaks on the principle of соборности in organizing social life. He reminds that isolated individual is only an abstraction; a real person can exist only in cathedral being, in society (ФРАНК С.Л., 1992: 53). In response to it N.A.Berdyayev fairly

criticized the idea of соборности as the principle, which declared the community's suppression relevancy of individual's will and intellect (Бердяев Н.А., 1912: 200.).

V.S.Soloviev supposes the way out "the golden mean" in personal and collective correlation. The thinker comes to the conclusion that the main condition of "a normal society" is an internal coincidence between the strongest development of a personality and the fullest social unity; as only this coincidence satisfies the formal moral requirement: every person will become everybody's aim (individualism) and everybody will become every person's aim (community). Such coincidence or internal unity of both diametrically opposed beginnings V.S.Soloviev calls "free community" (СОЛОВЬЁВ В. С., 2001: 120-121).

In fact, individualism and community (collectivism) have relation not only to morality but to special types of behaviour and psychology as well. From the behavioural point of view individualist prefers to act alone, independently from other people. He is ready to give up benefits and fulfil heavier and less profitable activity, if it gives him independence for the activity if other people. Collectivist prefers to act in a group, in contact with other people, making the same. Individualist avoids meetings, tries to stand out against a background of a crowd. Collectivist aids to join groups, parties, crowds. In a crowd he behaves according to its laws and doesn't stand out of it. Individualist forces his way through life due to individual abilities and personal labor, and collectivist does with collective due to his role in this collective.

When we speak about individualism, we suppose the highest mark of personal beginning in the society. But collectivism makes a person more adapted to complex conditions of modern society and turns out to be the most adequate to the basis of the society itself. The fight for the best social positions takes place under such circumstances in which in most cases not the best and respectable person but a more flexible and dodge individual will have advantages. The criminal activity of Russian citizens abroad strikes with its high ability to maneuver in another's social surroundings and are the evidence of well cultivated collectivists. Individualism hardly forces its way. It happens only due to the fact that there are creative kinds of work in the society, in which collective has no advantages over an individual.

Spencer in his theory of evolution of the state as well as in organics and ethics gave a personality insignificant part in the political life. Such ideas roused Russian community on the eve of the revolution of 1917. The idea about a possibility of changing state regime at the expense of energetic people's activity began to spread in our country, on the contrary to Spencer's statements. Thanks to the ideological ideas about "state's passing away" Bolsheviks organized roughly repressive staff, which suppressed many personal rights, to govern the country, and Spencer's gloomy prognosis, unfortunately, came true. Sensible ideas of the thinker were neutralized during the revolution and the civil war. Earlier, 50 years before Bolshevistic regime was established in our country, the scientist described its possible structure in detail and showed what the politics of communal economical compensation and "caserne socialism" would lead (Spencer, 1896: 691-695).

Spencer was the protector of personality's rights and individualist in politics. He was called "the Utopist of individualist idea" with good reason. According to Spencer any compulsion is evil, and there is no matter where it comes from, including the state. He saw only the personality's enslavement in the system of state guardianship and in one of its variants – in socialism.

All his views Spencer took out from the principle of personal freedom inviolability, from holiness of free agreement between separate personalities, in whose relations secondary healed mustn't interfere even through they are the representatives of executive power. Spencer said: "the personality's liberation was always the true task of the Liberal party both before the English revolution under Karl II, and in the first half of the XIX-th century, when all the liberals were united with a common wish to abolish a number of laws, which were deleterious interference of government into economical life of people and presented profit only for a small privilege class" (Spencer H., 1884: 7).

Russian sociologist N.K.Mikhailovsky considered the development of human individuality to be the aim of progressive historical process, which could be examined as a consequent and gradual realization of personality's self-actualization principle. Only respect to a human originality may guarantee fair social order, when a person doesn't owe to a state and a society, but they owe to him. That's why

N.K.Mikhailovsky underlined especially that a personality was no to be sacrificed, it is sacred and inviolable (Михайловский Н.К., 1877: 419).

On the occasion of collective consciousness people in Russia we think that not only in Russian elite but in a common Russian there was aspiration for private, individual life, and it let to know about it under any little possibility. The historical examples are known: opening of capitalist enterprises drew many peasants to the towns and cities, where the work was not easy, but they became free from the control of the community. Another example of *private* consciousness of Russian can be noted in his way of life. Russians tend to keep their houses in special unique cleanness. Modern sociologist V.I.Tishkov marked the private character of a Soviet person, who first of all worried on the condition of his own home, and not on those things which were outside (Тишков В. И., 2003: 419). Thus, we can't suppose that a Russian has exclusively cathedral collective consciousness as it doesn't correspond to a real state of affairs. French enlightener J.J.Ruossou was right when he spoke that in their natural state people tried to live alone.

A.S.Khomyakov's positive argument in favor of socialist collectivism was the category of love. First of all, love supplies the achievement of ideal integral state to realize the process of perception. Therefore, it has the function of collecting together al personality's forces. Secondly, love is a factor which provides for the unity of the whole mankind to realize the process of perception in sense of patrimonial process, i.e. «соборность» of perception. In other words, "not available for single thinking the truth is available for whole thinking, linked with love" (Хомяков, 1900: 283.). Individualism, that goes without saying, is equal to egoism here and it isn't examined as a social value. Unfortunately, this view is so far spread in Russian society.

So, love unites people in a community in order to realize truth in a social way. Then, the perception itself is imagined as a joint activity of people united with love. Soviet researcher of Slavophiles' philosophy Z.A.Kamenskiy calls such A.S.Khomyakov's conclusion "romantic declamation" (Каменский, 2003: 311), want points to a needless idealization of social reality by Slavophiles.

But we'll risk to affirm that the community taught people the main feeling. That is love. What is the concept of love, Slavophiles spoke much about? This notion has lost its primordial meaning because of its frequent usage and is in danger of regenerating into literal sense. In the context of communal life love should be understood not as any active external action but as internal, mental *feeling of participation* to everything existed.

Another advantage of social collectivism is that it destroys personal individuals' "appearance", which condemns them to mental loneliness, and organizes people in a certain mental unity. A.S.Khomyakov wrote about such understanding of love in cathedral community.

The community or collectivity as the organization of people into associations is peculiar not only to Russia. It is a natural phenomenon in the history of mankind. It fully corresponds to human nature and results from this nature. The most part of their historical past people lived in associations. It's quite another matter when collectivity is developing, organizing and strengthening in the character of a social order as a special way of life for millions of people. In this case the collective-communal relations become the deepest basis for other social phenomena and define the character of people's industrial activity.

The essence of communal-collective relations, when people have to live together at least because of their huge amount, was known to some thinkers of the past many centuries ago. English philosopher T. Gobbs rather accurate expressed it in the formula "a person to a person is a wolf". The nature of collective is in people's fight for being and improving their position in a social sphere, which is understanding as something alien and hostile because it doesn't give blessings to a man without efforts and fight. That's why "everybody's fight against everybody" is the basis of people's life in this society. The position and behavior of a person in the internal life of the group are determined with definite communal rules. If a person doesn't follow those rules, he can't exist in his/ her social surroundings and become successful. These rules, indeed, don't cancel the justice of Marxist formula that a person is a whole of social relations.

Results and Evaluations

Well, the basis of the traditional psychology is historically appeared and constantly repeated tendency of people and groups to self-preservation and improving the living conditions under the circumstance of social existence. The researcher A.A.Zinoviev gives many examples of such tendencies: to give less and to take more; to risk less and to gain more profit; to have less responsibility and more respect; to have less dependence on others (Зиновьев А.А., 1994: 64). Let's imagine, that if a cultural intelligent civilized person with opposite views and type of behavior gets into that common communal society, he will have to "escape" or "play" according to the rules of the most. This society's psychology in its endless change of generations implants in existence in such a way that we can speak about both conscious collective behavior and unconscious one, which is given a priori (the phenomenon of collective psychology is described K.G.Jung's theory of neofreudism (Юнг, 1994).

Socialists think that if the wishful living conditions are created, people will become personification of virtues. Meanwhile people themselves are the product of history and the have the qualities, which don't depend on social reforms. On the contrary, possibilities of reforms depend on those qualities.

Of course, socialists don't wish and have never wished to foresee such results. The examples given above won't convince them of the fact that different forms of society organization are defined with the properties of human nature, and only having improved this nature we can improve the society. Socialists hoped that under the favorable circumstances of living they will make egoists to act non-selfishly, and dishonest people will act honestly. H. Spencer fairly notices that the followers of socialistic upbringing believe in "social alchemy, which should elicit noble acts from shabby ones" (Spencer H., 1896: 696). In his work "From Freedom to Slavery" (1894) the English scientist writes that "nothing except slow improvement of a human nature by means of organization of social life can make favorable change (Спенсер Г., 1894: 26).

H. Spencer explains slow change of human qualities with the fact that they are influenced with definite circumstances which pull them in different directions. The upbringing, which a social life gives to them, develops feelings of sympathy, but the necessity to defend when animals, other people and even other societies attempt their well-being nourishes the old feelings, which kill this sympathy. That's why human qualities improve only when the influence of the first kind prevail, and only in the size of that prevalence (Spencer H., 1910).

Being the theorist of organicism of H.. Spencer considered a social organism to develop according to the same objective laws as a plant or an animal one. The development occurs nearly spontaneously without conscious role of a person. It is naturally because if a society is an organism, it should develop as an organism, that is slowly, gradually, constantly completing in its structure and functions (Spencer H., 1910).

Joining to H. Spencer's opinion that a single personality can't change the historical process motion, we can't agree with him and accept that a group of active figures of history is able to create a new state regime. Trying to achieve definite changes in their living conditions people are not able to state the regime they wish. The fact is that there are numerous objective factors which don't depend on people's consciousness or will. People have no power to choose the type of a society which is being formed under new conditions; they can't change the common direction of society's evolution. By the way the greater the changes in the society are, the less obedient the processes of forming a new society are to people's will. The tragedy of our epoch is that rational measures to overcome the evil of modern social life become the ones which in reality cause new ethic problems, strengthening the past ones and giving the another shape. Social-and-psychological qualities of population create only prerequisites and directions for the further development.

In such case social-and-psychological style of relations having been formed in a Russian society naturally joined to a new political regime, which came to change monarchy in 1917 though a peasant community had disappeared to the beginning of the XX-th century, the people's traditional social psychology didn't change greatly. The principles of communal living, according to which individuals' relations were

formed within the community, collective, corporation, were the same. В этом можно убедиться, обратившись к сатирической литературе 20-30-х годов.

The Soviet writer M.M. Zoshchenko in realistic literary and language form, using grotesque, showed that “birthmarks of the past” during the Soviet period “have blossomed”: those disadvantages, which accompanied the life of people in peasant communities because of their dense population and lack of resources, organically shifted into the city life and even strengthened there. People’s fatal “naughtiness” is determined with the psychology of nation, which had been settled during its long historical period and showed itself in rather predictable forms under the changed conditions.

We can’t say that the Soviet regime as a type of society appears directly from communal life of people of previous centuries. A number of different conditions under which people’s communal relations could get a wide distribution in all spheres of social life and become dominant is necessary for the appearance of the society of a definite type and character. These conditions are those ones which constantly exist in the life of a new society, renew and serve as the basis for this renewal. They should be found not only in the past of the society, but also in its present as something evident, well-known and usual. A part of these conditions has a historical meaning: for example, the defeat of the country in a war, economical breakdown, the occupation by enemy’s army. These are the external factors but there are internal ones besides them. It is internal facts that determine “the face”, image, type of a society. (H. Spencer wrote about such internal phenomena (Spencer H., 1872: 50-54). The element of future communism can be met in non-communist societies (relations of command and obedience, collateral subordination, the hierarchy of social groups and positions, the collective’s power over individual, etc.), but we can understand their real social nature only examining them as the elements of communist type society.

The type of a society in which communal relations between people became dominant appeared for the first time in history in the Soviet Union. Moreover, in the countries of the East Europe it was imposed from the outside under the pressure of political state of affairs, military threaten and diplomatic contrivances. In the Soviet

Union it was formed immanently by virtue of social laws, traditional collective psychology and conditions given historically. This regime quickly reached its classical type and clearly showed all its merits and demerits. The problem of the world revolution, declared by the Soviet government during the first years of the Soviet power, became the evidence of communal collectivist ideas spreading in other countries. And though the world revolution didn't take place there was created the social system of countries with the Soviet Union at the head in the world. We can suppose the presence of objective pattern in forming of collectivist-communist society independently from private examples of societies of socialist type. We speak on the "east" type of society on the contrary to the "west" one. Thereupon, it seems not to be correctly to examine the Soviet regime as an obvious deception and constraint on the main part of population, imposed by Bolsheviks. But it is this point of view that prevails in the west political literature of the XX-th century.

If the given society has been existing for a long period of time, it shows that there is some stable system of renewal such form of life in it. That's why we can speak on the social type of this society. We speak on a special spirit, which distinguishes one nation from another and gives the qualities which are characteristics only of this society. We think that such mass consciousness was formed due to Russian community and its "collective spirit". Thanks to such consciousness the country was created as a whole, there was the unification in all spheres and levels of social life. The essence of the historical process which caused the Soviet regime and modern society was the following: the organization single structure creation, the unification and standardization of the way of life in all parts of the social whole. The process of unification came under the mutual influence of the whole on its parts and of the parts on the whole and has become the norm of life. It has become possible due to people's "mental way of life" as the objective force which is perpetual natural essence and can't be subjected to alien assimilation.

Methodology and The Analysis

In the research was used comparative and system method, functional and historical approaches also. Бердяев has several studies on discourse analysis (1900, 1912, 1920). Хомяков and Аксаков studied the influence of socialism in Russia

(1888, 1897, 1891, 1900). Зиновьев wrote some articles about Soviet communism (1984, 1994). Франк studied Russian mentality in 1922. Spencer systematized socialistic and liberal ideas in XIX th century. He made several global researches on the problems (1850, 1884, 1893, 1896).

References

- Аксаков, И. С. (1891). Сочинения. Т.2. Славянофильство и западничество, Санкт-Петербург, типография Розенберга.
- Аксаков, К. С. (1889). Полн. собр. соч. Т. 1. Москва, типография Розенберга.
- Бердяев, Н.А. (1912). А.С. Хомяков, Москва
- Галактионов, А. А., Никандров П. Ф. (1970) Русская философия XI-XIX веков, Ленинград, ЛГУ.
- Зиновьев, А.А. (1994). Коммунизм как реальность, Москва.
- Каменский, З.А. (2003). Философия славянофилов. Иван Киреевский и Алексей Хомяков, Санкт-Петербург.
- Кампанелла, Т. (1952). Город Солнца, Москва
- Кареев, Н. И. (1897). Введение в изучение социологии, Санкт-Петербург, типография Стасюлевича.
- Кнабе, Г. С. (1986). Древний Рим - история и повседневность: Очерки, Москва, Наука.
- Кошелев, А. И. (1890). Записки А. И. Кошелева. Ч.1., Санкт-Петербург.
- Ленин, В. И. (1980). «О кооперации», Полное собрание сочинений. Т. 45. Москва, 374.
- Михайловский, Н.К. (1877). «Записки профана», Отечественные записки, Санкт-Петербург, типография Краевского, 1: 419.
- Мижухев, П. Г. (1904). Социологические этюды, Санкт-Петербург, Знание.
- Мор, Т. (1954). Утопия, Москва, Наука.
- Мор, Т. (1998). Утопия. Эпиграммы. История Ричарда III, Москва.

- Самарин, Ю. Ф. (1996). Избранные произведения, Москва.
- Соловьев, В.С. (2001). «Критика отвлеченных начал», Сочинения. Т.3. Москва.
- Спенсер, Г. (1894). От свободы к рабству: Доводы против социализма, Ковна.
- Spencer, H. (1873). *Descriptive Sociology*, England, L., University Press.
- Spencer, H. (1910). *Essays: Scientific, Political, and Speculative, Works*, L.-N.Y., v.1-3.
- Spencer, H. (1884). *The Man versus the State, Works*, L.-N.Y.
- Spencer, H. (1896). *The Principles of Sociology, System of Synthetic Philosophy*, v.2.
- Spencer, H. (1872). *The Study of Sociology*, L.-N.Y.
- Тишков, В. И. (2003). Реквием по этносу: Исследования по социально-культурной антропологии, Москва.
- Франк, С.Л. (1992). Духовные основы общества, Москва.
- Франк, С. Л. (1996). «Ересь утопизма», Русское мировоззрение, Москва, 84.
- Франк, С. Л. (1996). «Сущность и ведущие мотивы русской философии», Русское мировоззрение, Санкт-Петербург.
- Холодный, В. И. (2004). А.С. Хомяков и современность: зарождение и перспектива соборной феноменологии, Москва.
- Благова, Т.И. (1995). Родоначальники славянофильства. А. С. Хомяков и И. В. Киреевский, Москва, 231-232.
- Хомяков, А.С. (1900). Полное собрание сочинений: В 8 т. Т.1. Москва.
- Хомяков, А. С. (1994). Сочинения: В 2 т. Москва.
- Юнг, К. Г. (1994). «Психология бессознательного. Ответ Иова», Собрание сочинений, Москва.
- Эдельман, А. И. (1985). Кому служит «богоизбранность», Ужгород.