

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

THE DICHOTOMY OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE

Natalya Y. Gusevskaya¹, Inna N. Mamkina²

¹Head of the Department of International Law and International Relations

²Head of the Department of Theory of State and Law

E. mail: gusnat1@rambler.ru

Natalya Y. Gusevskaya, Inna N. Mamkina. The Dichotomy Of External And Internal Development Of The State-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(4), 1253-1260. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Foreign Policy; Domestic Policy; State Interest; Great Power, Conservatism, Liberalism.

ABSTRACT

The subject of the research is liberal and conservative concepts of Russian and Western socio-political thought of the XIX - early XX centuries on the problem of the relationship between external and internal development of the state. The goal of the research is to reveal the specifics of the socio-philosophical and political views of Russian and Western conservatism and liberalism on the state development priority course selection problem. The article examines the views of prominent Russian and foreign thinkers and politicians on the correlation between the domestic and foreign policy of the state. Two main directions were formed in the socio-political thought of the XIX - early XX centuries liberal and conservative, studying the problem of the internal or external state development dominant determination. The liberal direction is characterized by the understanding of human freedom and well-being as the highest value and the ultimate goal of all state policy. Followers of the conservative approach defended great-power values, the priority of the state primacy. Since the XIX century, liberal ideas of state development have become dominant in socio-political thought in the West and Russia. However, Russian liberalism was significantly different from Western liberalism, combining the ideas of conservatism.

INTRODUCTION

The research subject selection is conditioned by the actualization of rethinking the experience of prominent thinkers of the 19-20 centuries, associated with the selection problem of the state development priority: internal or external. An analysis of their ideas is in demand because the world's socioeconomic and geopolitical situation is in many ways dangerously similar to the one that was 100 years ago. The tension of the socio-economic systems of states, caused by

external pressure, mutual economic restraint the emergence of new centers of power on the one hand, and the absence of internal economic growth, and a drop in the standard of living of citizens on the other, asserts itself especially strongly. Extract of the 19-20 centuries socio-political idea experience is significant for solving the selection problem of the state development priority vectors. To establish a strong and sustainable statehood, it is necessary to comprehend the conditions that ensure its security and development. In this regard, the view of philosophers and political figures of the XIX - early XX centuries to the problem of strategy selected by the state for internal development or external expansion is certainly of scientific interest.

METHODS

The methodological basis of the research is the principle of interdisciplinary synthesis based on the achievements of the socio-philosophical and political-philosophical thought. One of the leading methods in the research is the method of historical and comparative analysis of Russian and Western European liberal, conservative thought of the XIX - early XX centuries on the problem of the state foreign and domestic policy correlation. This method is based on the system-structural and functional analysis principles and allows us to identify important features of Western and Russian socio-political concepts.

The works of I. Kant [4,6], F. Hegel [3], I. Fichte [12], B. N. Chicherin [13], V.O. Klyuchevsky [6], P. B. Struve [9, 10], A. Tocqueville [11] and G. Spencer [8] were the theoretical basis of the research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The dichotomy of the state external and internal development has been in the focus of attention and discussions of philosophers, political scientists-liberals, and conservatives for more than one century. The essence of the problem lies in the dilemma: what is more important - internal well-being or protection from external threats and a strong state position in the international arena? Most often in the history of mankind, the bias was towards external development. Even the ancient philosopher Plato stood for foreign policy primacy. He proposed the idea of a state with an internal life completely subordinate to external tasks and priorities, opposing the state as a single entity, striving for conquest, and the people, whose needs must be suppressed to solve the super tasks of the state.

The ideas of the great German philosopher Immanuel Kant about man as the measure of all things turned the understanding of the state interests and the personality well priorities, becoming the basis of the liberal direction of the political theory. Kant defined human personality as an absolute value, a criterion, and his well-being as the highest goal of state policy. In Critique of Practical Reason, he formulated the principle of the humanism policy: "Man ... is a goal in himself that is, can never be used by anyone (even by God) only as a means" [5]. In addition to morality, Kant pointed to the need for the supremacy of law in a just society. Through the development of social institutions, laws, including the norms of morality and law, Kant saw the movement of mankind towards progress. The central link in Kant's political

philosophy is progressivism, which unites all representatives of political liberalism. Defining the concept of progress, Kant, like other philosophers of the modernism period, used the teleology principles. Kant considered the goal of progress to be the development of the initial dispositions of mankind. Antagonisms, the struggle between individuals and countries contribute to progress, progressive development. Kant considered the division of people into races, nationalities, states, and the competition between them as the most important step towards historical development under the laws of nature and reason. However, at some stage of historical development, there always comes a stage when moral improvement requires to overcome these antagonisms. The natural disposition of people to interaction and cooperation contributes to the training of community, civic awareness. Kant refers to the laws of reason and nature, defining the idea of overcoming the natural state and achieving a civil law order at the initial stage within society and later between states. The ultimate goal of progress, Kant considers the resolution of the "greatest problem of mankind" - the construction of a "legal civil society" [4, p. 12] all over the world.

Following Hobbes, Kant recognized that the anarchic nature of international relations, the need to be constantly ready for war, to fight for territories and defend them are an obstacle to the moral progress of mankind and the achievement of a civil law state of societies. But in Kant's theory, there is one significant difference from the ideas of Hobbes - the philosopher rejects the idea that the natural state is irresistible. He was convinced that there was a possibility of building an "eternal peace" based on "the moral policy" and the supremacy of law, combined with the preservation of state sovereignty. Kant believed that a peaceful union is achievable only if there is a key political prerequisite - the republican mechanism of the government when the people take part in the solution of a question if there is a place for war or not. Kant put forward the idea of the democratic mechanism of the government, proposing to obtain the peoples' consent when pursuing a foreign policy. Kant was sure that the people did not want bloody and ruinous wars, but he also did not claim that democracy itself would eliminate wars [13, p. 205] from the life of states.

Kant has a good many critics in the liberal camp. The "weak spot" of his theory is that he did not call civil society a counterweight to the totality of statism. The ideas of the statism philosophy, which asserts the supremacy, domination of the state over individuals, was shared by another great German philosopher - G. W. Friedrich Hegel. He believed that "the state is the utmost, which expresses the claims to life and property, and requires the individual to sacrifice them" [3, p.217]. G. Hegel distinguished between the state and society, considering the state as a goal in itself: "An absolute, immovable goal in itself and this goal in itself have the highest right concerning individual people, whose highest duty is to be members of the state" [3, p. 214]. By civil society, he meant the connection of individuals through their needs, through legal institutions and external order. Hegel advocated the priority of foreign policy, was convinced that "eternal peace" is nothing more than a utopia, and successful wars "did not allow internal flurries to develop and strengthened

state power" [3, p. 215].

The statism theory of the "absolute state" is brought to its logical conclusion by I.G. Fichte. He saw the state as a "compulsory institution", the purpose of which is to dissolve the individual as a whole to achieve some purpose transcendental to people: "Personality should be sacrificed to the idea" [11, p. 236], that is to obey the national objectives.

The great humanist philosopher W. Humboldt did not share the idea of the priority of external development over the internal one. In his work "On the Limits of State Action", reflecting on the conditions required for the development of individuals and the nation as a whole, he asked: "Should the state mean the positive welfare of the nation or only its security." The basis of the dilemma is the problem of the ends and means reasonable balance determination or the allocation of resources and government measures between competing goals of external and internal order. If there are external threats, then national security interests require the diversion of funds outside, which negatively affects the welfare and vice versa. According to Humboldt, the main criterion for a reasonable policy is "the general strive of the state to raise the positive welfare of the nation" [1, p. 629].

A similar view was expressed by the French politician A. de Tocqueville. In his work *Democracy in America*, he presented a liberal understanding of the issue of the state's destination and its participation in the achievement of human welfare: "... the main goal of the government ... is certainly not to give the entire nation as much power or glory as possible, but to provide all the individuals of whom the nation is made up with as much prosperity as possible and wean them off of poverty" [10]. In his ideas, Tocqueville was ahead of Comte and Marx, having expressed earlier the idea that the main activities in modern society are trade and industry. He pointed to the fundamental contradiction of traditional societies with expansionist aspirations and an advanced society aimed at achieving the well-being of the majority. A. Tocqueville considered favorable conditions for commerce and industry as the main factor in democracy development. By democracy, he understood a certain structure of society aimed at an increase in the citizens' welfare, the achievement of which ultimately contributes to the political and social stability of the state.

It should be noted that Tocqueville was one of the first to pay attention to the foreign policy process, comparing foreign policy with democratic and authoritarian forms of government. The conclusion he comes to is very unhappy - in the field of state foreign policy, democratic governance is way below the other forms. The reason for this state of affairs lies in the deep nature of foreign policy, for which competence, efficiency, the ability to keep secrets, a single direction of the political course are important, and these parameters are not characteristic of democracy. Public participation based on common sense at the best, which is not enough for successful foreign policy activities, the variability, and instability of public sentiment of voters, the

strong influence of passions and an acrimonious struggle for votes, the publicity of foreign policy discussions, the separation of powers, the priority of immediate tasks and short-term plans. All these factors, from Tocqueville's point of view do not allow to pursue a strong foreign policy in a democracy, while at the same time providing more opportunities for the development of domestic potential and economic growth.

The English philosopher Herbert Spencer played an important role in the development of theories describing the relationship between internal, social, and foreign policy relations. Spencer expresses his understanding this way: "The most important thing is to instill in all people that important, still unrecognized truth by many that the domestic and foreign policies of society are interconnected, and that there can be no significant improvement in one without a significant improvement in the other ... " [7]. Spencer talks about the relationship between domestic and foreign policy, writes a lot about the system of the social development priorities: "Society exists for the welfare of its members, and not its members exist for the welfare of society." For G. Spencer the domestic policy is more important for the common welfare than the foreign policy. With a decrease in external threats, the role of internal parameters of social and economic development grows. Being a staunch liberal, Spencer nevertheless pointed out the need for "coercive" moments in public policy, namely the need to prepare for war and cultivation of a spirit of obedience and unquestioned faith in the government strength and authority in citizens.

It should be noted that the liberal approach in the socio-political thought in the 19th century is gaining strength not only in the West but also in Russia, where there the strongly conservative attitude towards the state is traditional. In Russia it has developed into a socio-political trend that combines the ideas of liberal measures and strong power, liberal conservatism.

The famous Russian historian, philosopher, legal theorist B.N. Chicherin in his writings comes to the hard conclusion that in the history of Russia, the state authorities have always considered the main goal to be the retention of sovereignty and survival in the face of constant external threats. In this connection, the welfare and interests of the people inhabiting it have always been secondary concerning the state ones. Thus, he concludes the decisive influence of the external factors on the development of relations "state-society-man", summarizing that it was the external factors that put a "fatal stigma" on the fate of Russia. Rightly noting that the Russian people are ready to endure hardship if the state is successful and strong in the international arena. "In general, external victories lead to the consolidation of power ..., and defeats weaken it, revealing its insufficiency or inconsistency" [12]. The need for concentration and strengthening of power is reduced when the state is in a favorable international situation. B. N. Chicherin mentioned the United States as an example of a country in which the strength of democracy is achieved largely by being protected from external threats.

B.N. Chicherin set up the principle - "liberal measures and strong power",

developing the ideas of conservative liberalism and taking into account the conditions of the Russian reality, requiring strong and conservative leadership. The views of the liberal-minded historian V.O. Klyuchevsky on how the internal development and understanding of Russia's state interests relate. Analyzing the challenging Russian history, V.O. Klyuchevsky came to the position that a "adequate" path of development was impossible. In his writings, he argued the negative impact of the external situation and the Russian policy on socio-political and economic development. V.O. Klyuchevsky wrote that there is hardly a state whose fate was so influenced by external factors as they influenced the history of Russia. Klyuchevsky named three features that determine Russian policy: 1) the combat order of the state; 2) the injustice nature of internal governance and social staff; 3) the absolute state of the supreme power. As a result of an aggressive foreign policy, "the state became swollen, but the people grew sickly" [6]. He was negative about the expansionist foreign policy of tsarist Russia, which depleted internal resources and strengthened power against the public interests, hindering civil society development.

Although Klyuchevsky spoke in his writings about the strong influence of foreign policy on the internal development of Russia, he did not believe that in all cases foreign policy should predominate over domestic policy. According to Klyuchevsky, such an alignment of forces is possible in the history of individual states or specific historical periods, but should not become an immutable law.

If Klyuchevsky saw the foreign policy ambitions as the main factor slowing down the socio-political development of the Russian state, then P. B. Struve defended the priority of external power over the welfare of society and the well-being of specific individuals [8]. Reasoning about the issue of Russian power in response to the famous speech of P. A. Stolypin at a meeting of the State Duma in 1907 that "... we need a great Russia", Struve outlined the selection problem - it is necessary to prioritize, what is more important, internal or external interests.

Probably, he was one of the first Russian statesmen to aggravate a problem of the "individual-state" dichotomy, rising to a higher level of abstraction and pointing out the connection between individualism and the priority of domestic policy with the values of traditional rational liberalism. He contrasted traditional liberalism with state liberalism, combined with imperialism when the concern for external power is combined with the pursuance of justice in internal relations.

P. B. Struve recognized the contradiction between state and individual interests: "The goals of the specific individuals and the growth of the state and its power may be in irreconcilable contradictions." From his point of view, external power is the main value and criterion of the state's vitality and its internal policy. Struve prioritized public interests, arguing that they should be oriented towards the external goals: "The touchstone and measure of all so-called policy, both of the government and the parties, should be the answer to

the question: to what extent does this policy contribute to the so-called external power of the state?" According to Struve "the basis of Russian foreign policy should be ... the economic domination of Russia ... From such domination, the political and cultural predominance of Russia will follow naturally "[9].

Struve was the ideologist of the Constitutional Democratic Party. Constitutional Democrats saw Russia's internal political weakness and economic weakness as the cause of military and diplomatic failures in the early 20th century. They pointed to the need to consolidate power and society, pursue a liberal national policy develop the country's military, financial and economic might [2, p. 195]. P.B. Struve considered reliance on the nation to be the most important condition for the development of Russian statehood, without denying the paramount importance of state and military power.

According to him, "the national idea of modern Russia is reconciliation between the authorities and the people who have awakened to self-consciousness and initiative and become a nation." The organic unity of the state and the nation will create Great Russia, for the Russian people, overtaken by the spirit of true statehood, "will defend it boldly in the struggle against all its opponents, wherever they hide" [9].

CONCLUSIONS

The dichotomy of external and internal development of the state is one of the basic problems of the leading ideological trends of our time - liberalism and conservatism. The ratio "external development - internal development" is always in the process of its change and development in the direction of either internal or external dominant establishing, which is determined by the economic, social, political, and ideological situation in the country and the world policy. And yet it must be admitted that the liberal approach to the interpretation of the priority development of the state in the socio-philosophical thought has become dominant. However, Western European liberalism and Russian liberalism differ in their understanding of the value basis of state policy. For Western philosophers, these are the values of individualism, personal freedom, and its well-being, which means the paramount importance of domestic policy. Russian liberals moved away from the absolutization of the personal principle, seeing the danger of extreme individualism in it. They considered the purpose of state policy to be the national interest protection, the protection of the people from arbitrariness, and oppression. Russian liberalism supplemented Western theories of the state and civil society with the ideas of a citizen, free from over-pretensions and thinking of Russia's interests, and the reasonable strong power.

REFERENCES

- Anthology of the world political idea: Foreign political idea: origins and evolution. In 5 volumes. V. Ed.-in- chief: Migolatiev A.A., Moscow, 1997. 832 p.
- Voronkova I. E. Kadets (officer candidates) about the external power of the state through the prism of domestic policy // Bulletin of the Moscow

- State Regional University. Series "History and Political Science" 2009. No. 4. P. 193-197.
- History of political and legal doctrines: textbook. / compiled by Marchenko M. N., Machin I. F. — Prospect Moscow, 2007. 480 p.
- Kant I. The idea of universal history in the world-civil plan / I. Kant // Writings: in 8 volumes - M.: Chara, 1994. V. 8. P. 12-28.
- Kant I. Critique of Practical Reason [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.iakovlev.org/zip/kant2.pdf> (access date 07/05/2020).
- Klyuchevsky V.O. Course of Russian history [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.spsl.nsc.ru/history/kluch/kluchlec.htm> (access date 07/07/2020)
- Pozdnyakov E. A. Philosophy of Policy. - In 2 volumes - ed. 2nd revised and extended - Moscow, 1994. - V. 1, 275 p. vol. 2, 292 p.
- Spencer G. Personality and state [Electronic resource]. URL: http://econlibrary.ru/books/90/79/spencer_person%20and%20state.html (access date 07/06/2020)
- Struve P. B. Patriotica: Policy, culture, religion, socialism / Comp. V. N. Zhukov and A.P. Polyakov; Entry. Art. and note. V. N. Zhukov. M.: Republic, 1997. 527 p.
- Struve P. B. Great Russia [Electronic resource]. URL: https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/Sem4/32.php (access date 07/06/2020)
- Tocqueville A. Democracy in America. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://www.civisbook.ru/files/File/Tokville_Democracy_1.pdf (access date 07/07/2020)
- Fichte I. // Anthology of the world philosophy; In 4 volumes - M: Mysl, 1971 V.3. P.230-242.
- Chicherin B.N State Science Course. [Electronic Resource]. URL: <http://constitution.garant.ru/science-work/pre-revolutionar/3948892/> (access date 07/07/2020)
- Doyle M. W. Kant. Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs// Philosophy and Public Affairs. Vol. 12 №3. 1983. P.205-235.