

FEDERAL STATE BUDGETARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
RUSSIAN PRESIDENTIAL ACADEMY OF NATIONAL ECONOMY  
AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

NIZHNY NOVGOROD INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT

*As a manuscript*

**Lukshin Roman Sergeevich**



**PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HARMONIZATION  
SOCIAL INNOVATION AND SOCIAL MEMORY  
IN TODAY'S SOCIETY**

5.7.7. Social and political philosophy

Abstract  
to the dissertation for the degree  
Candidate of Philosophy

Supervisor:  
Doctor of Philosophy, Professor  
Dakhin Andrey Vasilevich

Nizhny Novgorod – 2026

**The relevance of this research** stems from the need for a philosophical understanding of the possibilities and conditions for the harmonious coexistence and interaction of two seemingly opposed principles: the pursuit of innovation and the need to preserve historical and cultural heritage. Modern society is undergoing intensive transformations caused both by the rapid development of technology and by profound changes in the sociocultural paradigm. These processes affect all spheres of social life, generating new demands on structures, institutions, and forms of interaction. One of the key challenges of the present era is the need to reconcile the vectors of innovative development with the preservation of cultural and historical continuity. Under conditions of digitalization, globalization, and technological and institutional change, the risk grows of losing social memory, which plays a fundamental role in shaping the identity, stability, and integrity of society. At the same time, processes of social innovation are becoming an indispensable condition for society's adaptation to new realities, and these processes likewise affect all spheres of social life, generating new demands on structures, institutions, and forms of interaction. Interest is also growing in the phenomenon of social memory, which serves not merely as a repository of the past but as the foundation of identity, sociocultural continuity, and the stability of social systems. Social memory ensures the integrity of collective experience by structuring the perception of time, traditions, and values.

However, tension, contradictions, and conflicts arise between these two phenomena, innovative development and the preservation of memory. Social innovations are oriented toward transformation and rethinking, whereas social memory strives to preserve and reproduce the heritage created by society's preceding history. Social memory and innovation often act as antagonistic forces: the former is directed toward preserving what has been, the latter toward renewing and transforming it. In particular, the Russian tradition of philosophical thought, represented by the Slavophiles, offers an example in which the value of tradition (the patriarchal way of life, Orthodoxy, the Russian peasant commune) was set against the values of Russia's innovative development in the nineteenth century (industrialization, the urbanization of lifestyle, the scientization of worldview culture, etc.). Another branch of Russian philosophy, dialectical and historical materialism, offers in the twentieth century an example in which the values of historical innovation (the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian consciousness, etc.) were set against traditions, which were defined as "birthmarks of the past" requiring removal. In the twentieth century, no convincing resolution of the dispute between these two branches of Russian philosophical culture was found.

The fascination with Western theories and practices of "progress" comes into conflict with definitions of it as a measure of the "scientific" "wearing out of the human being." The conception of Western memory studies as a linear, one-dimensional process leading to a plurality of opinions

contradicts the view that there is a substantial difference between the conceptual foundations of memory research in the West, on the one hand, and in Russia, on the other, the latter being oriented toward forming a holistic philosophical theory of social memory. In addition, there is a difference between Western and Russian politics of memory, which is most clearly manifested in the attitude toward monuments and events of the Great Patriotic War. All this makes topical the critical analysis of philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of social memory proposed by Western memory studies, and the critical analysis of philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of modernity in terms of the "tradition–innovation" relationship.

In this context, and in the context of the intensifying geopolitical confrontation between the West and Russia, questions become pressing about the origins of the principal social innovations of the early twentieth century, which initiated the differences in the modern social organization of society. These differences first took shape as the difference between the social organization of the USSR and that of Western countries, and now, in the early twenty-first century, appear in new forms. The role of social memory in forming such differences, and the interrelation of social memory and innovation, are usually not considered in this regard, although the fact of such a prolonged and stable confrontation suggests the involvement of structures of collective socio-historical memory.

The conceptual justification of the practice of demolishing historical monuments under the banner of "de-Sovietization," and of demolishing historic buildings on the pretext of developers' efficiency, leads to the conclusion that there are significant contradictions between various contemporary processes that promise society progress and development and the structures of the collective socio-historical memory of modern societies, and that these contradictions require in-depth study. Therefore, philosophical analysis of the interrelation between the structures of social innovation and the structures of social memory is necessary in order to search for the deep foundations of the integratedness of both phenomena in the nature of man and society, and to understand them as elements of a single process, the process of society's development in its integrity. In this context, it is important to identify the conceptual, social-philosophical foundations for forming a model of social organization in which innovative processes do not destroy but are organically incorporated into the structure of cultural continuity, relying on values and meanings rooted in collective memory.

The theoretical and philosophical relevance of the research also has a distinct regional, Russian dimension. The bearer of collective socio-historical memory is not only the state-forming community as a whole but also specific regional communities of Russia. The question of harmonizing social innovations and social memory therefore manifests itself most vividly at the regional level, where the gap between the pace of institutional and technological innovations and

the preservation of historical, cultural, ethnocultural, and confessional heritage appears in concrete, tangible form. Philosophical reflection on these issues with regard to Russian regions is presented in the studies of A.V. Dakhin, devoted to the diversification of the social frameworks of collective memory and to the specific features of the socio-historical self-awareness of Russia's regions. This makes the chosen topic relevant not only in general theoretical terms but also in concrete historical and regional terms, with regard to the tasks of preserving the integrity of Russia's state-forming community amid the diversity of its regional, ethnic, and confessional components.

The practice-oriented relevance of the research is due to the fact that the relationship between social memory and social innovations has become the subject of acute international political struggle. In recent decades, the policies of a number of Western states have consistently moved toward revising the outcomes of the Second World War. This is manifested in the dismantling and desecration of monuments to Soviet liberator-soldiers in the countries of Eastern Europe and the Baltics, in attempts to equate the responsibility of the USSR and Nazi Germany for unleashing the war, and in the heroization of collaborationist formations. It is telling that since 2005 the Russian Federation has annually put to a vote in the UN General Assembly the resolution "Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices...", which is invariably supported by the majority of UN member states but systematically rejected by a number of Western states. Russian state policy, by contrast, is oriented toward preserving the historical truth about the war, which has been enshrined at the legislative level and is substantively elaborated in a number of studies. This fundamental difference in politics of memory demonstrates that the question of harmonizing social memory and social innovations is not an abstract theoretical construct but a subject of direct practical, state-political significance.

#### **Degree of scholarly elaboration of the problem**

The subject field of the research includes two large groups of studies: one reflects the degree of scholarly elaboration of the problems of social memory and of the significance of the social memory factor in society, and the other, the degree of elaboration of the problems of innovative change in society. The earliest examples of philosophical reflection on the role of memory in cognition were presented in Plato's dialogues, in the philosophical and religious teachings of ancient India (the doctrine of "karma," etc.), and in the philosophical legacy of Confucius (the doctrine of the role of tradition and ritual). In Western European philosophy the theme of memory is reflected in the texts of Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus, and later, in the Middle Ages, in Augustine. The practices of mnemonics from ancient Greece to the Renaissance, studied in the work of F. Yates, though not a subject of special consideration at the time, were part of philosophical conceptions of the significance of oratory. This oratory was

developed by representatives of the school of ancient skepticism, by Roman philosophy, and by medieval Catholic liturgy, in which the notion of "eternal memory" and others became part of the prayer lexicon. In the subsequent tradition of Western European philosophy, the factor of memory appears as a direct subject of philosophical inquiry in the theory of knowledge of F. Bacon, R. Descartes, and D. Hume, in the works of European theosophists (A. Besant and others), in the psychology of S. Freud, and in the philosophy of life of H. Bergson and W. Benjamin.

If in Western European philosophy, from ancient Greece to the Modern era, thinkers regarded the memory of the individual person (the person of a human being or of God) as a significant element of the universe, then in the twentieth century a new stage of memory research emerges, in which memory came to be regarded as a collective phenomenon. In this capacity, conceptions of social memory are manifested in the works of M. Halbwachs, and subsequently give rise to the so-called "memory boom," that is, active conceptual study of various manifestations of collective memory (P. Nora, M. Ozouf, J. Puymège, M. Winock, Y. Zerubavel, E. Zerubavel, J. Assmann, A. Assmann, P. Ricœur, L. Cojocaru, I. Šubrt, A. Confino, W. Kansteiner, and others) and of mass manifestations of individual states of memory associated with the phenomenon of the Holocaust, with the "Vietnam syndrome" (cultural trauma), with the formation of the European Union, and so on. This field, diverse in its subjects of study and in the plurality of its concepts, came to be called memory studies, and at the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the 2000s became the main source of interest for Russian researchers in this area. Generalizing, systematizing works on Western memory studies were published by P. Hutton, F. Yates, J. Le Goff, P. Ricœur, and others, as well as by a number of the representatives of Western memory studies most frequently cited in Russian literature: J. Olick, J. Kubik and M. Bernhard, R.N. Lebow (with W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu), D. Lowenthal, A. Sierp, and others. Russian research also contains examples of systematization and comprehensive analysis of studies in the field of memory studies, including the works of D.A. Anikin, O.T. Loiko, F.V. Nikolai, S.Yu. Anisimova, A.G. Vasiliev, and others, and also reflects a critical approach to Western memory studies and defines their conceptual differences from the Russian tradition of humanities research in this area (Dakhin A.V.).

Within the present work, Western memory studies are examined from a critical standpoint, which makes it possible to reveal the weaknesses of these approaches and the fragmentary character of their description of the phenomenon of social memory. Drawing on the Russian traditions of humanistic knowledge, ways of overcoming fragmentation and achieving integrity in understanding the phenomenon of social memory are considered in the aspects of the dialectics of "individual–collective" and "substantial–attributive." This makes it possible to reveal the role of social memory as a key element in the system of interaction between tradition and innovation. A

holistic understanding of social memory as a cultural and worldview phenomenon serves as a necessary foundation for the subsequent analysis of its conjugation with innovation processes and for developing a model for harmonizing the functions of social remembering and social innovations in contemporary Russian society.

The philosophical-culturological direction is of the greatest interest for our topic, since it covers a broad range of questions reflecting various aspects of the dialectics of "tradition–innovation." Studies of the relationship between the phenomenon of "tradition" in culture and the phenomenon of "social memory" in culture make it possible to examine the formation of Russian theoretical and methodological resources for the holistic study of the nature of collective socio-historical memory. These include the ideas of continuity between Byzantine religious culture and Russian Orthodoxy of the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries (Fr. P. Florensky and others), the Slavophiles' ideas on the significance of the patriarchal traditions of the Orthodox peasant commune (A.S. Khomyakov and others), the ideas of socio-political conservatism in the social order of nineteenth-century Russia (I.A. Ilyin and others), and the ideas of the "generic memory" of a people as a form of existence of "consciousness in general" (S.N. Trubetskoy). Within the system of twentieth-century dialectical and historical materialism, the following were studied: "historical cognition" (A.I. Rakitov, V.B. Ustyantsev, and others), "anticipatory reflection," the problem of the "ideal," the conceptualization of ideas about tradition in culture (E.S. Markaryan), and the concept of systemogenesis (A.I. Subetto, V.A. Shamakhov, and others).

Russian philosophical discourse on the dialectics of "tradition–innovation" in the nineteenth century was tied to the debate between the Slavophiles and the Westernizers, in which an opposition between these social phenomena took shape. In the twentieth century, within dialectical and historical materialism, the dialectics of "tradition–innovation" was considered along the lines of the class approach to the development of society, of the connection between the scientific and technological revolution and the theory of socialist revolution, and of the practice of building socialism in the USSR. In the 1990s this direction was displaced by interest in the philosophy of technology and technical progress. In post-Soviet Russia, discourse on the dialectics of "tradition–innovation" includes both elements of Russian theories and concepts and elements of Western theories of "modernization" (including in the aspect of the modernization of Russia), "catch-up development," "techno-revolutionaries" (A. Toffler), "modernity" (A. Giddens), "liquid modernity" (Z. Bauman), "social change" (P. Sztompka), and others. Innovations are considered as an element of contemporary sociality, as the human capacity to go beyond the given ("to transcend the given"), as a way of creating new variants of thinking and social interaction, and in other aspects.

Contemporary processes of innovation in society and the state are considered in philosophical and culturological terms in the works of A. Toffler, U. Beck, A. Moles, P. Sorokin, M. Castells, P. Bourdieu, P. Berger, D.C. Dennett, J. Baudrillard, Guy Debord, S. Žižek, A.A. Zinoviev, V.A. Kutyrev, M.V. Maslovsky, N.A. Khrenov, A.P. Khokhlova, O.R. Chepyuk, and others. The works of these authors cover research content that reflects the contradictions and conflicts arising along the line of the relationship "human being–innovation–tradition," which creates a distinctive demand for studying the possibilities of harmonizing this line of social relations. The consideration of the interrelation of traditions and innovations in the context of social memory research is presented in the works of A.G. Vasiliev, whose position reflects an idea characteristic of Russian researchers: that "the concept of tradition in contemporary social and humanitarian knowledge is being transformed in a direction that brings it closer to the notion of cultural (social) memory." This position contradicts V.A. Kutyrev's conclusions that contemporary Western social and humanitarian knowledge is characterized by a tendency toward the "scientific" "wearing out" of "the human being as tradition." This contradiction requires additional study of how contemporary social and humanitarian knowledge defines the relations among "social memory, tradition, and innovation." The combination of the Russian traditions of humanities research of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with the wave of memory studies and with contemporary Western theories of "modernization," "change," and the "digital transformation" of society has created a live area of conceptual and methodological contradictions and ruptures requiring philosophical consideration and resolution. In this problem field, questions become pressing about the possibilities, and the conceptual and socio-political foundations, of harmonizing the politics of memory and the politics of innovation in contemporary societies, including Russia.

**The object** of this research is contemporary social reality, in which there are alternative forms of the social organization of society, alternative tendencies of innovation processes, and alternative concepts for describing them.

**The subject** of this research is the "social memory–innovations" relationship, which is considered as an integral aspect of contemporary society and a source of various forms of social innovations.

**The aim** of the research is to determine the role of social memory in the structure of contemporary society, and its significance as a factor whose action ensures the differentiation of the forms and direction of social innovations and the social contradictions associated with social innovations. The aim is also to determine the conceptual foundations for harmonizing the "social memory–innovations" relationship in the context of the development of Russian society in the twenty-first century.

**To achieve this aim, the following tasks must be accomplished:**

1. Critical analysis of philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of social memory.
2. Critical analysis of philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of modernity in the aspect of the "social memory–innovation" relationship.
3. To investigate the philosophical origins of contemporary concepts of collective memory and modernity, tradition and innovation, and to conceptualize the categorial apparatus for analyzing the dialectics of the interaction between social memory and social innovations.
4. To investigate the origins of the principal social innovations of the early twentieth century associated with the differences in the social organization of society in the USSR and Western countries, in the aspect of analyzing the role of social memory in forming these differences, as well as the interrelation of social memory and innovations, including the role of memory in the movement of innovations along the line "singular–particular–universal."
5. To investigate the theoretical origins of contemporary conceptions of the social framework of organizational-state collective memory and the social framework of economic collective memory, as well as the forms of their interrelation in the alternative societies of socialist countries (using the USSR as a model example) and Western countries (using the USA as a model example).
6. To develop a conceptual basis for contemporary research into the dialectics of the "social memory–innovation" relationship, and to determine the directions for harmonizing the "social memory–innovation" relationship in the context of the social development of Russia in the twenty-first century.

**The methodological basis** of the research is E.V. Ilyenkov's theoretical conception of the dialectics of the "singular," "particular," and "universal," which is used to describe the social dynamics of innovations; L.A. Zelenov's dialectical conception of the systemic-activity approach, which defines the principles for analyzing the "human being–world" relations and provides a systemic description of activity; and A.V. Dakhin's conception of being-memory, which defines the socio-ontological foundations of the nature of social memory and their connection with questions of social dynamics, and which also introduces into scholarly usage the concepts of the "social framework of organizational-state collective memory" and the "social framework of economic collective memory."

As the theoretical and methodological basis for the critical analysis of contemporary concepts of social transformations, changes, and innovations, the works of Professor V.A. Kutyrev were used, which define the main aspects of the contradictions of these theories and of the essential nature of the human being. In addition, in analyzing contemporary social processes, the research

relies on the ontological, philosophical, and scientific theories of G.W.F. Hegel, K. Marx, A.A. Bogdanov, L.S. Vygotsky, A.F. Losev, E.S. Markaryan, A.A. Zinoviev, A.G. Dugin, A.I. Subetto, L.S. Vasiliev, S.N. Grinchenko, R. Koselleck, J.-F. Lyotard, Y. Mullis, and others. The works of M. Weber, A. Moles, N. Luhmann, Z. Bauman, J. Arnason, and others are analyzed critically, as are the works of a number of the most frequently cited representatives of Western memory studies in Russian literature: J. Olick, J. Kubik and M. Bernhard, R.N. Lebow (with W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu), D. Lowenthal, A. Sierp, and others. Since the task of this research is not an exhaustive analysis of the entire diversity of Western memory studies but the identification of tendencies characteristic of this field, the range of analyzed sources is limited to the "founders" most frequently cited in Russian literature. What they have in common as a philosophical and methodological foundation is the conception of the socially constructed, discrete nature of memory. It is essential, moreover, that the substantive pluralism of the conceptual apparatus of Western memory studies, conditioned by the multidimensionality of the phenomenon of memory itself, does not eliminate the internal social-philosophical monism present in it: the conception of the primordial fragmentation and discreteness of social experience and of the subject. In this research this is countered not by negation but by a different perspective of holistic perception of the subject: a holistic philosophical theory of social memory that does not exclude the diversity of manifestations of one and the same phenomenon under consideration.

On this conceptual and methodological basis, the following methodological principles are applied to accomplish the research tasks: the principle of systemicity, which describes remembering systems; the principle of synthesis and integrity, applied to integrate the individual aspects of the subject of research; the principle of analysis and diversification, used in studying alternative directions of social innovations; the principle of development, used to clarify the role of social memory in the structure of social reality; the principle of historicism, used to analyze the origins of a number of contemporary concepts and social processes; the principle of comparativeness, used to identify the common and distinctive features of various modes of social reality; the principle of determinism, used in describing the functional aspects of the "social memory–innovation" relationship; and the principle of critical thinking, which makes it possible to identify the strengths and weaknesses of existing theories of social memory and modernity.

The working definitions of the main concepts of the dissertation research draw on E.S. Markaryan's theory of cultural traditions, on D.S. Likhachev's conceptions of historical and cultural heritage and the "ecology of culture," and on L.A. Zelenov's systemic-activity approach, and are consistently used at all further stages of the analysis. Social memory is understood as a set of structures and mechanisms of society that ensure the preservation, reproduction, and transmission of socially significant collective experience in the unity of the objective-activity,

sign-noematic, and ideological-worldview structures. Tradition is understood as a substantive, historically determined, and socially significant mode of being of collective experience, preserved and reproduced by the structures of social memory. Tradition is broader in scope than historical and cultural heritage, which is understood as the objectively fixed, material and spiritual part of tradition (monuments, texts, works of art, etc.) that is accessible to purposeful study and preservation. Historical and cultural continuity is understood as a processual characteristic of the connection between successive states of tradition, ensured by the action of social memory. Innovation (in the broad sense) is understood as a singular or particular deviation from the historically formed tradition which, through the action of social memory, can be adapted and scaled up to the status of a universal scheme of society's activity. Social innovation is innovation in the sphere of the social organization of society (institutions, norms, forms of activity), as distinct from technological innovation; institutional innovation is a particular case of social innovation associated with changes in the formal norms and structures of social organization. Development is understood as a directed, irreversible change of society in which preservation (tradition, memory) and renewal (innovation) are dialectically connected. Activity is understood in the systemic-activity sense developed by L.A. Zelenov, as the unity of subject, object, means, process, and result of the purposeful transformation of reality, constituting the generic characteristic of human being. The set of the working definitions given constitutes the author's conceptualization of the "social memory–tradition–innovation" relationship, consistently applied in the critical analysis of the philosophical approaches considered below.

**The scientific novelty** of the research lies in the philosophical substantiation of the necessity and possibility of harmonizing the action of social innovations and the action of social memory as complementary processes of the social development of contemporary society.

1. A critical analysis of philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of social memory has been undertaken. It made it possible to identify the features of Western memory studies and of Russian philosophical studies of social memory, to determine the main contradiction in this field of research into the social nature of the human being, and to characterize its manifestations in the differences between the approach of Western memory studies and the Russian tendency to form a holistic philosophical theory of social memory in the context of the "social memory–tradition–innovation" relationship. It also made it possible to clarify the differences between the social-philosophical theory of K. Marx (and the theory of dialectical and historical materialism based on it) and contemporary theories of social memory in Russia.

2. A critical analysis of philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of modernity has been undertaken. It made it possible to determine the main contradiction in the sphere of research into the social nature of the human being (the contradiction between socio-ontological

and socio-praxeological approaches), to reveal its connection with the social-philosophical theory of K. Marx, and to characterize its manifestations in research on the "social memory–tradition–innovation" relationship. These manifestations appear, in particular, in the differences between the Russian conceptions of the development of society characteristic of twentieth-century dialectical and historical materialism in the USSR and the conceptions of societal development in twentieth-century Western social science.

3. The dialectical interrelation of social memory, tradition, and innovation in the context of modernity is presented through the introduction into the subject field of research of the concept of the "event of modernity." This concept makes it possible to give a holistic description of the elementary, "atomic" taxonomic unit of contemporary social reality; to determine the modes of the event of modernity and their internal dialectics associated with the factor of social memory; and to clarify substantively the concepts of historical and cultural heritage, historical and cultural continuity, and social innovation in their connection with the ontological foundations of social reality. The concrete historical content of the entire dialectical configuration is substantiated through an analysis of K. Marx's social theory, in which economic theory and revolutionary theory are analyzed as elements of a particular scientific and social innovation, and its role is clarified in the formation of the alternative directions of social transformation in the early twentieth century in the USSR and in Western countries.

4. The central element of the conceptual basis for harmonizing the "social memory–innovations" relationship has been determined. It describes the action of social memory at the macrostructural level of the organization of society and functions as the basis that ensures the movement (or absence of movement) of innovations along the line "singular–particular–universal," ensuring the continuity (or discontinuity and incompleteness) of the innovation process.

5. In the context of studying the dialectics of the interrelation between the social framework of organizational-state collective memory and the social framework of economic collective memory, the internal functional structure of the macrostructural element of social memory is disclosed, along with its connection with both frameworks. The role of social memory is also determined in the formation of two directions of the development of social innovation. Its initial stage was marked in the nineteenth century by the emergence of the social-philosophical theory of K. Marx and F. Engels, and its concluding stage in the twentieth century, when the innovation acquired the status of a universal scheme of action, marked by the emergence of the "society of socialism" (examined using the USSR as a model example) and of modern society (examined using the USA as a model example).

6. A description is given of a conceptual approach to the holistic understanding of the "social memory–innovation" relationship, on the basis of which four main dimensions of harmonizing the "social memory–innovations" relationship are defined with regard to the development of contemporary Russia: 1) scientific; 2) geopolitical; 3) Russian domestic-political; 4) the dimension associated with preserving and developing Russian traditional spiritual values and preserving "the human being as tradition" in the perspective of Russia's movement toward the turn of the twenty-second century.

#### **Provisions submitted for defense**

1. Two approaches to the study of social memory that differ fundamentally in their philosophical foundations have been identified. One is the infinite pluralism characteristic of Western memory studies; the other is the holistic philosophical perception of social memory characteristic of Russian humanities culture. In the aspect of the "tradition–innovation" relationship, twentieth-century Western memory studies are characterized by a tendency to exclude the concept of "tradition" from the research context. As a result, the functioning of social memory is reduced to a relationship defined, in particular, in terms of the "hot option" and the "cold option" (after J. Assmann), whose basis is the process of "change" and the "innovation–innovation" relationship. In a broader perspective, this substantiates the orientation of the state policy of Western states toward the priorities of trans- and posthumanism. The alternative tendency, characteristic of twentieth-century Russian humanities culture, considers the nature of social memory while preserving and developing the concept of the dialectics of "tradition–innovation." In a broader perspective, this is regarded as a basis for substantiating the orientation of Russian state policy toward both the priorities of traditional values and the priorities of innovative development.

2. The content of the main contradiction in philosophical approaches to understanding the nature of modernity in its relation to the phenomena of social memory, innovation, and tradition has been determined. It is conditioned, first, by the dynamics of the praxeological turn in the worldview culture of society at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, that is, by a universal scheme of activity in which the dialectical interrelation of the socio-ontological and socio-praxeological aspects of social reality is violated. In Western theories of memory studies, this contradiction is manifested in the denial of the connection between modernity and tradition, in the denial of the connection between the nature of collective socio-historical memory and the essential nature of the human being as tradition, and in the exaggeration of the role of social memory as an instrument of social change in the actual socio-political environment. In Russian studies of social memory, the manifestation of this contradiction consists in a certain confusion and indistinctness in studying the conceptual connection of continuity

between the contemporary themes of social memory research and the context of Russian twentieth-century dialectical and historical materialism. It has also been determined that a consequence of this contradiction is the opposition between the concepts of modernity without memory, characteristic of Western theories of modernity, and the concepts of remembering modernity, conceptions of which are taking shape and are regarded as promising in Russian social philosophy and culture.

3. The concept of the "event of modernity" has been introduced into the subject field of research. It reflects the fluid character of contemporary social reality, encompasses the dialectics of all components of human activity, includes the contour of its public perception, and covers the dialectics of the spheres of social being and social existence of society. The "event of modernity–social memory–social tradition" relationship is posited as the conceptual basis for research on social memory in the context of modernity. In its light, the content of the dialectics of traditional events of modernity and innovative events of modernity is determined. It comes down to the fact that the criterion for classifying an event of modernity as traditional or innovative is its relation to the ontological flow-tradition, whose presence is conditioned by the action of social memory. The action of social memory is an integral element of social dynamics, in which historical and cultural continuity and social innovations are interrelated. Their definitions are clarified through their connection with the permanent overcoming of the barriers of social rotations, of the change of generations. This makes it possible to define the entire dialectical complex of the concepts considered as a description of society's ability to remain "the same" in its essence. The concept of "barriers of social rotations" reflects the presence in social reality of generational and other social ruptures that impede the permanent presence of tradition in the social space-time. In light of this approach, a traditional event of modernity is defined as a mode of the here-and-now of a given activity in the sphere of the community's existence as "the same" in essence. The content and forms of a traditional event of modernity have analogues and prototypes in the cultural heritage of the community, formed by its preceding history. An innovative event of modernity is a mode of the here-and-now of a given activity in the sphere of the community's existence as "the same." Its content and forms have no analogues or prototypes in the historically formed cultural heritage of this community, or constitute part of a previously unknown social tradition of another community, or are part of a forgotten tradition.

4. A chain of dialectically interconnected functions of social memory, which ensures the movement (or absence of movement) of innovations along the line "singular–particular–universal," is defined as an internally integral loop of social memory embedded in social reality at the level of macrostructural dynamics. The integral contour of the macrostructural-level loop of social memory ensures the continuity of the innovation process and generates the "spiral"

development of innovations. Its result is, on the one hand, ever newer universal schemes of activity in society and, on the other, the dynamic presence of the human being as "the same" in essence throughout history. Violation, destruction, or functional incompleteness of the integrity of the macrostructural-level loop of social memory in the sphere of social existence manifests itself as rejection, halting, or dying out of innovations and absence of implementation. It also manifests itself as the weakening or loss of the quality of being "the same" (in essence) human being and "the same" (in essence) society, that is, as the loss of the connection of a society's "modernity" with its own preceding history. The movement of an innovation along the line "singular–particular–universal" is understood as a change in the social status of the innovation: from the status of a singular, accidental event in the practice of an individual social subject, through the status of a particular, stably reproduced circumstance of the practice of a specific group, to the status of a universal scheme of activity shared by society as a whole. Barriers of social rotations is a concept denoting the set of generational, institutional, and communicative ruptures of social reality capable of interrupting the transmission of social experience over time. The integral loop of social memory is a concept that fixes the dialectical unity of the functions of overcoming the barrier of rotations, and of adapting and scaling up an innovation. Violation of this unity leads to the halting, forgetting, or incompleteness of the innovation process.

5. The internal structure of the loop of social memory at the macrostructural level comprises: a) the function of overcoming the barrier of social rotations and preserving the innovation as a particular circumstance of social reality; b) the function of adapting the innovation as a particular activity of a concrete historical social subject; c) the function of scaling up an individual innovation to the status of a universal scheme of activity of a concrete historical society/country. The presence of the macrostructural-level loop of social memory is also disclosed as an integral element of the functioning of the social framework of organizational-state memory and the social framework of economic memory, whose elements are first described as far back as the historical turning point of the scientific innovation of K. Marx and F. Engels. The various forms of the relationship between the statuses of the social framework of organizational-state memory and the social framework of economic memory in society are the ontological basis for the division of the praxeological turn of the early twentieth century into the direction along which the society of socialism was formed (examined using the USSR as a model example) and the direction along which modern society was formed (examined using the USA as a model example). In the early twenty-first century, the contradiction between the society of socialism (the USSR) and modern society (Western countries) is transformed into a contradiction between the society of the social state (Russia) and postmodern society (Western countries). As in the twentieth century, it is

based on different forms of relationship between the social framework of organizational-state memory and the social framework of economic memory in Russia and in Western countries.

6. Overall, the proposed conceptual basis of the contemporary dialectics of the "social memory–tradition–innovation" relationship encompasses the dialectics of the "modernity–social memory–tradition" relationship, the dialectics of the relationship among the functions of social memory united in the structure of the macrostructural loop of social memory, and the dialectics of the interrelation between the social framework of organizational-state memory and the social framework of economic memory. From these conceptual positions, harmonization in the "social memory–innovation" relationship is defined in four main dimensions: 1) in the scientific dimension, as a conceptual basis for integrating social-philosophical and cyber-informational knowledge in studying social evolution as a sequence of steps in the formation of the systemic memory of the human being and society; 2) in the geopolitical dimension, as a conceptual basis for substantiating the origin of contemporary multipolarity and the social significance of state sovereignty; 3) in the Russian domestic-political aspect, as a conceptual basis for Russia's self-determination as the legal successor of the society of socialism (and not of modern society), continuing the Russian "spiral" of innovations in the direction of developing the social state; 4) in the aspect of preserving and developing Russian traditional spiritual values, as a conceptual basis for substantiating the social significance of the ideological-worldview structure of social memory. This structure is the common basis for the social frameworks of organizational-state and economic collective memory of Russia's state-forming community, a basis that can ensure the preservation of "the human being as tradition" in the perspective of Russian society's movement toward the turn of the twenty-second century.

**Theoretical significance** of the work consists in revealing a philosophical understanding of the internal dialectical structure of social changes and innovations connected with the development of society, which are grounded in the action of social memory. In the conceptual elaboration of this understanding, significant differences between Western memory studies and promising Russian philosophical approaches are identified. The theoretical significance also lies in the fact that the study of social-philosophical conceptions of modernity is treated as a sphere in which differences appear in the understanding of the role of social memory in contemporary social reality, characteristic of Western memory studies and promising Russian philosophical approaches. It further lies in the fact that the research reveals the role of social memory in the division of the social innovation flow at the turn of the twentieth century into conflicting directions, one oriented toward forming the society of socialism (the USSR and the socialist countries), the other toward forming modern society (the USA and Western countries). In addition, on the conceptual basis of the contemporary dialectical understanding of the nature of social memory

relations, the directions of harmonizing the "social memory–innovations" relationship are determined in the context of the development of contemporary Russia.

**Practical significance** consists in the possibility of using the dissertation materials for teaching humanities disciplines at Russian universities. It also consists in the fact that the developed conceptual model of the social foundations for harmonizing the "social memory–innovations" relationship can be used to promote cooperation between social-philosophical and cyber-informational approaches in organizing applied research on social memory in Russia, to clarify the content of the strategic priorities of Russia's development in the twenty-first century, and to clarify the priorities for forming and developing the ideological-worldview culture of Russian society, including in the development of the humanities component in the state education system.

**Structure of the work** is determined by the logic of the philosophical analysis of the stated topic and corresponds to the aims and tasks set. The work consists of an introduction and two chapters, devoted to the theoretical and methodological foundations of the research, to the analysis of contradictions and points of conjugation between memory and innovations, and to the development of a philosophical conceptual basis for harmonizing the "social memory–innovations" relationship. The research concludes with a conclusion and a list of references.

#### **Approbation of research results.**

The research results are set out by the author in 8 scholarly publications with a total volume of 3.65 author's sheets, including four peer-reviewed journals recommended by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation for publishing the main results of doctoral and candidate dissertations.

The main provisions of the dissertation were presented in papers and reports at scientific-practical, international, and interregional conferences:

- "Dialogue of Worldviews: The Human Being in the World of the Modern Economy" (international symposium, RANEPA, Nizhny Novgorod, 2015; paper: "The Formation of Historical Consciousness and Memory in the Learning Process: Collapse or New Opportunities?");
- "Greater Eurasia: National and Civilizational Aspects of Development and Cooperation" (international scientific-practical conference, Moscow, 2025; paper: "Heritage Under the Pressure of Time: A Philosophical View of Preserving Historical Memory in Greater Eurasia");
- "Civilizational Foundations of Russian Statehood: Dialogue of Worldviews in the System of the Multipolar World" (international symposium, RANEPA, Nizhny Novgorod, 2025; paper: "Artificial Intelligence and Historical Memory: The Philosophy of the Process");

- "Civilizational Foundations of Russian Statehood: 'Scientific Dialogue: Theory and Practice'" (international scientific forum, Moscow, Infinity LLC, 2025; paper: "A Philosophical Understanding of Progress and Innovation in Preserving Historical Memory");
- "Higher School: Scientific Research" (interuniversity international congress, Moscow, Infinity LLC, 2025; paper: "The Philosophy of Memory in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Prospects").