

# The State and the Citizen: From Paternalism to Neopaternalism

*Larisa D. Kozyreva*

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (North-West Institute of Management, Branch of RANEPA), Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation; kozyreva-ld@ranepa.ru

*Козырева Л. Д.*

Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации (Северо-Западный институт управления РАНХиГС), Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация; kozyreva-ld@ranepa.ru

## ABSTRACT

In article historical aspects and a current state of system of mutual relation of the state and the citizen are analyzed. The novelty of the author's approach consists in demonstrating the cyclic process: from civil paternalism to a social contract society and neopaternalism. The basic models of social support based on the degree of state intervention in the life of civil society and citizens are developed. A substantiated conclusion about necessity of social support not only not protected social groups, but all citizens of the state, transition from vertical to the horizontal social contract. Features of a formed Russian neopaternalism, its inconsistent character are specified. Necessity of forming of new system of mutual relations of the state and its citizens, based on trust and mutual responsibility of the parties is underlined.

**Keywords:** paternalism, neopaternalism, social support, models of social support, social contract, civil society, social state

**For citing:** Kozyreva L. D. The State and the Citizen: From Paternalism to Neopaternalism // Administrative consulting. 2020. No. 7. P. 46–52.

**Для цитирования:** Kozyreva L. D. The State and the Citizen: From Paternalism to Neopaternalism // Управленческое консультирование. 2020. № 7. С. 46–52.

Mutual relations of the state and civil society, the state and the citizen - not passing theme philosophical, sociological and economic researches. In different periods actualized various aspects of the problem: an origin of the state as a result of the social contract; forming of the social state and the social rights of citizens; social responsibility of the state and the citizen etc.

The urgency of the given research is caused by necessity of theoretical judgement of the new phenomena arising in mutual relation of the state and the citizen, change of the maintenance of functions of the modern state, and, as consequence, transformations of system of social support of the population, forming new models.

It is also necessary to explain the survivability of the phenomenon of social dependency — the existence of a fairly large number of people who do not want to be aware of the realities of modern society and continue to demand from the state that they solve all their social problems. According to sociological polls, up to 70% of Russian citizens adhere to state-paternalistic positions [4]. At this conjuncture the explanation of that fact is necessary that the quantity of such citizens does not decrease, despite considerable reducing of a cohort of the people, which *all* social blessings received from the state.

Besides, abundantly clear a duality of a position of the modern Russian state in relation to citizens. On the one hand, the state would like to dump from itself a part of the financial loading connected with execution of obligations taken on, but with another —

especially in the beginning of 2000th years did attempts to divide this burden with new business and structures of a civil society [6, p. 7].

The purpose of the present research is the analysis of process of transformation of system of mutual relations of the state and the citizen as member of a civil society, origin of new not state institutes and new forms of social support of citizens.

As methodological basis of research the classical works devoted to studying of functions of the state and its mutual relations with citizens, works of modern western and domestic analysts act. First of all it is the fundamental works devoted to evolution of the state paternalism, the analysis of its historical stages, their maintenances and A. S. Ahiezer and A. J. Rubinstein, N. M. Pliskevich, T. J. Sidorina, T. V. Chubarova etc.

The position of supporters of the “new” paternalism developed within the limits of modern behavioural economy is worthy also. In works of key ideologists R. Thaler and C. R. Sunstein “the new” paternalism is contrasted with a criticised “old”, traditional paternalism and is based on idea that influence of the state and private structures on a choice and preference of people (including in the absence of effects of influence) not only is not reprehensible, but also is justified by the purpose of such influence — welfare improvement “patronised individuals” [14, p. 1161–1162].

In the domestic literature the criticism of ideology of a new paternalism [10, p. 29–30] is given. Although it is noted that the predisposition to paternalistic guardianship of civil society is “inherent” to the institution of the state as such. But the question always remains: does this “innate” tendency come up against any restrictions and how strong are these restrictions [2, p. 51].

The empirical basis of the study was the data of state statistics (Rosstat), the results of public opinion polls of leading research centers: Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VCIOM) and Levada Center [4; 5].

### **From Hobbes to Locke, from a paternalism to “the general welfare state” and a neopaternalism**

The problem of mutual relations of the state and the citizen has appeared the central theoretical theme during the European New time. Especially accurately it was showed in ideological fight of two giants — T. Hobbes and J. Locke.

T. Hobbes has appeared the supporter of the unlimited rights of the state which arise in the course of “delegation” of unlimited natural human rights. Hobbes underlines the dual nature of the state: it both protects, and punishes. According to Locke, the sovereignty remains behind the people which can be released from state guardianship if the last does not carry out the obligations.

State paternalism is formed historically and manifests itself to varying degrees at various stages of state evolution once. Its essence lies in the fact that a paternalistic state makes decisions *for* citizens, either in an open form — in the form of strict requirements and prohibitions, or in a latent form — in the form of instructions on the desired actions of citizens.

There is a research position according to which the paternalism is an organic part of relations in any community. In this sense the state paternalism is collectivism “from above”; the collectivism “from below” is a form of self-organizing of a society [6].

As supporters of the ideas of behavioral economics, paternalism, state custody of a citizen is necessary “in the vast majority of cases”. The patronized individual simply needs to be “nudged” by the state in a situation of choice when the acts he performs have a delayed effect, are difficult, are infrequent and involve poor feedback, and also when his experience is ambiguous [13, p. 84].

It is necessary to underline rather an important point: as object of the state paternalism (a policy “nudge”) the separate individual or social group and a *society as a whole* acts not. From here the thought that *all* members of a civil society need social support from the state logically follows, to whatever social group they belonged.

Supporters of the “new” paternalism either openly or implicitly present the idea that today there is a change in the classical, traditional “welfare state” with its new form, such as the “paternalistic state”. For example, J. Saint-Paul is consistently pursuing the idea that, in order to solve their problems, citizens need the intervention of “third parties”. Only the state can best fulfill such a role [12].

A “welfare state” is being formed as a result of the growing maturity of civil society trying to free itself from state guardianship. Briefly describe its evolution, it will look like this: two centuries of the dominance of Locke liberalism, then its crisis at the beginning of the last century. How to overcome the crisis — New Deal, Keynesianism, statism. As T. Sidorina notes, then “the spiral turns — the neoliberalism of the London, Freiburg, Chicago schools” [8, p. 127].

All diverse models of the state of general welfare which exist today, differ on several key parameters: the nature and a limit of the state intervention, degree of a social inequality, stratification.

Since the 70s of the last century, the welfare state in all its various models has been experiencing a systemic crisis that has covered all areas - the economy, ideology, and the social sphere. It was the symptoms of state disease that gave rise to the ideas of a “new paternalism”.

### **Social support, models and measures**

It's clear that different models of the welfare state give rise to different types of social support for citizens.

Social policy of the states, measures of social support differ extreme variety. However, with a view of the analysis it is possible to speak about several models of social support, which differ with degree of responsibility of the state for the decision of social problems of *all* its citizens.

In the *paternalistic model* of social support, the state fully assumes responsibility for solving social problems of citizens. As the researchers note, the state as such seeks to predetermine all problems, paint all conditions and results, save a person from the “burden of individual freedom” [11, p. 15].

In *liberal model* of social support the state role, on the contrary, is minimum. The state provides support to a citizen only in exceptional cases when the intervention (resources) of all other *non-* state institutions (family, business, nonprofit organization, etc.) is clearly insufficient to solve the citizen's vital problems. As a matter of fact, this support has extreme and situational character.

The *institutional model* of government “takes care” of citizens not directly, as in the paternalistic model in through a system of specialized institutions, the purpose of which — insurance against various social risks: poverty, unemployment, occupational diseases, etc. This model is also called insurance.

At present, one can see the formation of a new *neopaternalistic* model of social support. State neopaternalism lies in the fact that the state, providing assistance to citizens, encourages them to responsibility for the state of their affairs; calls for intensifying “strong” connections in the system of social support (from the side of close relatives and friends), making greater use of “weak” connections (through real and virtual acquaintance, through various institutions that expand contacts).

A form of such an incentive (or “pushing”, in the terminology of supporters of the ideas of a “new” paternalism) can be a social contract.

## The social contract as the agreement and technology

The idea of the social contract far is not new in the public theory. As a matter of fact, all theories of a civil society are based on idea of the social contract, or the social contract. As marks A. A. Auzan, the civil society is always the voluntary multilateral arrangement of people concerning achievement and the statement of any rights and interests. In this sense the society is a model of the agreement. There, where the civil society has appeared more strongly, there was a horizontal scheme of the social contract. The society has extended the device to the relations with the power and on relations of an entrepreneurial activity with the power. There, where the civil society has appeared more poorly, the state has extended the principle of hierarchy to relations with economy and with a society — there was a vertical social contract.

As the Russian history testifies, in the country forms of the vertical social contract always dominated. So, for example, the state “having adhered” the citizen to the earth, has caused occurrence of such specific phenomena of the Russian vertical contract as autocracy and a serfdom [1, p. 7–8].

In modern conditions, the dominance of the vertical social contract is manifested in the fact that on almost all issues you have to turn up. However, processes have already been outlined for strengthening the positions of the horizontal contract, which are manifested in the formation and development of elements of civil society — non-profit organizations, amateur associations of citizens in various fields, etc.

Within the limits of the state neopaternalism the social contract acts as the agreement between the state and the citizen in whom the mutual rights and obligations, restrictions and responsibility of both parties register. Both bargaining parties are equal in rights. By the tradition which are going back to Roman Law, such contract is a source of origin of mutual obligations and corresponds to two necessary conditions: availability of the purpose of the agreement not contradicting the existing law and voluntariness of its conclusion.

With the first condition it is quite clear. The goal of the social state and the goal of an individual citizen do not differ. For example, our Constitution emphasizes that the goal of a social state is “to ensure a decent life and free development of the individual”. Article 7 enshrines the first generations of human rights: “natural and inalienable” rights to life and freedom as the highest value; sufficient level of material support. The rights of the “third generation” already reveal the modern modes and contours of a decent life: environmental protection, reform of the educational process, the labor market, healthcare and medical insurance, access to cultural goods, digitalization and information security, professional retraining and professional mobility of the economically active population etc. [3, p. 25].

The social contract acts as *method* of achievement of the purpose — *welfares of all* citizens of the state.

With the second condition, everything is much more complicated. We proceed from one of the key provisions of neopaternalism: the state as a guardian, trying to solve the life problems of a citizen, is obliged to take into account the particular behavior of the latter, his position in relation to the state.

There are always people in society who willingly accept the terms of the contract; people who agree to these conditions under the pressure of certain circumstances; people who do not want to accept the terms of the contract. We will deal with these positions.

The first group of people is a significant part of society and is the guarantor of stability. They are distinguished by social responsibility, awareness of their obligations, political activity. However, if state pressure (even in the form of guardianship) intensifies, aggressive adaptive individualism develops, which develops in conditions when an indi-

vidual enters into a struggle with his rivals in a hierarchically structured bureaucratic structure for obtaining certain goods [6, p. 15].

The second group — agrees on the agreement under the pressure of any circumstances, debt comprehension etc. Concerning such persons the state offers a special kind of the social contract. In that case it will be the agreement which consists between the citizen and the state institute (for example, social protection body). Within the limits of this agreement the state institute is obliged to give to the citizen the social support provided by the legislation, and the citizen to the full to implement the obligations provided by the social contract. In this sense the social contract will act as *social technology*, the special tool which gives the chance to the citizen to solve own problems, thereby to promote to purpose achievement — welfare achievement.

However, there is also a flip side to the “coin”. Knowing that in a difficult reality situation the state to take care at least of “fishing tackle” (i.e. all the same something will give), the citizen loses necessary stimulus to search of means to worthy existence, remaining on the verge of a survival.

The third group — people who do not wish to “agree”. They or rise in rigid uncompromising opposition in relation to the state by a principle “to me it is necessary of nothing” and “lag behind me”; or take of a position of a social dependence by a principle “to me all should”.

The Paternalistic state, having done in the history a cyclic coil and having turned in neopaternalism with corresponding system of social support, it is forced to “work” with all three groups of citizens. A trend of a general orientation (irrespective of model of social support) — reducing of a share of the state social services and increase in volume of the services rendered by institutes of a civil society (non-profit organizations, the business, socially focused public consolidations etc.). Participation of citizens in not state pension funds, for example, is stimulated. In our country, for example, the participation of citizens in private pension funds is stimulated by the right to receive a private pension 5 years earlier than the deadline set by the pension law.

### **The Russian neopaternalism**

Paternalism of the Russian state — the phenomenon specific enough. Very many works as classical — N. M. Karamzina, V. O. Klyuchevsky, S. M. Soloveva, Slavophiles, N. A. Berdjajev etc., and modern — A. S. Ahiezer, A. A. Auzan, A. J. Rubinshtejn, S. S. Tsukanova etc. For example, reveals, at least, 4 types of the relation of the Russian citizens to the state — paternal, participative, individualistic and deprived. However, the significant works devoted to forming of the Russian neopaternalism, practically are not present.

Trying to fill this research lacuna, we will note the basic features of the Russian state neopaternalism. If it is short, as follows: a close genetic relation with a traditional Russian paternalism; reproduction of the archaic of Russian paternalism; the inconsistency of this phenomenon, combining the national special and elements of borrowing, etc.

As a matter of fact, the Russian neopaternalism as ideology and sociopolitical practice is in process of formation. Today it is shown in removal on the constitutional level of the social rights and guarantees of their accomplishment as obligations of the social state; the state support of structures of the civil society which are carrying out of a task of social support.

In addition, it manifests itself, on the one hand, as the expansion and specialization of measures of state social support within the framework of its non-paternalistic model (in cash and in kind, in the form of services and social benefits), on the other hand, in the formation of a new attitude of citizens to the state (responsibility, longevity, trust, etc.).

Important value is acquired by the efforts directed on increase of efficiency of all system of social support. In modern Russia considerable means are allocated for social

support of citizens - about 3% of gross national product that more than other countries with transitive economy. According to Rosstat, only in 2019 expenses of the consolidated budgets of subjects of the Russian Federation have constituted about 1,2 bln. rbl. [9]. However, this did not have a significant effect on the poverty level in the country.

Constantly the circle of people social support appears which extends. Today it basically in great need to which the conclusion of the social contract providing the help from the state in employment is offered, conversion training, allocation of the initial capital on business opening etc. we will notice that conditions of the conclusion of social contracts it is strongly separated on regions that too essentially complicates an estimation of their efficiency. The next step should be the unification and standardization of contracts.

It should be noted that the idea of social support of *all* citizens of the state, being a component of ideology of a neopaternalism, gradually makes the way in life. Exclusively as positive it is possible to estimate the offer from the government about creation of the register of incomes of the population. In our opinion, it will help not only to group the population in criterion of security, but also to find out, what sort of a measure of social support are necessary for separate categories, and in the long term (unfortunately, rather kept away) for each individual citizen.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that an analysis of the relationships and mutual obligations of the state and its citizens allows us to see a certain cyclical nature: from state paternalism to a social contract society and to state neopaternalism. It is in this way, as neopaternalism, that one can determine the attitude of citizens to the modern social state. Russian neopaternalism is still being formed, but its features and the contradictory nature of the process of emergence and transformation are already evident. But today we can definitely say — a radical revision of the system of mutual responsibility of both the state and the citizen is necessary.

## References

1. Auzan A.A. Social contract and a civil society // World of Russia [Mir Rossii]. 2005. V. 14. N 3. P. 3–18. (In rus)
2. Kapelyushnikov R.I. Behavioral economics and the new paternalism [Text] preprint WP3 / 2013/03. M. : Publ. House of the Higher School of Economics, 2013. (In rus)
3. Kasavina N.A. The phenomenon of a decent life in the context of the problems of the social state // Questions of Philosophy [Voprosy filosofii]. 2019. N 11. P. 22–27. (In rus)
4. Public opinion – 2016. M. : Levada Center, 2017. (In rus)
5. Public opinion – 2019. M. : Levada Center, 2019. (In rus)
6. Pliskevich N.M. Paternalism and the processes of post-socialist transformation : Scientific report. M. : Institute of Economics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2019. (In rus)
7. Rubinstein A.N., Gorodetsky A.E. State paternalism and paternalistic failure in the theory of trusteeship benefits // Journal of Institutional Studies [Zhurnal institutsional'nykh issledovaniy]. 2018. Vol. 10. N 4. P. 38–57. (In rus)
8. Sidorina T.Yu. Social contract and civil society in a historical perspective and modern Russian realities // Economic Bulletin of Rostov State University [Ekonomicheskii vestnik Rostovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta]. 2007. Vol. 5. N 2. P. 118–128. (In rus)
9. Federal State Statistics Service [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.gks.ru/folder/13397?print=1> (accessed: 20.04.2020). (In rus)
10. Chubarova T.V. Modern paternalism as a product of the mainstream: social problems, individual solutions // Social Sciences and the Present [Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost']. 2019. N 6. P. 27–39. (In rus)
11. Tsukanov S. S. Paternalism of the Russian state (IX–XIX centuries): historical and legal research : Dissertation abstract. Moscow, 2011. (In rus)
12. Saint-Paul J. The Tyranny of Utility. Behavioral Social Science and the Role of Paternalism. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2011.
13. Sunstein C., Thaler R. Libertarian Paternalism Is Not an Oxymoron // University of Chicago Law Review. 2003. Vol. 70. P. 1159–1202.

14. Thaler R. H., Sunstein C. R. Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008.

**About the author:**

**Larisa D. Kozyreva**, Professor of the Chair of Social Technologies of North-West Institute of Management, Branch of RANEPA (St. Petersburg, Russian Federation), Doctor of Science (Philosophy), Professor; kozyreva-ld@ranepa.ru

**Об авторе:**

**Козырева Лариса Дмитриевна**, профессор кафедры социальных технологий Северо-Западного института управления РАНХиГС (Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация), доктор философских наук, профессор; kozyreva-ld@ranepa.ru