

Transformation of the national statehood as a global challenge

V.V. Lokosov,
Doctor of Sociology,
Assistant director of the Institute of Social and Political Research of the
Russian Academy of Sciences

In the majority of conceptual approaches to the analysis of historical development of social systems three stages of this process are observed. For example, “feudalism – capitalism – socialism”; “agrarian period – industrial period – postindustrial period”; “theological stage – metaphysical stage – positive stage”; “tradition – modern – postmodern”, etc. As the states are at different stages of historical development, it is acceptable to divide the present-day world community on different bases into “three worlds” according to the stage of development on which the states are at the moment. We take **ability of the society to sovereign, independent and original development as the basis of division.**

Let us define and analyze three essential qualities of this type of a society.

1. “*Soft sovereignty*”. Despite the fact that in most cases the principle of the state sovereignty was only declared, nevertheless, it was considered at least as a bad tone to openly break Westphalia rules of mutual relations of the states. Now the situation is cardinally changing. The international law, i.e. a certain global right reflecting the interests of the leading world organizations and countries-constituent territories gradually replaces the sovereign right of the states. And on the example of Kosovo randomness of the international law interpretation leading to its devaluation is clearly visible. If the state with the “soft sovereignty” does not agree with decisions, expert estimations of the countries, then sanctions, embargo, boycotts and others retaliations are applied, which in the present-day interdependent world can seriously break a vital rhythm of the country.

The national state becomes “a version of a transitive organization for managing economic processes”¹, i.e. the state-corporation, which has a certain

¹ Ohmae, K. The End of the Nation State. New York: Free Press, 1995, p.149

cost, personnel and management. According to the American sociologist M.Sandel, “the institute of the territorially limited sovereign power against the transnational organization of many aspects of the present-day economic and social life is perceived as something abnormal”.² Not less clearly his colleague J. Raggie states “the sovereignty end”. He speaks about a "rupture" during the global transformation of the link between the sovereignty, territoriality and the state power.³ The conclusion is obvious: if the state intends to enter the global scenario, it is necessary to say goodbye to the sovereignty, or, using the euphemism developed by the American sociologists, to make the “sovereignty soft”.

This word-combination is a sample of neo-language of the international communication when an adjective or other corrections are added into standard concepts. Owing to it the sense of this concept changes dramatically and gets the features of a postmodernist simulation game. “Humanitarian intervention”, “managed democracy”, “velvet revolution”, and others are the examples of such neo-language formations. Such play of words is not a harmless entertainment of intellectuals, but it is bringing chaos to the settled norms and values, in this case the principle of the state sovereignty. For the state acceptance of such “soft sovereignty” means as a matter of fact the beginning of its semi-colonial status legalization.

In Russia the situation is complicated by the presence of "limited" sovereignties of the national republics, which are the parts of the Russian Federation. The model of sovereignties as "Russian dolls", which has been realized in our country, on the one hand, belittles the Federation sovereignty; on the other hand, it is a potential basis for separatist moods and actions. "Softening" of the Russian sovereignty goes both from the outside, and from the inside.

In a case with a society-transformer the mother country intervention is carried out latently, with a formal recognition of the state sovereignty. The recognition of the state sovereignty by the international community remains an

² Held, D., Goldblatt, D., Mackgrue E., Perraton, G. Global Transformations. Politics, Economy, and Culture. – M.: Praxis, 2004. – P.10

³ The same source

important tool of the global policy. Reception of the sovereign status by Abkhazia would have serious political consequences. However, sovereignty interpretation is so washed-away and dual that it becomes more and more difficult to define the functional maintenance of this concept. For example, at the end of July 2004 it was officially declared that the USA returned the sovereignty to Iraq, thus the occupation regime remained in the country. It is possible to think that the country sovereignty is a sort of keys to a city: at first somebody took them and then returned. The officially recognized sovereign status adds some mobility to the society-transformer at negotiations with the mother country, but does not change its dependant state.

The “soft sovereignty” also has objective reasons. Indeed, there is “weakening and transformation of the national-state principle, which is one of the components of the project of modern and the world social and political order, based on it”.⁴ And the process of globalization has an objective character; it is impossible for the state to ignore it. But the problem is that along with normal sovereignty the state can lose the ability to independent, and then original development. Simultaneously the state role in every base sphere of public vital activity decreases, up to the loss of the exclusive right to legal violence. State compression is well combined with the neo-liberal concept, which actually became the leading ideology of the new world mono-order. As a result, the state cannot carry out its fundamental functions on guaranteeing conditions for the safe, effective and orderly development of the society.

The “soft sovereignty” discredits one more major principle of the national state – recognition of the fact that people have the right of sovereign. In the constitution of the Russian Federation it is unequivocally specified: “the carrier of the sovereignty and the only source of power in the Russian Federation is its multinational people” (article 3, point 1). However, according to the sociological data of the Institute of Social and Political Research at the Russian Academy of

⁴ Poljakova, N. XX Century in Sociological Theories of the Society. – M.: Logos, 2004. – P.353

Sciences, only about 10 % of Russian citizens think like that. The bureaucracy, underworld and the big capital were and remain real sources of power in the opinion of the people.

Along with the washing-away of the concept of sovereignty the understanding of the sovereign people is devaluated, i.e. the “soft sovereignty” assumes “soft people”. Is it possible to be sovereign people in the absence of sovereignty? Hence, as in late XVII century in France the right of sovereign passed from the monarch to the people, so in early XXI century in a society-transformer it passes, possibly, to the global ruling class, to which the society-transformer’s elite expects to belong. This is the source of, maybe, not anti, but not national policy realized in the society-transformer. It basically cannot be national as when it is pursued, the role of sovereign people becomes stronger, and it can lead to gaining normal sovereignty instead of the “soft” one that functionally does not correspond to the society-transformer. Constructive vertical consolidation of "tops" and "bottoms" becomes essentially impossible, and that makes the society-transformer split.

The concept "people", as a rule, is admitted by sociologists as too foggy and traditional, to speak about the citizens of the country, the population in a more scientific manner. But people can have a dual citizenship, and it is impossible to belong to two sovereign people. Especially we are called out to think “how to fall outside the limits of the idea of citizenship”⁵, i.e. "citizenship" will soon become outdated as "people" once became obsolete. Besides, in our country social myths, from Norman theory to sociological fabrications about immemorial laziness of the people, which show its inability to be sovereign, are constantly reproduced. Actually, belonging to the people, to its state is a destiny of the person, but not his choice. Only in such understanding it is possible to realize the sovereign people’s right.

And, at last, one more important problem connected with the “soft sovereignty”. If the sovereign people did not have a state or were deprived of it,

⁵ Vallerstein, I. The End of the Familiar World. Sociology of the XXI Century. – M.: Logos, 2003. – P.161

people by national-liberation struggle had the right to win or restore it. National-liberation struggle was considered as an adequate answer to colonial claims. In the society-transformer nobody seems to take the state sovereignty away, the people are constitutionally fixed as sovereigns. Can we speak about any national-liberation struggle in such conditions?

Thus, the word combination “soft sovereignty” is essential for the society-transformer. There is no need to allocate the dependency of the state legally; it becomes even excessive. The main thing is to transform the state in such a way that its normal sovereign development is considered as a totalitarian threat or an anachronism for the global scenario. At the same time, the right of a sovereign nation should be reconsidered (*de jure* or *de facto*) and its national liberation struggle as a means to get sovereignty should be blocked. Undoubtedly the legal devaluation of the state sovereignty will proceed, as this is a crucial method for globalism to legalize the construction of a new global mono-order.

2. “*Social entropy*”. An ordinary colonial society is very slow to change; it usually acts as an ethno-biological reserve, which is oriented towards ecological and ethnological tourism. A society-transformer is on the contrary too rapid in its changes and in order for its forming structure to be mainly of a marginal kind, for it not to have enough time to get firmly established – at last until the nucleus of the transformer society is of the shape that the mother country needs.

The main feature of “social entropy” is a total dissolidation of the society. As E. Durkheim defines it, «the anomie is impossible if the solidary organs are in a close and long contact».⁶ The society-transformer should not have «solidary organs», and even if they are formed, they must not be organized. The society individualizes, groups and becomes incapable of wholistic systematic self-reflectiveness. It also does not realize and accept common interests as a priority. Permanent transformation not only interferes with the habitual way of life, but also constantly kind of brings the society back to the «time of trouble» and reproduces the model of a «split» society.

⁶ Durkheim, E. The Division of Labour in the Society. – M., Kanon, 1996 – P.377

The traditional society consolidated under such extreme conditions as it had preserved its ethnical and confessional unity. The transformer society is torn away from its traditional roots, and its social energy is dispersed. A synergetic effect is either absent, or is of a negative character. The concepts «time of trouble», sovereignty and sovereign nation are too abstract for the society-transformer, as its main energy is directed towards the solution of elementary issues of individual security and survival. As a result, the energy potential of the society is being reduced.

A far too large part of social energy in the transformer society is spent on the deviant behaviour in its anti-social sense. This is a waste of force as well. Moreover, it is usually young, energetic and talented people who go into the deviant sphere – those who could have helped the society to get over the “energy recession”. We should also mention that the Russian society is characterized by the ageing of population, depopulation, active brain drain as well as other social processes that increase “social entropy”.

The inability of the transformer society to realize and implement its national interests is expressed not only in the dominance of private and group interests but also in the substitution of interests on the state level, when the interests of the mother country are being interpreted in such a way, that they look natural for the transformer society. For example the establishment of military bases not far from the state’s frontiers should be interpreted as the increasing struggle against the common enemy – international terrorism, and, therefore, as a useful measure for the national security. The interests of the mother country are obviously unable to consolidate the society-transformer, and their defense just increases “social entropy”.

Eventually “social entropy” leads to a pointless, unreasonable waste of energy, to dissolidation of the society and to its inability to struggle for its priority interests. The transformer society remains ill structured because of its excessive mobility and changeability of its elements that are disposed to anomie and deviant forms of behaviour.

It is relatively easy to control such society as it usually organizes itself in order to survive, which determines its higher adaptive capabilities. Actually it is exactly the adaptive capability that is required from the transformer society, not its ability to organize its own life in a creative and sovereign way. Decrease in the social energy, dissociation, marginality and strong adaptive capabilities are prolonging “social entropy” and preserving relative calmness and inertness in the transformer society. Social technologies make it possible to obtain an irreversible “social entropy”, which leads the societal system to a hard crisis at the best, as well as a reversible one, when the transformer society imitates activity, remaining at the same state.

3. “*Ersatz ideology*”. This is the 3rd essential quality of the society-transformer. Previously, the neo-liberal conception was in the foreground, while the “ersatz ideology” is determined by the postmodern conception.

The beginning of the postmodern epoch is connected with the end of the II World War. At least it is since that time that the essential theoretical thesis of the Enlightenment, which says that the humankind is steadily developing and becomes wiser, has been openly criticized. Though many scientists believe that it was Nietzsche who was the harbinger of postmodernism, but it took 70 years for his ideas to obtain a wide social and philosophical interpretation in the conception of postmodernism. This conception is considered to be an “epoch-making change” (R. Tarnas) that makes the social reality basically unstable, independent and chaotic, it is always “an unfinished and changeable set of regulations that was being formed gradually under the influence of a great number of various intellectual and cultural trends...”.⁷ According to the fair assessment of I.I. Antonovich, under the conditions of postmodernism, nihilism “expresses itself more and more as skepticism, distrust in the traditional forms of spiritual experience and thinking that are already formed, and prompts to search for reasonable definitions. Although these definitions are intended to be short-term, they still sufficiently explain the new reality. Criticism of the preceding scientific

⁷ Tarnas, R.. *Passion of Western Mind*. – M., 1995. – P.335

structure and systems of values becomes one of the major trends of scientific efforts”⁸. Postmodernism tries to stand beyond the objective knowledge about the society and rational way of thinking, arduously combining and interpreting in a peculiar way the fragments of other conceptions. Postmodern game of values and senses that are being chosen every time all over again forms a permanent individual crisis of a personality. The person seems to be vested with a right of self-determination, up to the separation from the society.

A set of ideas, political slogans, and myths acts as the ideology in the transformer society. They contradict each other and are of situational character. The perception of the world is being formed; it is based on the social chimeras, which are shown multi-culturally attractive. In this case it is the mosaic structure, the fragmentariness of “ersatz ideology” as well as the gaming interchangeability of its components that are to play the main role; it all happens proceeding from the capricious stimulation of a person, as the border between change and treason disappears. Today you are a communist, tomorrow you are a capitalist, and then you are a fascist, but it does not matter, as there is allegedly no real sense behind these labels (or it is just the same), and a person has a right to search for identity, after all. One can find a wide space for all kinds of oddities at the “ersatz ideology”, but this chaotic, eclectic set of ideologems is, as a rule, skillfully structured in order to neutralize the possibility of consolidation of the nation as a sovereign – this time, on the level of values.

⁸ Antonovich, I.I. After the Modern Times. The Sketch of Modernism and Post Modernism Civilization. – Minsk, 1997. – P.249