

# THE ONLY CRITERION IS NATIONAL INTERESTS

Mikhail Leontiev



MIKHAIL LEONTIEV — a Russian journalist, public personality, the host of the 'Odnako' TV program, and Editor-in-Chief of the 'Odnako' weekly magazine

**'Progress', 'progressive', 'modern', 'innovative' are all widely used words nowadays. But no one has ever bothered to explain the exact meaning they are supposed to convey. One would think it is intuitively clear that progress bringing forth innovation is a blessing. However, thus far, no one has succeeded to prove that innovation is actually a good thing. Just what is innovation? Why should innovation be a benefit? If all that innovation fosters is an increase in welfare, then innovation and progress are not needed.**

For instance, from the viewpoint of a religious person, such notions as 'progress' and 'innovation' in the sense described above are actually absurd. Another point of view, which is opposite to the previous one, is that a human being has only one objective — to survive in the antagonistic competitive struggle. This is the task that was addressed when establishing the state and in integrating isolated human societies into tribes and nations. And here as

well, innovation and progress are not necessary. The improvement of welfare alone does not require having a state. Luxemburg, for example, is not a state; however, the welfare of those who live on its territory continues to grow. And do we really need Russia according to its current boundaries from the perspective of cost optimisation, economic efficiency and the welfare of each and every person? This question remains open.

Nevertheless, the state as an institution has been established. It was established in order to win the war — both in the literal and figurative meaning of this term. After all, humanity has lived, is living and will most probably continue to live in the foreseeable historical period in the context of antagonistic competition. Consequently, it is this prism that we should use to explain the necessity of innovation and modernisation as a process that leads to innovations. No other types of modernisation have ever existed and shall never emerge. However, this gives rise to the following question: **which war do the authors of the current version of modernisation intend to win? And whom is this war challenging? After all, even the opponent has not been defined yet, but it is this very potential opponent who is helping to carry out this modernisation.**

Many people think that I am a reactionary. Sometimes I also consider myself to be a reactionary but I don't see anything bad in this word. I do not think in terms of progress and reaction. I have only one criterion for judgment — it is the interests of my country. Whether or not the realisation of these interests is perceived on the world arena as being progress or a reaction, I do not really care because I think according to a different reference base.

For instance, you calculate movement in space and they show

it to you as movement over time. You will hardly be able to say exactly where you are and where you will be in the future. It is the same in this instance. **If what you call a reaction serves the better interests of the country, I am all in favour of this reaction, and vice versa — if it does not serve the best interests of the country, I am against such a reaction or what is called reaction.**

Conservatism is something quite different. Conservatism is an absolutely normal element of any historical mind. I have, on many occasions, repeated that a human being differs from an animal not due to the fact that he is cleverer than an animal. Some dogs seem to be cleverer than many politicians and financiers. A human being differs from animals because he has historical memory and he has graves for his kind. Conservatism is the existence of historical memory, historical responsibility, and the understanding that everything that we have is genetically connected with everything else.

There is no such understanding in terms of liberalism. Regarding liberalism, there is only the present. For liberals, for example, Russia is a country that was established in 1991, which should be guided in its activity by abstract universal values. There is no such reference to the past in revolutionary ideologies either; instead they look forward to the future. Revolutionaries are ready to sacrifice everything for the future, while conservatives are ready to sacrifice much to preserve the past. This is a very rough, I would say even a vulgar demarcation line, but it does help us to distinguish between the liberals, conservatives and revolutionaries. ■

*Exclusively for the Yaroslavl Forum*