INTRODUCTION

Historical memory, as a way of preserving the past in the present, has a significant impact on functioning of economic institutions of society. Currently, the processes of economic modernization, due to the modern globalization trends, follow the Western development vector, which involves introduction of liberalism in national systems of economic activity. This situation is often accompanied by a conflict between the traditional economic institutions and liberal model of economic development that is imposed on the non-Western world. The conflict is caused by different value systems that contain mutually exclusive ideas about the motives, methods and goals of economic activity. In this case, the traditional institutional environment often resists introduction of social institutions alien to many local cultures.

It is obvious that memory of the past determines the models of individual’s economic conduct in collective consciousness of local cultural communities. In this regard, it is necessary to take into account the archetypes of people's historical memory. Economic institutions are maintained by these archetypes, that hinders economic development of society in conditions of the global market, global financial system and transnational corporations.

The working hypothesis of this study is the assumption that historical memory, which includes a certain system of value orientations, determines the model of economic behavior. Moreover, in this aspect, historical memory is both an inertial factor that hinders effectiveness of innovative economic institutions and a way to preserve traditional models of economic activity in the context of radical transformation of institutional system.

The purpose of this work is to substantiate the role of historical memory in formation of a certain social and economic culture, which determines the models of economic activity.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The conceptual foundations for the study of historical memory are laid in the works of K. Jung (2012); E. Durkheim (1976); M. Halbwachs (1950); Ya. Assman (2004); V.Je. Boykov (2011); S.N. Ikonnikova (2006); K.S. Romanova (2016); I.Yu. Alekseeva (2019); I.Yu. Alekseeva and A.P. Alekseev (2018).

The study of memory politics in the context of formation of civil culture in modern Russian society undoubtedly has an interdisciplinary character, formed at the interface of humanities, such as, first of all, sociology, history and political philosophy (MILLER, EFREMENKO, 2018; BESPALOVA, 2017).

The fundamental basis of economic behavior research is represented in the works of A. Smith (2007) and D. Ricardo (1955). Historical and modern aspects of economic institutions
development are covered in researches of F. Braudel (1986), M. Weber (1994); K. Polanyi (2002). The relation between economics and culture is discussed by P. Dimaggio (1994); A. Rich (1996); A. Sen (1996).

Theoretical aspects of economic culture of Russian society are assessed by I.V. Voytov (2009); T. Efremenko (2005); N.S. Kondakova (2017); E.A. Trautman (2014); S.M. Reznichenko et al. (2018); K.S. Ezhov et al. (2019). The specifics of Russian economic institutions are studied by T.I. Zaslavskaya and R.V. Ryvkina (1991); N.N. Zarubina (1997); S.G. Kirdina and S.G. Kirdina (2014); N.A. Kargapoltseva et al. (2019).

Ethnic features of economic activity are considered in the works of A.L. Andreev (2017), V.N. Ovchinnikov and Y.S. Kolesnikov (2006); E.Y. Perova (2016); A.N. Sadovoy (2017). At the same time, despite the fact that considerable attention is paid to this topic in scientific discourse, there is no comprehensive analysis of the influence of historical memory on economic institutions in multicultural society. Understanding of this issue requires further systematic research on the impact of historical memory on patterns of economic behavior.

METHODOLOGY
Methodological background of research is based on neoinstitutional approach that allows us to understand the specifics of social institutions, their cultural and historical features. Within this approach institutions are treated as current rules which determine the nature of social interactions. This makes it possible to study the economic institutions not only as purely rational, but also as value structures that include norms, traditions and thinking patterns (specific to a particular culture).

The research methodology uses a civilizational approach that allows us to understand the specifics of economic institutions resulting from cultural archetypes that determine the patterns of economic behavior of people and are transmitted from generation to generation (RAZUMOVSKAYA et al., 2018; BUNNOVA et al., 2018).

The study uses the institutional matrix theory, which explains the features of social institutions. The researchers state that institutional matrix is “a stable, historical system of basic institutions that regulates integrated functioning of the main social spheres - economic, political and ideological” (KIRDINA, 2014).

The study uses the theory of modernization, which affords ground to consider modernization as a socio-cultural phenomenon that covers almost all the spheres of public life: economic, social, political, religious, ecological etc. (CHERDYMOVA et al., 2018).

In completing the work, we substantiate the need to take into account the phenomenon of historical memory in preserving cultural specificity of economic institutions. Historical memory, inculcating a certain system of worldview settings, can both prevent the introduction of innovative forms of economic activity in a regional society and serve as a basis for sustainable economic development.

RESULTS

Historical Memory in Formation of Economic Culture of Society
At present, there is an urgent need to modernize Russian economic institutions in accordance with the requirements of global economic system. Moreover, economic development in Russian society has traditionally been carried out exclusively on the model of “catch-up modernization”, the essence of which was to copy mainly Western experience.

However, as experience shows, not all the effective ways of organizing social life can be successfully transferred from one cultural environment to another. Direct borrowing of culturally alien institutions and their introduction into completely different civilizational space does not lead to the desired outcome. This situation is caused by civilizational difference of social models. N. Danilevsky (2003) drew attention to this fact, arguing that “the beginnings of one cultural and historical type of civilization are not transmitted to the peoples of another type. Each type develops it for itself under the greater or lesser influence of alien, previous, or modern civilizations” (DANILEVSKY, 2003).
Most economists admit that the results of Russian economy reform "demonstrated the fallacy of ideas about the possibility of rapid liberal economic model borrowing" (LIPOV, 2005). Understanding of this makes scientists recognize the need to take into account the previously existing institutional environment in formation of a new model of economic development.

It is interesting, that the institutional structure of society includes not only a set of economic, political, legal and other organizations, but also value frame of reference: a system of ethical norms, religious beliefs, political and legal views, etc. Thus, an important role in formation of economic institutions is played by the normative, subjective and psychological attitudes, transmitted from generation to generation through historical memory.

On this basis, we can talk about the role of historical memory as a channel for preserving and broadcasting the cultural and civilizational code which determines the specifics of institutional development.

Historical memory as the basic element of collective identity determines the specifics of economic culture of the people, which forms certain traditions in organization of economic activities.

In scientific discourse, economic culture is considered primarily as "a set of institutionalized ways of activity that ensure adaptation of specific societies, groups and individuals to economic conditions of their existence" (KUZMINOV, 1992). In this aspect, economic culture is formed under the influence of certain values, stereotypes and attitudes which determine the motives and behaviors of people in socio-economic relations. Historical memory transmits these values, which are closely related to religious worldview of people, that has for centuries formed ethical principles of public life. In addition, scientists treat economic culture as "social memory" that ensures the link of times and continuity of generations" (MOROZOV, 2017).

**Influence of the Religious Factor on Economic Institutions of Society**

Russia is a multicultural space: it unites people of various ethnic groups and religions politically and geographically. That is why Russian economic life has never represented a single economic system.

It is obvious that religious factor has for many centuries determined economic activity of people. M. Weber (1994) was one of the first who pointed out the connection between religion and economy. He justified the dependence of success in European social and economic development on the ethics of Protestantism. Protestantism changed the system of values of Europeans and laid the foundation for new traditions in organization of economic activity.

In turn, Orthodoxy has significantly influenced development and functioning of Russian economic institutions. In contrast to Protestantism, Orthodox ethics is focused on spiritual and moral content of economic activity and is not focused on its pragmatic content. From the Orthodox point of view, any useful work can be both good and evil, depending on "what kind of motivation lies at its base, for the sake of what and with what internal heart motives it is performed" (KOVAL, 1994). In this sense, any secular activity is evaluated solely on the basis of its spiritual orientation.

Through Orthodoxy, Russian cultural archetype establishes the principle of collectivism, which was initially implemented in the process of everyday economic activity of people, but it was the Orthodox Church that spiritually strengthened the status of Russian Christian community, laying collegiality at its foundation as "a value that defines the unity of man and society, the unity of society as a spiritual whole" (LIPOV, 2005).

Thus, Orthodox ethics does not set a person towards material achievements, it focuses his efforts on internal spiritual improvement. In addition, the confessional norms of Orthodoxy legitimized poverty as a type of culture. Striving for material achievements and enterprise are not personal qualities approved by God, on the contrary, humility and patience are the life attitudes of an Orthodox. Determining the specifics of economic institutions, such values did not contribute to development of personal economic activity and personal responsibility for the results of work.
Along with Orthodoxy, the influence on economic institutions of Russian society is exerted by Islam, which has become the prevailing denomination in the North Caucasus. The economic ethics of Islam is based on provisions of the Quran and Sunnah, which are the source of the norms of Muslim law—Sharia. In Muslim culture, no distinction is made between spiritual and economic life of believers; religious ethics is related to organization of practical life. The main principles of economic activity in Islam are fatalism, prudence, foresight and charity. Sharia prohibits such economic activities as usury, securities speculation, gambling, lotteries, etc. From the point of view of Islamic ethics, wealth and poverty are considered as natural states established by Allah.

Since Islam has not lost its influence on economic life of modern Muslims, in scientific discourse there appeared the term "Islamic economy". Researchers state that the model of Islamic economy involves formation of special financial institutions, their activities being focused primarily on "efficiency of capital", not on the "value of money" as in the Western world (GALIULLINA, SULEYMANOV, 2017) In this regard, Islamic economy gives priority to production sector, which is primary in relation to financial sector. Moreover, the model of Islamic economic system "does not justify expansion of consumption and growth of economic indicators, if such achievements lead to violation of social justice or weakening of the country" (IDIGOV, RAGIMOV, 2011) This also shows significant differences between the Islamic and Western economic models.

It is obvious that the attitudes and orientations formed in the economic sphere under the influence of Orthodox and Islamic beliefs do not fit into the model of Western economic system, based solely on market principles of economic organization and ideology of consumption.

This makes it possible to understand the difficulties of introducing Western economic institutions into a culturally different social environment that sets its own "rules of the game" and principles of economic activity. In addition, certain types of society form their own economic culture, which performs the function of "historical memory" and acts as a regulator of economic behavior. Despite the desire to implement the liberal social and economic models in Russian society, historical memory, including cultural archetypes, ensures reproduction of traditional economic institutions.

**Historical Memory and Ethnic Economy of South Russia**

Historically, the South of Russia is a complex multicultural space, a mixture of different confessional models with the dominance of Christianity and Islam. The uniqueness of historically formed social, cultural and ethnic features determines the institutional specificity associated with economic diversity of the region.

The practice of organizing economic activities in multi-ethnic regions indicates the presence of such a segment of economic activity as "ethno-economics".

Researchers distinguish such a characteristic feature of ethno-economics as "the use of traditional methods of production activities, personal subsidiary and household management in ethnically expressed regions" (OVCHINNIKOV, KOLESNIKOV, 2006). This is especially evident in economic stratum of the Cossacks, the mountain peoples of Dagestan, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia, and Kalmykia.

This makes it possible to assert that ethnic economy is based on a certain economic culture, the specificity of which is due to both the natural and climatic features of residence and historical memory, which stores and transmits information about traditional values in the sphere of production, exchange, distribution and consumption, specific to the ethnic community.

In turn, the presence of ethnic economy sectors hinders economic modernization based on the Western social and economic model which suggests introduction of economic institutions that conflict with the historically formed institutional environment of Russian multicultural society.

To date researchers point to the fact that "development and implementation of scenarios aimed at transformation of our economy was based on the concepts and recommendations of
Western theorists, especially of the monetary economic school, which contributed to
depersonalization of man and nation, as "characteristics of a person based on his upbringing,
education, customs, traditions, religion, national culture and national aspirations were not
taken into account" (LYUBIMTSEVA, 2001).

Thus, the mechanical transfer of a "different civilization" model of economic development to
the space of complex multicultural society, as a rule, does not cause the expected institutional
transformations, but only provokes the rejection of culturally alien elements and exacerbates
the country's economic crisis. The researchers note that the world experience of successful
development of national economic systems indicates: "the country succeeds mainly in those
sectors that best meet its historical conditions and national character" (PAVLOV, 2003).
Therefore, effective modernization of economic institutions of Russian society is possible only
on the basis of a social and economic development model that would take into account the
cultural and civilizational features of social development, as well as the ethnic and cultural
factors that determine the specifics of regional economic activity.

DISCUSSION
At present the problem of modernizing Russian economy is discussed in the context of
development vector and the role of Russia in the world economic system. In this regard,
researchers seek to identify the main institutional factors of economic growth and transition
from commodity economy model to the innovative one, because "the place in international
division of labor and, therefore, income, level of welfare, cultural development and future of
the country in macro-historical perspective - all that depends on success of modernization
project". (BELYAKOVA, BATUKOVA, 2010). Therefore, there is a wide discussion on
modernization project, the central issue being the role of the state in modernization process.

Proponents of the classic model of modernization believe that modernization is an
evolutionary path of social and economic system development which is universal for all
societies and is carried out mainly according to the Western vector. In this approach
modernization is treated as a natural process of social development, so the role of the state
should be minimized, since the mechanisms of market economy can independently make it
efficient and competitive. In this case, civil society becomes the key modernization factor. It is
obvious that this model of modernization is typical for countries with well-
developed political
culture and civil society institutions.

Proponents of the state-centered approach consider economic modernization of society to be
the result of deliberate state policy. They assert that modernization projects are doomed to
failure without active participation of the state. This position appeals to the model of "catch-
up" modernization, which is "as a rule, carried out by an authoritarian state, from on high and
by heavy-handed, often despotic methods" (SUZDALEVA, FEDOROV, 2013) Despite this,
South Korea, Taiwan, and China overcome economic and technological backwardness with
active participation of the state and constitute an example of successful "catch-up"
modernization.

Currently, there is an understanding that these two models do not exhaust modernization
processes, since there is no universal algorithm for economic development of any country. In
modern scientific discourse they move away from treating modernization solely as a process
of replacing traditional institutions with the modern ones (based on liberal ideology values).
Such a shift away from linear models of modernization actualizes the search of Russian society
for its own modernization project. Moreover, this project should take into account the
institutional environment of Russian society, its cultural, economic and political factors of
development. Therefore, to develop the model for modernization of Russian economy it is
necessary to take into account the set of value orientations determined by the cultural and
civilizational features, multiculturalism, economic diversity and the leading role of the state in
implementing economic reforms.

CONCLUSION
In conclusion, it should be noted that development, dynamics and structure of economic
institutions are determined by the cultural factors related to religious views, ethnic customs,
political and economic traditions. Representation of these factors is found in historical memory of the people. The cultural archetypes of historical memory define the economic culture of society and contribute to preservation of traditional economic activities, which are difficult to reform. At the same time, the multicultural nature of Russian society and its complex confessional and ethnic composition do not suggest a common economic culture.

In this regard, development and implementation of Russian modernization project should avoid purely liberal strategies. It is necessary to take into account the specifics of civilizational and ethnic features of regional development. In modern Russia it is obvious that the failures of economic modernization are largely due to underestimation of civilizational specificity, multiculturalism and economic diversity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
The article was prepared within the framework of grant by the President of the Russian Federation for state support of young Russian scientists - Doctors of Sciences (MD - 1493.2020.6) on the topic “The Resource of Historical Memory in the System of Institutional Parameters of Social Investment Development and Ensuring Cultural Security of the Region”.

REFERENCES
ALEKSEEVA, I.Y. Historical Memory Management as a Transdisciplinary Problem. Filosofija nauki i tehniki, 2019, 24 (2), p. 82-95

ALEKSEEVA, I.Y.; ALEKSEEV, A.P. Philosophy of Historical Memory. Voprosy filosofii, 2018, 10, p. 67-76.

ANDREEV, A.L. Global World and Ethnic Revolution. Monitoring obshhestvennogo mnenija: Jekonomicheskie i social'nye peremeny, 2017, 4, p. 23-36.

ASSMAN, YA. Cultural Memory: Writing, Memory of the Past and Political Identity in High Cultures of Antiquity. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury, 2004.

BELYAKOVA, G.YA.; BATUKOVA, L.R. On the Issue of Modernization of Social and Economic Systems: Theoretical Foundations and Role of the State. Problemy sovremennoj jekonomiki, 2010, 4 (36), p. 8-12.

BESPALOVA, T.V. The Politics of Memory and Oblivion in Modern Russia: the Problem of Methodology. Political Space and Social Time. 1917-2017: Meanings and Values of the Past Century: The collection of proceedings of XXXII Charax Forum, 2017, p. 38-46.

BOYKOV, V.J. Historical Memory in Modern Russian Society: State and Problems of Formation. Sociologija vlasti, 2011, 5, p. 44-52.

BRAUDEL, F. Material Civilization, Economy and Capitalism of the XV–XVIII Centuries. Moscow: Progress, 1986.

BUBNOVA, I.S.; KHVATOVA, M.A.; CHERNIK, V.E.; POPOVA, O.V.; PROKOPYEV, A.I.; NAUMOV, P.Y.; BABARYKIN, O.V. Research of Professional Activity Features of Ecologist at Carrying Out Public Ecological Examination. Ekoloji, 2018, 106, p. 999-1006.

CHERDYMOVA, E.I.; VOROBYEVA, K.I.; ROMASHKOVA, O.V.; MASHKIN, N.A.; GRIGORIEV, S.M.; ROMANCHENKO, L.N.; KAR'KENKO, M.A.; BAYANOVA, A.R. Photo Exhibition Influence on Student Environmental Consciousness Formation. Ekoloji, 2018, 2 p. 1271-1278.

DANILEVSKY, N. Russia and Europe. Classic of geopolitics. XIX century. Moscow: AST, 2003.

DIMAGGIO, P. Culture and Economy. The Handbook of Economic Sociology. Ed. by N.J. Smelser, R. Swedberg. Princeton: Bollingen, 1994.

DURKHEIM, E. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. London: George Alien & Unwin Ltd, 1976.
EFREMENKO, T. Economic Culture as a Sociological Concept. Sociologija: teorija, metody, marketing, 2005, 3, p. 123-141.

EZHOV, K.S.; CHERDYMOMA, E.I.; PROKOPYEV, A.I.; FABRIKOV, M.S.; DOROKHOV, N.I.; SEREBRENNIKOVA, Y.V.; BELOUSOV, A.L.; EFIMOVA, O.S. Conflict features depending on stay duration at workplace. Dilemas contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores, 2019, 4 (Special Edition), Article No: 38.

GALIULLINA, S.D.; SULEYMANOV, A.R. On the Issue of Competitiveness of the Islamic Economy: Limits and Prospects. Vestnik UNGTU. Nauka, obrazovanie, jekonomika. Serija jekonomika, 2017, 4 (22), p. 23.

HALBWACHS, M. The Collective Memory. New York: 1950.

IDIGOV, Y.Y.; RAGIMOV, A. Islamic Economy: a New Approach to Economic Relations. Biznes v zakone, 2011, 1, p. 256-259.

IKONNIKOVA, S.N. Historical Memory as a Spiritual Resource of Civilization. Humanitarian problems of modern civilization: VI International Likhachev scientific readings. Saint Petersburg. SPbGUP, 2006.

JUNG, K. The Archetypes and The Collective Unconscious. Princeton: Bollingen, 2012.

KARGAPOLTSEVA, N.A.; RAKHIMOVA, O.N.; SHABALINA, L.G.; GURYANOVA, T.Y.; MASHKIN, N.A.; MIRZALIMOVA, R.M.; POPOVA, N.F. Student Identity and Various Procedures of its Development. International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology, 2019, 2(1), p. 519-526.

KIRDINA, S.G.; KIRDINA, S.G. Institutional Matrices and Development of Russia: an Introduction to X-Y Theory. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2014.

KONDAKOVA, N.S. Axiological Aspect of Economic Culture. Voprosy teorii i praktiki, 2017, 12 (86), p. 87-90.

KOVAL, T.B. Orthodox Ethics of Work. Mir Rossii, 1994, 2, p. 54-96.

KUZMINOV, YA. Soviet Economic Culture: Heritage and Ways of Modernization. Voprosy jekonomiki, 1992, 3, p. 44-57.

LIPOV, V.V. Religious Values as a Factor of Dependence on Previous Development and Formation of Social and Economic Models. Jekonomicheskij vestnik RGU, 2005, 3 (3), p. 57-73.

LYUBIMTSEVA, S. Economic Theories and Russian Reforms. Jekonomist, 2001, 10, p. 78-87.

MILLER, A.I.; EFREMENKO, D.V. Methodological Issues of Studying the Politics of Memory. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2018.

MOROZOVA, V.A. Compatibility of Economic Freedom with Elements and Types of Economic Culture. Novosibirsk: CRNS, 2017.

OVCHENNIKOV, V.N.; KOLESNIKOV, Y.S. Ethno-economics as a Factor of Development. Problemy prognozirovaniya, 2006, 1, p. 118-123.

PAVLOV, K. National Features of Economic Behavior. Chelovek i trud, 2003, 10, p. 36-42.

PEROVA, E.Y. Ethinic Economy as a Way to Improve Utilization Efficiency of Social Resources in the Region. Izvestija Bahkal’skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2016, 25 (5), p. 705-712.

POLANYI, K. e Great Transformation: Political and Economic Origins of our Time. Saint Petersburg: Aleteija, 2002.
RAZUMOVSKAYA, M.I.; LARIONOVA, A.A.; ZAITSEVA, N.A.; OREKHOV, V.D.; TRUFANOVA, S.N.; KORZHANOVA, A.A.; TAKHUMOVA, O.V. Modeling the network integration space for educational programs. Modern journal of language teaching methods, 2018, 8 (5), p. 56-67.

REZNICHENKO, S.M; TAKHUMOVA, O.V., ZAITSEVA, N.A.; LARIONOVA, A.A.; DASHKOVA, E.V.; ZOTIKOVA, O.N.; FILATOV, V.V. Methodological aspects of assessing factors affecting the sustainable development of the region. Modern journal of language teaching methods, 2018, 8 (11), p. 70-80.

RICARDO, D. Introduction to Political Economy and Taxation. Moscow: Politizdat, 1955.

RICH, A. Economic Ethics. Moscow: Posev, 1996.

ROMANOVA, K.S. Discourses of Historical Memory. DISKURS-PI, 2016, 3-4, p. 31-36.

SADOVOY, A.N. The Ethnic Economy. On the Analysis of Traditional Social Institutions of Minorities. Informacionnyj bjulleten' associacii «Istorija i komp'juter», 2017, 46, p. 113-117.

SEN, A. On Ethics and Economics. Moscow: Nauka, 1996.

SMITH, A. An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. Moscow: Eksmo, 2007.

SUZDALEVA, T.R.; FEDOROV, K.V. "Catching up" Model of Modernization: Theoretical and Historiographical Aspects. Gumanitarnyj vestnik, 2013. Available at: http://hmbul.bmstu.ru/catalog/histarch/russhist/67.html. Access: August 21, 2021.

TRAUTMAN, E.A. Economic Culture as Factor of Institutional Efficiency of Economy. Lifelong Wellbeing In The World. Wells-2014. International Scientific Symposium Proceedings, 2014, p. 73-82. Tomsk.

VOYTOV, I.V. Economic Culture and Ways of its Formation in Russia. Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. Seriija «Filosofskie nauki», 2009, 2, p. 53-59.

WEBER, M. Economic Ethics of World Religions. Moscow: Jurist Format, 1994.

ZARUBINA, N.N. Modernization and Economic Culture (M. Weber’s Concept and Modern Development Theories). Sociologicheskie issledovaniya, 1997, 4, p. 46-54.

ZASLAVSKAYA, T.I.; RYVKINA, R.V. Sociology of Economic Life. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1991.
**Historical memory and features of economic institutions in a multilanguage environment and multicultural society**

**Memória histórica e características das instituições econômicas em um ambiente multilíngüe e sociedade multicultural**

**Memoria histórica y características de las instituciones económicas en un entorno multilingüe y una sociedad multicultural**

**Resumo**  
O artigo tem como objetivo fundamentar o papel da memória histórica na formação de uma determinada cultura econômica que determina a natureza específica das instituições econômicas em uma sociedade multilíngüe e multicultural. O histórico metodológico da pesquisa baseia-se em abordagens neoinstitucionais e civilizacionais. Por causa da metodologia escolhida, estudamos as instituições econômicas como estruturas que incluem normas, tradições e padrões de pensamento (específicos de uma cultura particular). Justifica-se que fatores culturais relacionados a visões confessionalis, costumes étnicos, tradições políticas e econômicas determinam desenvolvimento, dinâmica e estrutura das instituições econômicas da sociedade russa. Consta-se também que os fracassos da modernização econômica russa se devem, em grande parte, à subestimação de suas especificidades civilizacionais, ao multiculturalismo e à diversidade econômica.

**Keywords:** Multilanguage environment. Historical memory. Economic institutions. Economic culture. Cultural archetypes.

**Abstract**  
The paper aims to substantiate the role of historical memory in formation of a certain economic culture that determines the specific nature of economic institutions in a multilanguage and multicultural society. Methodological background of research is based on neoinstitutional and civilizational approaches. Because of the chosen methodology, we study the economic institutions as the structures which include norms, traditions and thinking patterns (specific to a particular culture). It is justified that cultural factors related to confessional views, ethnic customs, political and economic traditions determine development, dynamics and structure of economic institutions of Russian society. It is also found that the failures of Russian economic modernization are largely due to underestimation of its civilizational specifics, multiculturalism and economic diversity.

**Resumen**  
El documento tiene como objetivo corroborar el papel de la memoria histórica en la formación de una cierta cultura económica que determina la naturaleza específica de las instituciones económicas en una sociedad multilingüe y multicultural. Los antecedentes metodológicos de la investigación se basan en enfoques neo-institucionales y civilizatorios. Debido a la metodología elegida, estudiamos las instituciones económicas como las estructuras que incluyen normas, tradiciones y patrones de pensamiento (específicos de una cultura en particular). Se justifica que los factores culturales relacionados con las opiniones confesionales, las costumbres étnicas y las tradiciones políticas y económicas determinan el desarrollo, la dinámica y la estructura de las instituciones económicas de la sociedad rusa. También se encuentra que los fracasos de la modernización económica rusa se deben en gran medida a la subestimación de sus especificidades civilizatorias, el multiculturalismo y la diversidad económica.

**Palavras-chave:** Ambiente multilíngue. Memória histórica. Instituições econômicas. Cultura econômica. Arquétipos culturais.

**Keywords:** Multilenguaje. Memoria histórica. Instituciones económicas. Cultura económica. Arquetipos culturales.