

## ASSESSMENT OF REFORM ACTIVITIES OF P.A. STOLYPIN IN THE MODERN HISTORICAL DISCOURSE



УДК 332.363+ 332.145

**A.I. Matveeva,**

**A.V. Saroupultseva**

**Annotation:** The article discusses the assessment of the reformist activities of P.A. Stolypin in the modern historical discourse, given by scientists from different countries. The methodological basis of the article is the principles of integrity, objectivity and historicism. The complex of key methodological approaches is involved: 1) axiological; 2) dialectics; 3) structural-functional; 4) ontological. Therefore, according to the authors, the personality and activity of Stolypin did not find an adequate reflection in historiography, in the modern situation of coexistence of different scientific paradigms, splitting of the cultural matrix and «mosaic» of historical consciousness, it is very difficult to achieve this. The results obtained during the study may be of interest to scientists, managers and practitioners in the development of programs, strategies, directions of development and reforming of agriculture. The main provisions of the study can be used in educational institutions in the development of teachers of various economic disciplines.

**Key words:** Socio-economic transformations, economic policy, A.P. Stolypin, Stolypin reforms, agrarian problems, agrarian sector of economy.

### I. INTRODUCTION

One of the key historical figures of the XX century for Russia is P.A. Stolypin. In the XXI century all authors of scientific works and textbooks for schools and universities agree with this statement. As for the characteristics and assessments of his personality, reform activities and its consequences, here is the freedom of opinion, speech, judgment, from apologetic to extremely negative, from highly emotional to historical sources, fully implemented.

### II. THE DEGREE OF ELABORATION

Historiography of the activity of P.A. Stolypin totals more than a thousand titles of published works. In the post-Soviet period, the subject was addressed by A.M. Anfimov, B.V. Ananchich, R. Ganelin, A. Glagolev, A.J. Dvornichenko, I. Dyakov, P.N. Zyryonov, V.V. Kazresov, S.G. Kara-Mursa, V. Krivenkiy, V. Krivorovoe, I.V. Ostrovsky, O. Platonov, P.A. Povigailo, S. Stepanov, L. Taranova, V.V. Shelokhayev, etc. authors [7; 316].

Turning to the modern historiography of this problem, we note that the evolution of the views of historians for the last two decades is evident. In the years of perestroika began to change the «symbols-milestones» of national history. Since the late 1980s, the traditional Soviet historiography position assessing Stolypin's activities as an attempt to preserve the «rotten Tsarist regime», «drown the first Russian Revolution in Blood», and its reform Regarded as initially doomed to failure, as it contradicted the objective laws of the genesis of capitalism and the crisis of the bourgeois-landowner system. After searching for the years of «reconstruction» of «Bukhara» and similar alternatives to Stalin, the attention of historians shifted to the Russian reformers of the XIX-early XX centuries. (Vitte, Stolypin), and from them to statehood, in the framework of which this reform was developed.

The turn in relation to the historical figure of Stolypin consisted in the accent on inconsistency of its activity, and then in the promotion to the foreground of its reform potential. The urgency of such a turn was explained, along with other reasons and that at the turn of 1980-1990 for Russian reformers it was necessary to lean on historical experience of successful transformations in pre-Soviet Russia. Thus, in the early 1990s, the popularizer of agrarian reform, which he intended to conduct on the basis of the use of Stolypin experience, was vice-President A.V. Russkaya. At the same time, the figure of P.A. Stolypin, who needed «great Russia», became a symbol and a banner for supporters of strong statehood, which objectively was significantly undermined by the collapse of the USSR, followed by «loomed» possible Disintegration of the Russian Federation. Analyzing the «historiographic» situation in the 1990, V.D. Kamynin, E.B. Zabolotny, I.G. Shishkin drew attention to the existing differences in approaches to the evaluation of the activities of P.A. Stolypin related to methodological and conceptual Pluralism.

They noted that in the historical-materialistic literature about the characteristic personality Stolypin prevails that side of his activity, which is associated with the suppression of the first Russian Revolution. According to calculations of P.N. Zyryanov, if in 1906 was executed 144 persons, in 1907-already 1139, in 1908 g. – 824, in 1909 g. – 717, in total on average monthly of 58-59 executions [20; 3]. Speaking about the reasons of the punitive policy of Stolypin, E.G. Plymak and I.K. Pantin noted a strong motive of personal revenge, connected with the assassination attempt on Stolypin, during which his three-year-old son was easily injured and his

fifteen-year daughter was heavily wounded. This happened on August 12, 1906, and on August 19 Stolypin «adopted on an emergency basis 87 of the «Basic Laws» a decree on military field courts, which ordered to destroy» criminals «without any legal proceedings within 48 hours; The verdict at the command of the district commander was executed in 24 hours» [22; 261]. As underlined by V. D. Kamynin, E. B. Zabolotny, I. G. Shishkin «Modern ideological opponents Stolypin still believe that he did not conduct reforms, and tried to restore the previous orders and that his policy was only to immediate response to The various crises before which the Tsarist regime appeared» [11; 211]. Whereas, liberal historians wrote about the reformist activity of Stolypin, referring it to the greatest statesmen of the XX century. The opinion was expressed that «the outstanding statesman p.a. Stolypin was also mistaken in the estimates of the sharply prevailing situation of that time. But he was consistent in his actions, considering the most favorable way for Russia to agrarian transformations with the right of full ownership of peasants to the earth» [21; 48]. Such an argument, in particular, was intended in the early 1990 g., when there was an acute ideological and political struggle on the problem of choosing a strategy for economic reform of Russia, to help supporters of the radical, «shock» model of transition to the market.

### III. THE PURPOSE OF THE WORK

To study and describe the estimations of the reformist activity of P.A. Stolypin in the modern historical discourse, given by scientists from different countries.

### IV. METHODS OR METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The methodological basis of the article is the principles of integrity, objectivity and historicism. The complex of key methodological approaches is involved: 1) axiological; 2) dialectics; 3) structural-functional; 4) ontological.

### V. THE COURSE OF THE STUDY

New approaches to the activity of Stolypin allowed to talk about the proposed program of reforms for the renewal of Russia, designed for several decades. A. Iskandarov argued that Stolypin's reforms «should have prevented the revolutionary path of Russia's development and put it back on the rails of civilized evolutionary changes, the necessity of which is not enough for anyone who has been questioned». He further wrote that «it was, in fact, the last chance to preserve its statehood and to come to a qualitatively new stage of development, capable of protecting it from all kinds of accidents» [12]. With this interpretation Solidar A.N. Bokhanov, for whom it was «obvious that the chance to save the Russian monarchy gave implementation of reforms of economic and social institutions proposed by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers P.A. Stolypin» [7; 317].

The American historian D. Macy believed that «Stolypin agrarian reforms should actually be understood as part of a broader social, political and economic program aimed at radically transforming the existing system with Preservation of political continuity»[20; 3].

As for the content, degree of implementation of this program and its consequences, there were different opinions and positions. A significant part of the researchers had set the «programme of reforms» only to agrarian reform, while the other part sought to see the whole range of transformations, in particular, attention was drawn not only to economic and social reforms, but to the plan Reforms in the public sphere. Referring to the analysis of the Zemskaya reform proposed by Stolypin in 1911, N. Vert wrote that the establishment of «zemstvo» in the western regions of Russia was aimed at strengthening in them the situation of the Belarusian and Russian population, which constituted the majority, which depended on Polish nobility. He called it the mistake of Stolypin, which led him to the loss of political support from «ocbrists» [8; 58].

B. V. Ananich and R. Ganelin also believed that «Stolypin-skillful politician-wanted to combine the incompatible: representation and autocracy. Many of his projects of State transformations related to the completion of reforms of the 1860-ies, for example with the introduction of «zemstvo» western Region, failed» [1; 237].

A different interpretation was offered by V.I. Bolshakov. He noted that during the years of the premiere at Stolypin «The eyes were opened to a great deal and he made a noticeable step towards the national policy. I did not like the world behind the Desire Stolypin to cover up so beloved by all revolutionaries «finnish» aviary and parasyying Finns on the absence of a customs barrier. As a first measure, he put forward a project to join the St. Petersburg Province of two Finnish parishes. And in the Polish issue, the prime minister showed unheard-of resolute determination. He signed his verdict with these actions».

The researchers evaluated Stolypin's activity as the last outstanding attempt to save the state from impending catastrophe, energetic and powerful jerk to modernization. P.P. Cherkasov, and D. Chernyshevsky noted that «he sought to adapt the archaic political structures of the power to a rapidly growing economy and a dynamic society, to liberate the peasantry from the remnants of serfdom and involve it in the creative Activities, strengthen the national foundations of the monarchy and turn Russia into a state of law» [28; 394]. The authors believed that the course chosen by Stolypin was the only correct one, but the reforms came too late. The split between the state and the intelligentsia, which turned into an abyss after 1905, was not possible to overcome Stolypin, and immediately after his death the modernization was curtailed, which made the new revolution inevitable.

Evaluating the role of Stolypin in the history of Russia A.A. Iskandarov wrote: «With the departure from the political arena of such an outstanding reformer, what was Stolypin, the Russian state ship abruptly tipped to the right and slowly swam to meet the new dangers. If in due time care Vitte and replacement of it extremely reactionary V.K. Palve have become a kind of prologue to revolutionary events of 1905-1907, the elimination of Stolypin can be considered as the beginning of the end of evolutionary reformation of the Russian society» [14; 119].

In the situation of «deheroization» of the history of Russia of the XX century, characteristic of the national historiography of the 1990s, this trend allowed to mix the devastating consequences of the rapid change of political-ideological signs, cultural symbols, but at the same time, for Part of the authors, became the next fashion. Analysis of publications on the History of Russia, published in the first half of the 1990. Allowed the Italian researcher M. Feretti to conclude that «the process of reflection of the past, initiated by the revival of the idea of alternatives, ended in a new negation of this idea and the restoration of new «regularities of History»: Authoritarianism, deeply He sits in the very manner of thinking of the Russian modern liberalism, which has passed the way from the accusation of Stalinism to the «mythologization» of Stolypin [27; 306]. B. V. Ananchich noted that P.A. Stolypin «became an object of «unmoderated» praise not only in fiction and «publicistics», but also that, most unfortunate, in school textbooks on history» [1; 237]. Thus, v. P. Ostrovsky and A.I. Utkin claimed that P.A. Stolypin is a key figure of Russian history, his reformist ideas and their implementation were evaluated exceptionally high. It would be difficult to argue with this, notes A.V. Golubev [13; 63], if not for one detail-the authors do not separate the ideas, remaining on paper, from the realized, and, accordingly, exaggerate the real achievements of «Stolypinskaya policy». The Russian «economic miracle» of the beginning of the century is one-sided. Debating with exaggerated notions of Russia's backwardness, the authors clearly fall into the other extreme.

In 2000, the development of the research areas started in the 1990s continued. A number of historians come from the recognition Stolypin as one of the most important symbols of the Russian (imperial) civilization, a statesman who realized in the difficult moment of Russian history the need to modernize the existing system, and has done a lot for their successful implementation.

Dvornichenko A.N. drew attention to the civilizational, rather than narrowly utilitarian class roll of reforms [10] Stolypin, their multipurpose character and complexity. The government expected to modernize the entire socio-economic system in the country, to raise the welfare of the peasantry, to develop in it a sense of private owner and to awaken civil dignity. The authors emphasize that the matter is not whether the reforms of Stolypin or not, how many farms left the community and what the results of the resettlement policy, and in a different way. In their new

approaches the power faced with a wall of peasant patriarchy, equalizing traditions, «black-and-silver» moods. Peasantry turned out to be more conservative than power. The reforms of Stolypin, as in general, the entire centrist line of power, caused a sharp opposition from the right-conservative circles, liberals and leftist radicals. They were evaluated from the general political positions of each of these public groups and had no chance of support on their part. Consequently, the authorities carried out these reforms alone, without any social support. This was her weakness and doom. The death of Stolypin only underlined this truth [6].

The founder of the Russian School of Modernization Studies academician of RAS V.V. Alekseev and its representatives E.V. Alexeev, K.I. Zubkov, I.V. Poberezhnikov in the fundamental work «Asian Russia in geopolitical and civilizational dynamics of the XVI-XX century» [2]. Pay attention to the fact that at the beginning of XX century the representatives of the Russian ruling elite had contradictions on the question of prospects of development of the territories of Asian Russia. «By stimulating peasant resettlement to the east, the government at the beginning of the XX century saw the possibility of strengthening Russia's geopolitical position on the outskirts mainly in order of general progressive development, first of all strengthening Demographic presence of the Russian agricultural population and subsequent cultural «russification» of the territories. Attempts were made to design and lay new railway tracks, for example, the Amur railway in the far east, taking into account the realization of this task. The supporter of this variant of development of territories of Asian Russia, in particular, was P.A. Stolypin. The strategy of S.Yu. Vitte focused more on turning the remote margins of Asian Russia into a springboard for the deployment of more strategically oriented, predominantly industrial expansion of Russia into the neighboring countries of the East, First of all in China» [5].

Supporters of the liberal dimension consider the Russian history of the beginning of XX century up to 1917 through the prism of reform way of development of the country. For them, such facts as the adoption of the manifesto on October 17, 1905, the activities of the four State Duma, reform activities of S. Yu. Vitte, P.A. Stolypin, V.N. Kokovtseva testify that Russia in the first decades of the XX century rapidly has evolved towards a constitutional monarchy with a market economy. Researchers are trying to understand whether the Bolsheviki project of Russia could be embodied and blocked by the Bolsheviks, give him the history of those two decades, which he considered necessary and sufficient for reforming the country. A.S. Akhiezer, I.M. Klyamkin, I.G. Yakovenko [3] pay attention to the value split, the fundamental conflict of the old autocratic and new democratic-legal beginnings of the Russian statehood after it has started the Self-reform. Systemic socio-political modernization, which first affected the basic foundations of this statehood, faced with the anti-modernist, archaic culture of the peasant majority. It was impossible

to involve it in productive dialogue about ways and ways of modernization, and it was possible to neglect it in the course of reforms, only having turned the popular majority into the notorious minority in the Institute of National Representation. This, in turn, inevitably deformed the modernization itself, forced the authorities to abandon its proclaimed principles, including the principle of legality, and jeopardize the legitimacy of those social strata, which such principles professed. However, the legitimacy of the supreme power in the national environment as a result was undermined too, because agrarian reform, carried out on behalf of self-limiting autocracy, not only did not weaken, but also strengthened the position of private land ownership in village.

Liberal historians I.V. Karatsuba, I.V. Kurukin, N.P. Sokolov considering Stolypin's activity in the line of possible alternatives of development of Russia in the beginning of XX century emphasize that "the result of the reformist efforts of the government should be «Great Russia», which, first of all, was conceived as «Russian state», liberated from harmful influence of «foreigners». The backbone of power and the basis of state power was to be a «strong and strong peasant», freed from the shackles of the «socialist» community. The authors come to the conclusion that Stolypin himself «acting violently-bureaucratic methods, destroyed the possibility of» inner peace». His «forcible land reform has paved the way for a civil war in the village. The arbitrary national policy has persuaded the national outskirts that under the Stolypin constitutional regime «the political freedom of the dominant nation can be combined with the total denial of the rights of non-traditional peoples», and, in the final analysis, led to the explosive growth of nationalist centrifugal forces, «razorvavshih in 1917 Empire. The catastrophe could have been avoided if in 1907 the ambitious and energetic Russian prime minister did not dare to «enfavour» the country by reforms, contrary to the clearly expressed will of the majority of the country» [17; 447].

Considerable attention in modern historiography is given to the analysis of contradictions of the policy, conducted by Stolypin, draws attention to the combination of imperial and liberal approaches in reforms.

In the «Brief Historical Encyclopedia of the XX century», prepared under the editorship of Academician A. O. Chubaryan, it was stated that «as a result, the results of the agrarian reform of Stolypin were contradictory» [16]. The stratification of the peasantry deepened. At one pole formed a mass of poor, which increased the instability in the city and the village. On the other pole were strengthened rural bourgeoisie and prosperous «serednyaki». They purchased agricultural machinery, the production and import of which grew three times. But Stolypin made a mistake in the main – these layers did not become allies of landlords and autocracy. Many wealthy peasants have not even stood out from the community; last, preserved and largely determined the

development of the village. French researcher J. Sokoloff stresses, «that in no country in the world has there been a radical change in the psychology of agricultural way faster than in one generation. Stolypin himself took up his task for 20 years. Moreover, the number of peasants who are ready to leave the community increases in 1910 to the year 1912 (by this time they are more than 1.2 million people). This idea, initially met with restraint, now seems to be beginning to find more and more followers» [9]. The author further argues that «at the threshold of the war, peasant masses do not believe that the reform of Stolypin is able to solve their problems. They expected another and were still dissatisfied. Such disappointment weakens the moral spirit of the Tsarist power. Growing up, it will be one of the reasons for its death. The agrarian reform, which is intended to immediately reduce the tension, and the policy of gradual introduction of private property, which is intended for the future, were probably needed. However, Stolypin was destined to impose one of these complementary decisions on society to the detriment of the other, and in the midst of the general counteroffensive of the conservative forces that cast a shadow over everything, for whatever he might have taken» [19].

## VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The most important not only academic, but also political problem is adequacy of representations of reformers about the object which is subjected to reforms. In the beginning of XX century in reality the community was neither so elitist, as people believed, nor so differentiated, as Marxists claimed. The peasant world did not correspond also to those notions about it which officially distributed autocratic authority, continued to operate the concept of «peasant estate». In fact, as noted by T. Kondratieva «This incomprehensible world eluded the managerial and scientific elite» [18; 66].

Another point of view on the reforms Stolypin is that they were not understood and perceived by the majority of the Russian peasantry, because did not meet his true needs, mentality, traditions. If we consider the peasants who formed in the beginning of XX century 85% of the population of Russia, reasonable thinking people, supposes S.G. Kara-Murza [15], it is necessary to recognize as the fact; once they resisted the reform of Stolypin, it means that «the development of capitalism in Russia» contradicted their fundamental interests. As the peasants said; «if we disturb the community, we will have alms, but we have to ask someone».

Despite the powerful political and economic pressures, the peasant economy did not disappear, but was more viable and more efficient than farms. In 1913, 89% of the national income produced in the agricultural sector of the European part of Russia, accounted for peasant households-10 times more than the capitalist, «ie nasazhdavshiesja» government farms were less effective [23]. Therefore landowners, and stingy ground kulaks did not arrange farms, and gave



the land for rent to peasant yards. The destruction of the community and the transfer of land from holdings to the realm of capitalist relations meant not progress, but the enrichment of rural «parasites-rantier» by the regression of the economy and the suffering of the peasant. The dispute about the agricultural community, says S.G. Kara-Murza [15], is finished after two historical experiments; Reforms of Stolypin and October Revolution of 1917 having received the land, peasants everywhere and on their own initiative restored the community. In 1927, in RSFSR 91% of peasant lands were in the community land use. As soon as the story gave the Russian peasants a short respite, they definitely chose a community type of life-style.

Along with the civilizational, modernization, political, socio-economic aspects of Stolypin's activities, the researchers drew attention to the problems of political morality. G. Sokoloff has formulated three questions: is the authorities entitled to «pacify» society in order to expose it to transformations? Does the Government have the right to violate the Constitution for the transition to constitutional regime? Is it possible to conspire with the reactionary forces in the name of saving the few rudiments of progress? Answering these questions, the author writes that «Stolypin is the only one who realizes that he is compelled to do evil for the sake of the future good, which he still hopes to bring to the country. However, his charismatic charm partly compensates for the degradation of legitimate public institutions. But the more he abuses power, the more perverted the natural life of the state. On the background of soft «midtones» of the picture of the Russian public life the figure Stolypin looks though high, but gloomy» [23].

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

As you know, one of the famous Chinese politicians Zhou Enlai (1898-1976), asked how he evaluates the great French Revolution of the end of the XVIII century, said that the time has not yet come for evaluations. In this sense, the judgments about the state activity of P.A. Stolypin still experience the influence of the political conjuncture, the permanent (or simulated) process of reformation of Russia. The estimates given to him are polar: from apologists, when he is presented as a «leader of a new type», «capable of generating innovative ideas», «creatively and promptly respond to the challenges of modern Age» [24], until the total negation Positive results of its activity and preservation of the label «Ober-Hanger». Another position is to recognize Stolypin not a «figure of historical scale», but only a capable administrator, not devoid of charm and oratory [25; 306]. Therefore, one can agree with the opinion that the personality and activity of Stolypin did not find an adequate reflection in historiography [26; 394], stressing that in the modern situation of coexistence of different scientific paradigms, the splitting of the cultural matrix and "Mosaic" of historical consciousness, it is very difficult to achieve this. The results obtained during the study may be of interest to scientists, managers and practitioners in the development of

programs, strategies, directions of development and reforming of agriculture. The main provisions of the study can be used in educational institutions in the development of teachers of various economic disciplines.

#### References

1. Ananich B.V. In search of new priorities and concepts in the study of the history of pre-revolutionary Russia. (Historiography notes)//power, society and reforms in Russia: history, sources, historiography. St. Petersburg, 2007.
2. Alexeev V.V., Alekseeva E.V., Zubkov K.I., Poberezhnikov I.V. Asian Russia in geopolitical and civilizational dynamics of XVI-XX century. (Russian State Library) [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01002440059>
3. Akhiezer A.S., Klyamkin I.M., Yakovenko I.G. History of Russia: The end or the new beginning? [Electronic resource]. Access mode: [https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/History/ahiez/10.php](https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/ahiez/10.php)
4. Bolshakov V.I. facets of Russian civilization. (Russian State Library) [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01007573286>
5. Bolshakov V.I. Systemic crises of the Russian statehood. Historical and sociological Analysis (Russian State Library) [electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01004025615>
6. Bolshakov V. I. According to the Law of historical retribution (Russian State Library) [electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01007576215>
7. Bokhanov A.N. Nikolay II. II Russian autocrats. M., 1993.
8. Vert N. History of the Soviet state 1900-1991. M., 2012.
9. Gaman-Golutvina O.V. Political elites of Russia. Milestones of historical evolution. M., 2006.
10. Dvornichenko A. Russian history from ancient times to the fall of autocracy. (Russian State Library) [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01004731067>
11. Zabolotny E.B., Kamynin V.D., Shishkin I.G. Essays of Modern Historiography of the history of Russia from ancient times to the beginning of XX century. Tyumen, 2003.
12. Zyryonov P. Petr Stolypin: Political portrait. M., 1992.
13. Historical research in Russia. Trends of recent years. M., 1996.
14. Iskandarov A.A. Russian Monarchy, reforms and revolution//questions of history. 1993. № 5. P. 119-125.

15. Kara-Murza S.G. Soviet civilization. (Russian State Library) [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01006529025>.
16. Kara-Murza S.G. the right revolution! (Russian State Library) [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01004712762>
17. Karatsubba I.V., Kurukin I.V., Sokolov N. P. Choosing your own story. «Forks» on the Way of Russia: from Rurikovich to oligarchs. M., 2005.
18. Kondratieva T.V. Feed and rule. About power in Russia XVI-XX centuries. M., 2006.
19. Mironov b. N. Welfare of Population and revolution in Imperial Russia: XVIII-early XX century (Russian State Library) [electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01006515748>
20. Macy D. Land reform and political change: the phenomenon of Stolypin II questions of history. 1993. № 4. P. 3-10.
21. Essays on economic reforms in Russia. M., 1993.
22. Plamak E.G., Pantin I.K. Drama of Russian reforms and revolutions. M., 2000.
23. Sakharov N.A. Russia at the beginning of XX century: People, Power, society (Russian State Library) [electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01007579338>
24. Trofimova S.A. Multivariate development of civil society and integration of the indigenous peoples of the far North (Russian State Library) [electronic resource]. Access mode: <https://dlib.rsl.ru/01002882751>
25. Feretti M. Stalin died yesterday: authoritarianism in the political culture of modern Russian liberalism II where does Russia go? M., 1995.
26. Cherkasov P.P., Chernyshevskiy D. v. History of Imperial Russia. M., 2014.

About the authors:

**Matveeva Alla Ivanovna**, Doctor of Philosophy, professor, Ural State Economic University, City of Yekaterinburg, Russia, (620000, Russia, Sverdlovsk Region, Yekaterinburg, str. 8-Marta, Dom. 62), [orcid.org/0000-0003-0301-745X](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0301-745X), [matveevaa2011@yandex.ru](mailto:matveevaa2011@yandex.ru)

**Saroupultseva Anastasia Vyacheslavovna**, PhD in philosophy, associate professor, Ural State Economic University, City of Yekaterinburg, Russia, (620000, Russia, Sverdlovsk Region, Yekaterinburg, str. 8-Marta, Dom. 62)  
[vladislavaanastasevna@gmail.com](mailto:vladislavaanastasevna@gmail.com)