

Regionalism As Anti-Imperialism

Levintov A*

Ph.D. Geography, in depended researcher Moscow City University, Russia

*Corresponding author

Levintov A, Ph.D. Geography, in depended researcher Moscow City University, Russia

Submitted: 19 Apr 2022; Accepted: 23 Apr 2022; Published: 27 Apr 2022

Citation: Levintov A (2022). *Regionalism As Anti-Imperialism. J Huma Soci Scie, 5(2):104-105.*

I devoted the second half of the 1980s to the history of European and Russian municipalization, as well as to the theoretical and methodological development of regional studies. The created theoretical construction of the region included several fundamental principles and provisions, namely:

a region can be formed only if there is a regional entity (collective or individual) that takes responsibility for the region in contrast to the region = the result of the division of the territory, the region is considered within the framework of world development and world history region-forming processes are development, formulated as the mission of the region in the development of mankind, and reproduction, both material (economy) and spiritual (education and culture) the boundaries of the regions are linear and contrasting, the regions - wide bands of contacts, communications and exchange, empires are historically ephemeral (and none lasted more than a millennium), regions are practically eternal, at least historically stable and geographically localized the process of regional formation and regionalization is essentially an anti-imperialist struggle the region is a springboard of local political forces and interests that clash, seek compromises in the name of coexistence and fruitful interaction unfortunately, most, even the vast majority of the territory of the USSR is regionally empty, an interregional space in which regional formation is impossible or very difficult, and therefore the Soviet empire can fall apart, but cannot disappear, except perhaps with the disappearance of statehood here, the transformation of the northeast Eurasia to the new Antarctica.

These ideas were outlined in an article published in the geographical scientific community and in the methodological community [1-2].

Today, almost 40 years later, it can be argued that the main ideas of this development have been verified by post-perestroika, post-Soviet practice, and, therefore, the catastrophe of the Russian empire now being experienced can be considered from the point of view of regionalization as the antipode of imperial existence.

The origins, roots, features and destructive results of the Russian imperial consciousness are quite well-founded in the works [3-4]. In this article, this problem is considered from the opposite, regionalist point of view.

Features Of Imperial And Regional Consciousness

Strange as it may seem, imperial and regional consciousness have something in common: awareness of oneself within the global framework and within the framework of world history. The fundamental difference is that the empire strives for world domination (and in our time also for space), and the regional - for world development. In this sense, the empire always acts as an exporter of force (primarily military), laws, money/finance, and an importer of material, territorial, and human resources. The region exports ideas, knowledge, technologies and civilization novelties and, as a rule, imports money/finance, entrepreneurs and photoniners (gold miners and adventurers).

Regional formation can be based not only on the ideas of development, but also as problem regions. In this case, the presence of a regional subject is not at all necessary, more precisely, the subject of regional formation is either the state (Great Britain in relation to "Black England"), or the international community (Great Lakes in the USA, Southern Bavaria in Germany, etc.). All problem regions exist for a relatively short time and "dissolve" as regional problems are solved. There are too many problem areas in Russia for the empire to pay attention to their condition and salvation.

Regional consciousness, in contrast to the provincial one, based on local customs and customs, local color, history and culture, cultural autonomy and originality, uniqueness, in addition to all of the above, includes as an indispensable component the vector of world development, set by this region by its regional mission. : The Savoy Alps is the birthplace of mountaineering, mountain sports and the Winter Olympics, Judea is the birthplace of all three world religions, Silicon Valley is the hotbed of computer technology, TBA (the Tennessee Valley in the USA as a world center for the development of regional projects and programs), etc. .d. The first province in the world, in fact, gave this phenomenon a household name - Provence, which achieved cultural independence and autonomy from the Roman Empire - and the province does not pretend to anything related to the future.

Provinciality may be the historical basis for the origin of the region, but this is not necessary at all.

Unfortunately, in Russia, provinciality is synonymous with peripherality and backwater (which is unfair) and therefore has a

persistently negative connotation. The Bolsheviks, fearing for their "proletarian" imperial hegemony, carefully fought localism, to the point of criminal prosecution and anti-parochial legislation. Local interests were a priori recognized as harmful and insignificant, and therefore ignored and violated in practice.

Two types of patriotism. Rootedness vs hegemony bastards
Imperial, state patriotism demands boundless filial love and devotion to the Motherland, prohibits any critical attitude towards it, makes patriotism the main and unshakable value, recognizes the "sanctity" of borders only for others, allowing and encouraging their violation in favor and for the purposes of unlimited expansion of borders - for the sake of possession, rather than use of the newly captured territories.

Regional patriotism is taking responsibility for the past, present and future of one's place. This relationship is much more "marital" than "mother-son".

Unfortunately, responsible relations in most of the territory of Russia are very difficult due to the lack of roots of the population, dragged and dragged either during collectivization and industrialization, including the Gulag movements (20-50s), or during mass evacuations (during the Second World War and in present), then to the development of virgin and fallow lands (50s), then to the Great Construction of Communism (50-80s), then mobilization limits (60-80s). Strictly speaking, only the autochthonous population is indigenous: the small peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East, the highlanders of the Caucasus. It cannot be said that all the unrooted are comfortable in the empire (here the concept of "bastard" is not a curse word, but only testifies to the forced displacements and displacements), but

they are unsuccessful homographic material for regionalization: it is difficult to take the position of a regional subject if you feel the randomness and fragility of your own stay in this place.

Pride And Shame: Imperial and Regional Vectors

Perhaps these two feelings are the most striking in the emotional palette of the inhabitants of the empire and the region. Regardless of what kind of empire it is: Roman, Great Britain, the German Reich, the Japanese Empire, China, Russia-USSR-RF or something else - there is unbridled and unreasonable pride (fueled by propaganda, of course) for the empire, but modest shame for its secluded and inconspicuous place. The regional consciousness is dominated by pride in one's own region and a very restrained, cautious, shy, even skeptical attitude towards one's own and foreign empires, with an understanding of their inappropriateness and clumsiness [5].

References

1. Levintov, A. E. (1991). Ot rayona k regionu. Na puti k khozyaystvennoy geografii [From district to region: on the way to economic geography]. Voprosy metodologii [Methodological issues], 3, 45-52.
2. Levintov A. E. - From district to region: on the way to economic geography. "Proceedings of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Geographic Series, 1994, No. 4
3. Anisimov E.V. – Historical roots of imperial thinking in Russia. <https://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/sympo/Proceed97/Anisimov.html>
4. Rozov, N. (2011). Russian mentality: the most constructive concepts and their critiques. Mir Rossii, 2, 100-113.
5. Lefebvre V. - Reflection. M., Kogito-Centre, 2003, 496 p.

Copyright: ©2022 Levintov A. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.