

SCTMG 2020

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

PARADIGM OF JUST CAPITALIST SOCIETY IN MODERN WESTERN IDEOLOGY: REALITIES AND PROSPECTS

Shamileva Roza Kamilevna (a, b)*

*Corresponding author

(a) Grozny State Oil Technical University named after M.D. Millionshchikov;

(b) Integrated Research Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences named after Kh.I. Ibragimova, Grozny, Russia
orda.shamia@mail.ru

Abstract

The article is devoted to the discussion of Western researchers around the dilemma of whether modern capitalist society is a fair model. The paradigm of justice is expressed, according to Western authors, in the idea of a "new Enlightenment," a fundamental transformation of thinking, the result of which should be a holistic worldview. The article states that prominent figures and scientists of the international community are forced to admit an indisputable fact, namely, that today's crisis is not cyclical, but intensifying. It is not limited to the nature around us but includes a social, political, cultural, moral crisis, a crisis of democracy, ideologies, and capitalism. However, in the current economic and political system, concepts are associated with ideological positions. These concepts represent an attempt to evade the fact that it is necessary to comprehend the existence of a particular phenomenon. At the same time, modern concepts allow replacing decisions in a specific situation with vague, familiar phrases. Massive perceptions of justice or injustice underlie political movements and social revolutions. The modern age is the century of increasing globalization and the "clash of cultures." In the context of the 21st century, various interpretations of justice lead to a spiritual, ideological, and cultural crisis. This crisis threatens a global crisis of management mechanisms. Moreover, the emergence and intensification of various crises actualize the problem of developing a single conceptual approach to the concept of justice as a universal good.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Justice, modern capitalism, social equality, justice model, Western ideology, ideological trends.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

A significant difference in the interpretation of justice is noted in the analysis of modern Western society and traditional societies. Over the past centuries, a "western," "natural-legal" type of legal understanding has been formed in Europe and the USA. Accordingly, their interpretation of justice is presented as a form of individual human freedom. At the same time, the interpretation of the justice concept in traditional societies is based on the identification of a superpersonal principle. A superpersonal principle is a form of manifestation of moral and religious values that stand above a person. Russian culture and philosophical thought are characterized by interpretations of justice inextricably linked with the concept of truth. Truth for Russians is a common, transpersonal good that combines goodness, love, mercy, and spirituality.

2. Problem Statement

The philosophical problems of justice are actualized in Russia by mass assessments of the current social and economic policy as "socially unjust." There is an urgent need to develop political and state-management strategies aimed at strengthening the social state, on the one hand. On the other hand, these strategies should not impede the further development of a market economy. In society, it is necessary to create mechanisms to take into account the interests and needs of various social strata in order to more fully reflect them in the state, regional, and municipal social policies. Particular attention should be directed to the poorest layer of the population in the context of the development of the social state.

In social philosophy, the problem of justice is central to the history of philosophy, modern Western, Russian social philosophy.

Its various aspects were studied by many ancient philosophers: Anaximander, Heraclitus, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and other philosophers. She was in sight of ancient Chinese thinkers, for example, Confucius, Mo-Tzu. Particular interest in justice in Western society, starting from the end of the 17th – beginning of the 18th century, was shown. The cornerstone of the formation of the theory of justice for understanding social justice is the works of the classics of Marxism. They research issues related to social equality. It was believed that achieving social equality is possible in a classless society. Of great importance in the development of models of justice was given to the thinkers of the French enlightenment and classics of German philosophy.

Significant value is the statement of social creed, which is inherent in that generation of modern American sociologists. It was their social credo that stood at the origins of the post-industrial concept.

John Galbraith (1999) is an American researcher who was at the forefront of the theory of post-industrial society. Galbraith, in his book *A Fair Society. A humanistic view* discusses the fate of state regulation of the economy and methods of combating inflation. Galbraith (1999) considers acute social issues. Such issues are the problem of social and property inequality that is permissible, social and political problems, problems of stratification of society by educational principle, the relationship of developed post-industrial countries with third world states, economic danger, and other issues.

Galbraith (1999) claims that they have approached the economy from the standpoint of ideology for many years. Absolutely any economic phenomenon is provided with an ideological label. We talk

about liberalism, as well as socialism or capitalism when a person is called a liberal, a socialist. Some advocate for state ownership, while others favor privatization (Galbraith, 1999).

As Zinoviev (1996) noted,

Western society is non-ideological. Western ideology does not exist. But this statement is one of the ideas of the ideology of the West. It exists, is more powerful than the Soviet one, according to its characteristics – the number of people employed, the means of disseminating and suggesting it to people's heads, according to the degree to which this theory is saturated with the whole sphere of society. The ideology is actually hidden, dissolved, scattered in everything that exists for the mentality of people, for example, in literary works, films, special books, popular science and science fiction works, etc. Ideology merges with non-ideological phenomena that non-ideological theories are simply inconceivable without it. This expresses its invulnerability to criticism. (p. 311)

However, under the current economic and political system, the concepts associated with ideological positions represent an attempt to escape from the fact that it is necessary to comprehend the existence of a particular phenomenon. However, these concepts also replace decisions in a specific situation with vague, commonplace phrases.

Galbraith (2004) proves this truth with simple, in his opinion, examples. The goals and objectives of a fair society are apparent. The fair society goals are to ensure the efficient production of goods and the provision of services, as well as the disposal of the income received by acceptable economic, reasonable criteria. There is no doubt that the current market economy can provide the production of consumer goods, as well as services associated with high quality and even excessive volumes. In its abundance, it produces various goods: food, clothing, furniture, cars, entertainment, and also forms the need for these goods.

Galbraith (2004) believes that information is associated with an abundance of material goods that exist in Western countries. This information reached the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union through television and other means of communication. This process played a current role in the destruction of communist regimes in these states. The impossibility on the part of socialist economies to provide citizens with the necessary amount of goods and services, and to quickly respond to how changes in consumer preferences played a significant role in the collapse of the systems themselves. Statements that are connected precisely with the benefits of state property occurring in the process of an abundance of consumer goods were considered a whim. It is also ridiculous to try to convince the manufacturers of machinery and equipment themselves of specific merits of socialism.

It is the owners of capital who, according to Galbraith, possess power. During today's conditions, when huge commercial enterprises appeared, the owner does not participate in management and control. Entrepreneurs with capital also manage it. The Americans Vanderbilt, Rockefeller, Morgan, Harriman, and their brothers were in the past. Instead, massive, stagnant armies of corporate officials began to appear.

Moreover, along with them, many shareholders have a financial interest in the activities of companies. However, shareholders are deprived of the opportunity to influence decision making. The power of monopolies is the exploitation of consumers at the expense of prices that do not constrain competition. Monopoly was once the subject of antitrust laws in the United States. However, international

competition pressure and the rapid development of technology has led to the fact that the monopoly faded into the background. What today seeks to secure a leading position and economic influence may become outdated tomorrow. More recently, concerns have been raised about the power of large companies. However, today there is concern about the state of stagnation and the inadequacy of their leadership. Managers have always spent energy on the operation of workers and consumers. However, today this energy can be aimed at gaining or maintaining, improving one's position in the company, or providing personal income. The motivation for work is the desire to increase them, which applies to successful corporate executives.

Galbraith (2004) believes that one cannot choose for a model of a just society – capitalism in a classical form. The central fact is of particular importance, since the development of the current economy, the state should be responsible for the excellent performance of more functions and responsibilities. For the most part, there are some types of services that the private economy cannot afford and which can lead to a growing imbalance. The imbalance arises between the life quality standards that have been adopted in the private and public sectors.

The idea of socialism crashed as an ideological doctrine. After this came the opposite doctrine, which was not so widespread. Privatization – the return of state-owned enterprises and functions to private owners and entrepreneurs in the transition to a market economy. Universal privatization is unacceptable, as is socialism.

Galbraith (1999) believes that in a fair, and most importantly, rational society, strategies cannot be subordinated to various ideological doctrines. Actions may be based on an analysis of facts and circumstances specific to a particular case. According to Galbraith, a fair society cannot strive for equality regarding income distribution issues. Equality cannot correspond to either human nature or the very nature and system of economic motivation. The source of energy and initiative is the driving force behind the current economy. Part of the source of energy and initiative is not only the desire to possess money. The primary source is the desire to get around others in the process of receiving their salary. Such a desire is a criterion relating to the highest social achievements and the most important sources of public prestige.

According to Galbraith (2004), the most influential public thought directors are embodied in the following principle. A high motivation level can be achieved with an equalization system of remuneration: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

The modern market economy is forced to distribute material goods in a highly uneven manner. This situation causes not very pleasant social consequences and also interferes with its ordinary course of functioning. Society cannot put up with this provision, as evidenced by the report of the Club of Rome *Come On! Capitalism, myopia, population, and the destruction of the planet*. "The report was dedicated to the half-century anniversary of the Club of Rome. Potentially, this is one of the most important documents of our time.

The agenda proposed by the Club of Rome: a harsh criticism of capitalism, rejection of financial speculation, the rejection of materialism and reductionism, a call for an alternative economy, a "new Enlightenment," a holistic worldview, planetary civilization. The authors – Club Presidents Ernst Weizsacker and Anders Wiikman, with the participation of thirty-four other members, presented an analysis of the current situation, which does not please them. They claim that the planet is degrading;

authoritarianism and fundamentalism are on the rise, speculative capital is triumphing. Today's "crisis is not cyclical but intensifying. It is not limited by nature around us but includes a social, political, cultural, moral crisis, a crisis of democracy, ideologies, and the capitalist system" (Kerimova, 2017, para.4).

3. Research Questions

The justice paradigm is expressed at a critical point in the report of the Club of Rome. This key point is the idea of a "new Enlightenment," a fundamental transformation of thinking, which should result in a holistic worldview. Humanistic, but free from anthropocentrism, open to development, but appreciating sustainability and caring for the future.

Pillars of the "new Enlightenment" the Club of Rome sees complementarity and synergy. Synergy is the search for wisdom, through the reconciliation of opposites, and balance. Without pretending to be a complete list, the report identifies several areas in which balance needs to be achieved. These areas are

- the relationship between man and nature – sustainable development, environmental awareness;
- between the short and long term;
- between speed and stability – changes and progress should not be perceived as self-worth;
- between individual and collective – recognizing the importance of personal autonomy – one of the most significant achievements of the European Enlightenment – the Club calls for balance and consideration of the common good;
- in economics, this means that the state (society) must establish rules for markets, and not vice versa;
- between equality and fair remuneration – the state is required to provide mechanisms guaranteeing social justice;
- between equality and fair remuneration – the state is required to provide mechanisms guaranteeing social justice;
- between the state and religion, the current state of society requires the indispensable consideration of the interests of believers (Kerimova, 2017).

Secularity is welcomed in the report, but underscoring the positive significance of religion. States intolerant of religion lose an ethical perspective.

The class structure inherent in American society can also protect interests for the wealthy. Galbraith notes that in any publications related to this topic, the role and place of the middle class are emphasized. There are both upper and lower layers, but they always remain in the shade. This definition can be formulated in rare cases; it can also be judged that we have formed a three-class system, which consists of one class. Moreover, the middle class plays the leading role in this system, which provides protection and covers for the wealthy strata of society (Galbraith, 2004).

A fair society can recognize a traditionally vicious circle and try to break out of that circle. The fairest solution to this problem, according to Galbraith, is to empower and provide state protection for those who cannot be vested with power.

In a market economy, power can naturally be concentrated only in the hands of the employer. On this basis, the right of workers to uphold their power concerning the power of the employers themselves is recognized by them as one of the basic principles. Workers who come together to increase their incomes

and improve working conditions must have the support of the state. Furthermore, this state support should be as tremendous as that of corporations in order to make investments.

Galbraith makes generalizations of cumulative features, both positive and negative). It becomes clear that the economy is striving for a growing level of self-organization. The nature of the economy makes it possible to develop many different choices; for their consideration, the fact that the power of the monopoly of a single producer can be overcome is essential.

At the same time, the Western ideology of the 20th century presented by liberalism, neoliberalism, conservatism, and other ideological and political directions. These forms of ideology contributed to the instrumentalization and then institutionalization of social mechanisms. Social mechanisms provide certain human rights and freedoms. Thus, they realize the mechanisms of social justice in the form in which broad social strata interpreted them.

Libertarians see the link of property and economic freedom as an essential element and the basis of a market management system. It is the market that creates economic freedom of the individual in the libertarian sense and always needs it as a prerequisite for its development. This process is the basis of current economic theories of so-called monetarism.

Of course, it is logical that an "economic person" needs knowledge in order to succeed, at least in the knowledge of a utilitarian, pragmatic nature and only "for its purposes." Instead of freedom as a known necessity, the subject's ability to make a competent choice, the theorists of libertarianism are trying to affirm freedom as an actualized accident, Hayek (2009) formulates this idea.

Freedom means that to some extent we entrust our fate to forces that are not under our control, and this seems unbearable for those constructivists who believe that a person can create his fate as if civilization and the mind itself were his creation. (p. 81)

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is the expressed need to create new methodologies and conceptual approaches to the study of social, political, religious, and other problems directly related to the topic of social justice. This research will be useful for the development of conceptual political and managerial decisions in the field of building an effective social state.

5. Research Methods

The theoretical basis of the study is the classic and modern concepts of philosophy and sociology, conceptual achievements, and approaches of leading political science and research schools in Europe, Russia, and the USA.

The historical method allows studying the formation of ideology, from its origins to the present day. The historical method makes it possible to consider ideologies in the context of the historical situation in which they arose and developed. The historical method also allows finding out the factors and characteristics of political phenomena, their role in specific historical conditions.

The dialectical method examines the development of ideology. It, like any phenomenon, has its beginning and its logical conclusion. During the development period, there is a transition from one

qualitative state to another based on the accumulation of quantitative changes within the given quality. Based on the ideas and values of different thinkers, ideology formed such concepts as liberalism and neoliberalism, conservatism and neoconservatism, and social democracy.

The essence of the method of comparative analysis is the comparison of political objects or processes, identifying their similar and distinctive features. The application of this method makes it possible to show the peculiarity of the development of political ideology in various socio-cultural and temporary situations, as well as to show the trends of its development in the modern world.

6. Findings

Capital loses political power – the ability to influence the state and society itself as a whole. Commercial firms can very powerfully and effectively express their economic interests in the field of the modern system of government. Nevertheless, today they are only part of the community of entities that have a political voice and influence; these are communities that arise due to economic progress.

Once upon a time, besides the capitalist class, there are also proletariat, peasantry, and landowners. These classes, in addition to landowners, could occupy a subordinate position and meekly be silent. Currently, there are scientists, students, journalists, television presenters, lawyers, and doctors, as well as many other professional groups that claim to be influential. Therefore, today the voice of entrepreneurs is just one of many. Anyone who wants to give this vote in order to prove certain advantages of a system related to state property has long been known to history.

A fair society can and should accept people for who they are. The need to understand whether a strategy should be developed on the issue of the income distribution cannot be eliminated.

The "equal opportunities" recognized shortcoming in almost all its interpretations is the difficulty or even the impossibility of an adequate institutional system of free competition. This situation entails the difficulty of maintaining the principles of economic freedom of the individual. This principle is laid down in the ideology of libertarians and is propagated in the form of the concept of "individual freedom" (Shamileva & Ibragimov, 2019).

7. Conclusion

The individual left to his fate acts outside of a consciously organized control coming from other people and social associations, especially the state. Nevertheless, it is controlled by a force that imposes on its behaviors that are an unambiguous reaction to market signals in the form of prices, the ratio of supply and demand of goods and services, and market conditions. The behavior of the subject on the market is not fundamentally different from human participation in the game of chance. For example, Hayek builds his theory of the capitalist market on the analysis of a variety of game situations. The freedom of the person involved in the element of market relations is the freedom of the player to place bets, take the initiative in the framework of the established rules, take responsibility,

From Rawls (1995), people who want to create a well-organized, just society should accept, first of all, the idea of equal freedoms. This idea is something that should be preferred in all circumstances. That is why the first principle of justice, embodying this idea, is at the head of the lexical order. This

principle determines the logic of the subsequent behavior of the participants in the social contract, who must look for suitable grounds for any deviation from equal freedoms, justify them by referring to the priority rules established by the theory of "justice as honesty."

The priority of freedom, Rawls emphasizes, does not, of course, require that all material needs be satisfied in society. The principle of freedom implies a situation that excludes material wealth as an end in itself, the pursuit of economic and social benefits, i.e., that social atmosphere, the ideological expression of which was the philosophy of utilitarianism.

In a polemic with Rawls, English lawyer Hart defends the human right to control his freedom as he wishes. A person can exchange freedom, at least temporarily, for the values and benefits that currently attract him most.

A person can give up political and religious freedoms for economic benefits, so that tomorrow, having achieved wealth, he can restore these freedoms if he so wishes ... It seems that no general priority rules are prohibiting an exchange, even for a limited one, a period of any active freedom, an exchange that a person can voluntarily make in order to gain advantage and material prosperity. (Hart, 1972, p. 510)

On the whole, liberal ideologues and conservative ideologues rejected Rawls' feeble attempt to present the desire for profit, to increase private property and wealth as ordinary human freedom, to impose moral restrictions on it.

The main problems of a fair society are: ensuring the free internal life of various social groups, organizing their relations based on the equal freedom, ensuring the foundations of self-esteem of a person, people's desire to express their nature in a free social union with others. Of course, the priority of freedom, emphasizes Rawls (1995), can only be realized in favorable conditions when the basic, primary needs of people, especially real ones, are met, that is, in conditions that may not be achieved soon. Hence, accordingly, the ideological and political order, difficulties arose before this theory. This order try to return the outgoing "welfare state" to the position where it needs to start all over again.

For example, the utilitarians criticize Rawls for the fact that his scheme of equitable distribution is developed without taking into account the problems encountered in the production of public wealth. Rawls, in their opinion, ignores the connection of the individual's labor contribution with the share of its receipt in the distribution system and thereby puts itself on the path of social utopia.

The theories of "justice as honesty" utilitarians contrast the concept of justice, based on the concept of "human rights." The essence of the latter in general is as follows: if each person has the right to his life, the products of his labor, to his own free and independent judgments, everything that does not violate these rights recognized by the legal system of the nation, and does not make an exception, can be considered justice... A just society is a society that recognizes individual rights and incorporates them into its constitutional structures. The ideas of justice, according to this theory, characterize relationships in which people have mutual obligations determined by a system of rights (Shamileva, 2019).

The concept of a "welfare state", exaggerated by Western ideologists (especially conservatives), is utopian under the realities of modern capitalist society. The freedom of economic activity should, first of all, be supplemented by a guarantee coming from the state of social assistance to all those who are not

able to provide themselves with a sufficiently high living standard. This task is a priority in regulating the mechanism of social justice.

References

- Galbraith, J. (1999). *Just society. The humanistic look. A new post-industrial wave in the West*. Moscow: Academia.
- Galbraith, J. (2004). *New industrial society*. Moscow: LLC "Publishing house AST".
- Hart, H. (1972). *Rawls on Liberty and its Priority*. Vol. 3.
- Hayek, F. (2009). *The fate of liberalism in the twentieth century*. Moscow: IRISEN.
- Kerimova, I. (2017). *Anniversary Report of the Club of Rome: Condemnation of Capitalism and the Call for a New Enlightenment*. Retrieved from <https://monitor-ua.com/1381-yubileynyy-doklad-rimskogo-kluba-osuzhdenie-kapitalizma-i-prizyv-k-novomu-prosvescheniyu.html>
- Rawls, J. (1995). *Theory of justice*. Moscow: Lenand.
- Shamileva, R. K. (2019). Justice in the interpretation of the conservative theory of the West. *Human. and soc. Sci.*, 3, 70–77.
- Shamileva, R. K., & Ibragimov, M. M. (2019). Conception of Justice in Liberal Ideology: Utopia or Reality? *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 58, 1138–1144. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2019.03.02.132>
- Zinoviev, A. A. (1996). *Postcommunist Russia*. Moscow: Republic.