Abstract. As the fifteen former soviet economies progress in their political, economic, institutional, and state-building development, the role of the ideology among them is being neglected. It is assumed that as the USSR collapsed, the role of socialistic or communistic ideologies is no more in the mind of the politicians and decision-makers or even citizens. However, for 70 years these countries used ideology, and only ideology to guide their societies. Complete deviation from the traditional courses of the state, or institutions among the former Soviet Union countries should be hard to ignore even today. In this light, the connections between ideology as a non-scientific factor that impacts economics seems to be relevant in the case of the former Soviet Union countries. Consequently, a set of questions arise: are the post-Soviet countries post-Soviet, or the legacy of the USSR is still present? How exactly an ideology must be pinpointed among the former Soviet countries? What is the overall situation related to the connection between the economic development and ideological situation among the ex-Soviet countries? This paper discusses the concept of ideology in the context of the Soviet economies, by briefly considering country examples, referring to the permanent importance of the notion of ideology in daily life, politics, and economics.
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1. What is an Ideology?

The effect of ideology on economic theory has been identified starting from the 19th century and since that time, there are a lot of debates, arguments, and
discussions around. Economics similar to the other sciences designs hypotheses, certain results from those hypotheses, and checks the outcomes with the proper facts. During this process, as Karl Popper told, science can be affected by non-scientific factors. Ideology enters among those non-scientific factors.

An ideology can be seen as a comprehensive vision of a view of things, of several philosophical tendencies, or of a series of ideas proposed by a dominant class in society to the members of that society. Ideologies are related to social structures, economic production systems, and political structures. The main purpose of an ideology is to bring about a change in society, either by adhering to a set of ideals or by conformity with existing normative thought processes [1, 2]. Moreover, an ideology is a system of certain views, ideas, concepts, or concepts represented by a class or political party. At least since Stalinism, this description no longer applies to political parties. Movements exist less as ideologies than as ideologies within movements [3, 4].

An ideological approach explains theories of social dominance and analyzes how ideology legitimizes political attitudes and social policies and discusses the political and cultural implications. An ideological approach also describes approaches to why people have political attitudes and the consequences of these attitudes [5].

It is said that the more a state observes and accumulates power and security, the more it must accumulate without the risk of retaliation from others, influences the internal political process of other states, and tries to replicate its internal political system in other states. Radical states, at least the Calvinists in Geneva, made ideology an important instrument of statecraft, but it was the conditions of mass politics, post-traditional societies, and other aspects of the twentieth century that were more conducive to the influence of ideology in international relations [6].

An ideology theory defines its subject by the beliefs of a group or individual. Jon Elster defines ideology, for example, as "the false or distorted conscious beliefs held by individuals in the social world". Another strand of the theories for understanding ideology focus on the problem of imaginary knowledge, which assumes that ideology involves our beliefs and fantasies [7, 8].
The second theory of the French political philosopher Louis Althusser is that ideology is less a fantasy and more vulnerable to the truth than a set of practices and ideas originating from social institutions such as churches, media, and schools. It is not that all beliefs are ideological beliefs, but that beliefs are idealized, universalized, and detached expressions of actual social relations. Ideology is one of the variants that form a comprehensive pattern of cognitive and moral beliefs about man, society, and the universe in which man and society thrive as a human society [7, 9, 10].

Jost, Ledgerwood, and Hardin (2008) propose that ideology functions as a ready-made unit of interpretation that spreads from basic human motives to understand the world, avoid existential threats, and uphold values and interpersonal relationships. To understand what is ideological, we need an idea of what is true and what is not. It is wrong to assume that ideological thinking is part of our waking thoughts and experiences or that its degree, intensity, and commitment to a set of ideologies are the same for all people [4, 8].

What distinguishes ideological thinking from mere fantasy and error is the social context in which these beliefs occur and the use in which they are made by people. False beliefs about other people, however false or unflattering, are not ideological unless we can prove that they have an ideological effect on the social world. We can understand the world from an ideological standpoint while being aware of the limitations and distortions of our own deeply held ideological beliefs [4, 8].

Thus, more elaboration needs to be done to find the changing role and importance of the ideology within our modern societies. Before this paper focuses on the links between ideology and economics, and the former Soviet union countries’ experience since the independence, footprints of an ideology must be clarified in a more precise way, by giving concrete examples from the socio-economic formations.

2. How one can Find the Footprints of an Ideology in Society?

Ideology cannot be pinpointed directly by particular things, events, or precise ideas. In theory, ideology is an attempt to explain why people are disadvantaged by
certain formations and seem to make concessions to them. As we have seen, ideology seems to convey not only values to people, but also beliefs. We have seen that political reasoning does not follow the logic that is hoped to characterize an informed and driven population with ideological values, beliefs, and opinions [7, 8]. Due to the reason that ideology is highly embedded into subjective mindsets, any clear separation to interpret analytically is a tough mission.

The approaches vary to conceptualize the ideology. For instance, critical theorists of the ideology theory of the Frankfurt School focus on representative works of art, popular culture, and mass media that tell the story of society, its members, and our way of life. Meanwhile, some other approaches extensively analyze the social and economic dimensions of the society to track ideological aspects. Stated alternatively, Marx believed that when workers develop class consciousness and become aware of their exploited position vis-à-vis the more powerful classes of factory owners and financiers, in other words, they experience a fundamental change in ideology, and that they respond to this change by organizing and demanding changes in the social, economic and political structures of society. Likewise, Gramsci's theory focuses on the central role played by social institutions, especially education, in spreading dominant ideologies and maintaining the power of the ruling class [2].

The "isms" of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries suggest that ideology is no longer the old word itself, but belongs to a time when secular beliefs replaced traditional religious beliefs. Recent analyses tend to posit ideology as a coherent system of ideas, based on a few basic assumptions about reality, but without a factual basis. On this basis, five characteristics in ideological systems as varied as the science of destruction of ownership, the idea of positivism (according to the French philosopher Auguste Comte), communism, several other kinds of socialism, fascism, Nazism, and certain types of nationalism are recognized today [11].

However, in the business and economic life of the society, ideology can be easily come to light on the higher levels of the hierarchy as well. In this context, the idea that the board of directors political ideology influences its governance decisions and actions: separating the CEO from the role of the chairman of the board,
designing compensation packages for the CEO, adopting recovery provisions and governance policies to increase management accountability [7].

One must try to examine one's ideological convictions to understand the role of ideology in politics and society. If we limit our study of ideology to the mechanisms that produce convictions that benefit the dominant group, we strip ourselves of many examples of ideological thought that not only shed considerable light but also have more hegemonic examples that are worth checking for ourselves [4, 8].

Ideology uses social symbols and systems to organize social relations in a hierarchy in which some social identities are superior to others and social identity is considered inferior. According to Louis Althusser, class and social ideology convey the elements of the relationship between people and their conditions of existence, which are regulated in favor of the ruling class. Ideology is linked to class interests, and when society becomes a class society as a result of the inevitable proletarian revolution, the false bourgeois ideology disappears [4, 7].

3. Ideology and Economics.

Despite it is not the primary goal of this work to explain what is ideology and how the relationship between ideology and economics evolved, answering or approaching this theme illustrates an exciting and challenging question that holds an entry-forming feature. We can not forget how the term ideology is multifunctional and how the approaches to this concept can differ. For instance, Marx and Engels used it to denote the most abstract conceptions that populate an imaginary world of ideas independent of material life [12]. In addition, "Ideology has a pejorative meaning. Ideology is a set of ideas that directs political action and legitimates the quest for power of a political party or political movement" [13]. Moreover, although there are obvious and particular differences between economic systems of neoclassical and socialist economies, we can observe some common features like Ellerman (2010) mentions:

"Regardless of other differences, both neoclassical economics and socialist economics (e.g., in the former Soviet Union) agreed on modeling problems mathematically as the maximization of some objective function subject to various
constraints so that problems would have an "optimal solution" (not necessarily unique).”

Although some economists argued the role of ideology on the improvement and progress in economic thought is not that significant, meanwhile other economists defended the meaningful position of it. In 1948 Joseph Schumpeter made a speech under the title "Science and Ideology", nevertheless, he also devoted the first paragraph of the fourth chapter of his very famous book "History of Economic Analyses" to the issue that what if economic history is the history of ideology [14]. Nonetheless, Joseph J. Spengler in his book "Modern Ideology and Economic Theory" in one form or another, approached this issue as well [15]. Also, several names can be considered as very solid sources to understand the science and ideology relations. We can mention Maurice Allais, Gunnar Myrdal, Austin Robinson, Thorstein Veblen, Joseph Stiglitz, and Paul Krugman's names.

Furthermore, we must acknowledge the fact that economics as a social science is vastly different from any of the natural sciences. Gulbina and Artibyakina (2015) explain this as follows:

"Economic theory is learning human behavior which can change exactly like the particular economic system. Unlike nature which is the primary research object of natural science scientists, social-economic realities are injected with value judgments. An economist can not be just an impartial participant in the observation process but in fact, he is also an active participant in economic life, and as the result, he cannot be unprejudiced." [16]

Additionally, the boundary between objective descriptions and assessments remains permeable and in the final analysis, it is related to the human character of economic science [17].

Economic ideology differs from the economic systems it supports, such as capitalism, and insofar as the explanation of economic systems is a positive economy and is different from its endorsement of a normative economy. Economic ideology eliminates competitors and undermines the legitimacy of other concepts. However, when economics functions as ideology, it interprets evidence of conformity with a conceived and prescribed self-image as the only rational way to
think about social interactions, recommends and implements strategies in modern liberal societies that encourage us to become independent, benefit-maximizing actors with arbitrary preferences [18].

In practice, economics and politics are inextricably linked, and economic success is one of the most crucial political battlegrounds. Many economic concerns are essentially political, allowing for a wide range of viewpoints. In economics, we argue that free politics, the basic concept of supply and demand, and business theory are not loaded with political ideology. Therefore, economic ideology expresses a perspective on how the economy should function, while the ultimate goal of economic theory is to create an accurate explanatory model describing how the economy works. These two are interlinked, and the underlying economic ideology influences the methodology and theories used in the analysis [19].

Simply put, political economics refers to the advice that economists give governments about general economic policies and certain specific policy proposals. International political economy is a study (also known as a global political economy) that examines the relationship between economics and international relations. It focuses on how state institutions use global economic interactions to shape political systems [20].

The ideal is for economists to ignore political bias and prejudice and provide neutral and unbiased information and recommendations to improve the country's economic performance. If they do, it is because they promote an economic ideology for the simple reason that it serves their self-interest. Therefore, we should be skeptical of economists' claims and proclamations about real-economy problems that are under the ideological influence [18, 21].

In other words, a set of formal economic theses is considered immune to ideology and can be used as a means to illuminate real-world problems. Cause and effect can then be derived from these theses, which in turn can form the basis for political prescriptions before ideology comes into play. For the twentieth-century economist Maurice Dobb, before ideology came into play, we made the toolbox work [21].

Despite widespread poverty, almost everyone agrees that the state has been responsible for economic growth and development for more than 50 years and is a
major player in the country's industrialization and capital [22]. Toffler and others called for the formulation of the third wave of political ideology. This ideology sought to shift the balance between the economy and the state by shifting the provision of public services to the private sector, where solvency would determine their availability. The ideology of information technology masked real political and social issues with the glamour of electronic impulses [23].

4. Ideology and the Former Soviet Countries/Economies

Nearly 70 years of the Soviet regime deeply rooted, so to speak a “soviet heritage” among the ex-Soviet countries that cannot be ignored even after the collapse of the empire. Newly independent countries chose the world’s leading economy – the USA as a benchmark country, not only to adopt economic systems, but also the day-to-day social life in the form of a new ideology. A central tenet of the prevailing ideology in US society is that people are free and equal and can achieve what they want in life. This belief is a form of ideology that supports capitalism and helps us understand why some people achieve so much in success and prosperity, while others achieve so little [2]. However, a certain bite-sized analysis must be implemented to build up a post-Soviet-specific understanding of the link between political ideology and economics.

Firstly, after the roughly 70 years of socialistic lifestyle, the individuals of post-Soviet countries were in a shock after the privatization waves and market reforms that started during the early 90s. Moreover, a lot of political instabilities and conflicts led to regional and even civil wars. Regarding this fact, it can be a biased approach that we evaluate individuals' behavior and decisions through the periscope of only social norms, social capital, and trust. In other words, because it was impossible to slide over immediately to the capitalistic mentality, it is understandable that some ideological remainings had to be among the decisions of politicians and institutions. Accordingly, Facchini and Melki (2013) argue that political ideology is not a less important factor to understand business cycles and the long-term economic growth of societies [24]. It gains even more importance when it comes to discussing post-socialist countries because they used to be officially ideological countries and it is not, nevertheless will not be easy to cut all connections
with the “Old School” of doing things in the Soviet Union. For instance, in the case of Georgia, ex-president of the country Mikheil Saakashvili mentioned crystal clear the "daltonism of the Soviet heritage" in his interview to the Chanel PIKTV in 2012, which is the great barrier in front of the reforms towards the market economy, democracy, and functional society:

"Fulfilling reforms successfully take generations. You have to explain that white is white and black is black whenever you do something. There are always contradictions even with good reforms. It is the result of Soviet daltonism. However, we don't have any nostalgia about the Soviet Union in contrast to the other post-socialist countries. Even more, it is not a nostalgia for the Soviet Union, it is the nostalgia about our youth."

Despite this statement holds very warped ideas, still encompasses some specific realities of the ex-socialist countries and can be considered as a very good example of a post-Soviet country – Georgia’s current experience of ideology and economics relations. It is not easy to eliminate the effect of the ideological impact of the state in a short time and decrease the influence of the old ways of doing things. Yet, Mikheil Saakashvili is a good example who did exceptionally beneficial works to decrease both the Soviet heritage of ideological "decorations" and modern Russia’s influence. What is the result of it? Georgia is taking "good" positions in different economic and political rankings among the western evaluations compared to other ex-socialist countries. Unfortunately, the increasing influential political power of Russia, the decreasing speed of reforms in Georgia slowed down the country and the political elite's ideological commonalities tend to be Russia-friendly nowadays.

Additionally, in the paper named "Zombie socialism and the rise of neoliberalism in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe", authors Chelcea and Druţă (2016) present a particularly interesting term - "Zombie socialism" [24]. Subsequently, the term "Zombie socialism" means that neoliberal politics and new configurations of inequalities are formed by the help of keeping the socialist past alive in public discourse, despite the time between the collapse of the socialist block is far behind. The paper is not forming any solid foundations to trace the tracks of
the ideological effect of socialism in these ex-socialist countries, rather than it depicts general evidence of the patterns of socialistic principles which are used by countries like Hungary and Romania, to fulfill specific type economic and social policies which are doubtful that they are considered to maximize the social welfare in these countries. However, because these countries officially disarmed the ideology, still, we can observe some good hints that are possessing some other ideology that is not directly related to the integration to the free market mechanism or capitalism, and having distinct goals and objectives. Also, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the borders between ideology and politics became blurry and that is why it is getting more and more difficult to speak about the current ideological status of these countries, as well as, its impact on the economy of the countries. Including a lot of territorial disputes and political instabilities grew and different groups tried to achieve their intentions and purposes rather than doing things for the sake of the whole society.

The same mechanism is actual for the Central Asian countries, which used to be part of the Soviet Union. Rustemova (2011) depicts the two former Soviet countries – Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan's modern political-economic realities which is the result of appropriate political substances [26]:

"Political economy of Central Asia cannot be analyzed by pure economic modeling and a priori prescriptions because politics and economics are woven together not only in an ordinary interdependent fashion seen in most developed states but represented by a highly structured personalist political regime that pursues economic liberalization in two different ways."

Secondly, if we are speaking about the current relations between ideology and economy among the ex-Soviet countries, we don't have to forget the generation which we can call "Soviet Man". The collapse of the Soviet Union ignited the conversion process from “Soviet Man” to “Economic Man” as Tverdohleb (2012) writes:

"The population in these countries experienced a type of disillusionment and hardship previously unknown to them. Besides the macroeconomic challenges, other significant changes influenced the outcomes of transition: the total reconfiguration
of the social structure; reevaluation of values, norms, habits, routines, leaders, and heroes; premature exposure to regional and international economic competition; and national identity crises for many of the newly re-created states (for ex. Russia, Ukraine, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, the Baltic countries, etc.) [27].”

Moreover, the author (Tverdohleb, 2012) mentions that the most important coordinator of the transition process indeed was exactly the shift from “Soviet Man” to “Economic Man”. On the other hand, certainly, the level of the institutional quality is the indicator of the mentioned transformation and functional economic and social activities in these societies. Instead, when we look for the ex-socialist countries to identify the level of the formal institutional environment of the countries, we observe low indicators compared to western countries. Kunčič (2013) classified most of the post-socialist countries under the low evaluated countries on the “Institutional Quality Dataset” paper [28]. That’s why it is safe to say, to make a successful transition process from the planned economy and ideological society into the market economy and free will community, you have to stimulate the main agent of it – “Economic Man”. However, the institutional background was very poor to accomplish this mission at least until the late 90s. Not only creating "Economic Man" is unfinished, subsequently, but the application of democracy and market economy principles are also being late in the major post-socialist countries. In fact, this aspect can be evaluated as the main criteria of the ideology and economics relation among the post-socialist countries. All economic agents are still not purified from the ideological heritage of the Soviet system, moreover, some sympathy still is existing amongst the adults and older generation members.

Thirdly, the transition process itself revealed a lot of new adaptation challenges for both political and economic setups for ex-Soviet countries. Although different countries adopted different economic strategies, we can trace many commonalities among some of them on the ideology and economic relation. Furthermore, from the economic perspective, it was a new challenge since prior history did not provide examples of this systemic transition as Ellerman (2010) denotes [29]. That is the reason why the "ideology and economy" relation is becoming a more interesting and
impressive topic. Consequently, the important thing about the ideological situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union is its distortion function as a tool in the hands of politicians. They tried to manipulate the public thought by the interpretation of the realities which they want to see, in other words, with the help of ideology. For instance, Boris Yeltsin told that there won't be any devaluation during 1998, on the eve of the 1998 crisis of the Russian Federation [30]. However, to prop up the currency and stem the flight of capital, in June 1998 Kiriyenko hiked GKO (GKO or OFZ are government bonds issued by the state of Russia) interest rates to 150%.

Also, it is an obvious fact that a lot of ex-Soviet countries started to have a lot of economic difficulties since they gained independence. More interesting is Russia's behavior towards the animation of old "union traditions" lately. The Eurasian Economic Union can be shown as an example of this aspect during recent years. Despite the definition of this organization is as “an economic union of states located primarily in northern Eurasia", this union is an economic tool to fulfill the ideological goals of the Russian Federation. Although this union's working mechanisms and principles are based on European Union's, it is still aiming to change the economic attitudes of post-Soviet countries for the sake of the Russian Federation. The prior example of this organization-type efforts was the Treaty of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and as Yesdauletova and Yesdauletov (2014) mention the quote from the president of Kazakhstan, “for objective and subjective reasons the CIS has not become the decisive integration structure of the post-soviet space” [31].

However, the tricky part of having Russia-centered organizations like The Eurasian Economic Union or its predecessor the Treaty of the Commonwealth of Independent States is that these types of organizations serve directly to Russia's geopolitical aims. We can safely mention that the ideology which Russia is holding is not about the modernization of post-soviet countries but it is about using them for having good partnerships with the West. "In the reorientation of foreign trade, Russia is leading among the CIS countries. Russia proclaimed the Commonwealth of Independent States as its foreign relations priority, but this declaration has not been supported by its actions. For Russia, the preferred direction is west, where the
majority of its exports fetch higher prices, payments are made on time, and the quality goods it receives in return are better (Yesdauletova and Yesdauletov, 2014). So, primarily, in all post-soviet media channels, you can observe opposite patterns of this reality which is also another direction of ideological guidance of societies. This situation is like a mirror inside another mirror. You can find an infinite number of mirrors when you put two mirrors face-to-face, so ideology and the economic connection is masked under the terms of integration or alliance, however, it is exactly the process of building up Russia centered forces (both economic and political) to compete with western countries after the failure of the modernization of the economy, military and institutions.

5. More on the post-Soviet Economies

In terms of living standards, people with higher incomes and education are more likely to say that changes in political and economic systems since 1991 have had a positive impact on their country (meaning a post-Soviet one). For example, in terms of pride in their country, the proportion of people who believe that these changes have had a positive impact in Russia and Ukraine has risen sharply. In 1991, only about one in ten said that these changes had good civic pride in Russia (9%) and Ukraine (11%), compared with 54% and 52%, respectively, today [32]. This small example is generalizable to the overall union countries since 1991; however, multiple factors play a crucial role to determine the citizens' understandings after the apprehensions of the fall of the USSR.

Those with more education are less likely to say that the changes that took place between 1989 and 1991 had a good impact on living standards in countries like Russia. There is a near-universal agreement that today is the economic situation better than it was under communism, and the belief that it is better has spread in some countries since 2009, especially Russia. However, certain problems are deeply rooted among the post-Soviet countries. For instance, international observers point to Russia as a model of a corrupt and repressive state but a decent number of other post-Soviet states, especially Central Asian states are worse off in terms of public corruption [32, 33]. This evokes a set of considerations about the gap that was created between the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the transition period. The
"gap" was likely under the impact of several political ideologies that failed during and after the Soviet Union.

According to Gorenburg (1999), it was the bilingual elites who spoke the title language (Russian) in the big cities that had the greatest interest in maintaining political relations with Moscow; however, it was the economic elites who left the planned economy, who saw the commercial opportunities greater than Russia and had a greater interest in keeping Russia abroad [34]. These constellations of interests were different in Russia than in the Soviet Union, which gave crucial elite republics an interest in Russia. As we can see, around the end of the USSR, the ideological collisions dictated all realities to act for the main and follower agents. Meanwhile, the other side of “the table” did not keep silent.

While the US can lead certain democratic processes to their rightful conclusions, such as by supporting the opposition in Georgia and Ukraine in 1991 and 1996, the democratization process in Russia, as in many other independent states, has been left to its own devices. The refusal of the Baltic states to reconnect with the past is illustrated by their desire to not be part of the Commonwealth of Independent States, which has a loose political link with the former Soviet republics of Russia at its center [35]. Therefore, this posits an interesting picture related to the political ideology of the former Soviet countries. The independence was precious enough to fight over and the integration towards the Western societies mirror better chances in a form of political and economic globalization. This aspect is totally understandable if we remember how the USSR was a closed and repressed system, despite Gorbachov's reforms during the second half of the 1980s.

But the economic changes under Gorbachev have done little to revive the country's flagging economy. The economies of the union countries moved from stagnation to crisis, and this trend only deepened over time. As a centrally planned economy, the Soviet Union was strictly opposed to the market liberalism of Western nations, but the rapid economic development of the country in the post-medieval decades of the twentieth century made its system look like a viable economic alternative [36, 37]. Furthermore, by the time Gorbachev took office in 1985 the Soviet economy had stagnated for 20 years and needed reforms; the country's gross
domestic product (GDP) had risen from 5.8% in 1940 to 2.6% in 1970. In Eastern European countries, output fell by less than the 20-30% average every 2-4 years, while growth accelerated after reforms in China and Vietnam [38, 39]. Gorbachev's economic policy of Soviet expansion and cooperation with the Western world has changed the country's posture from one that saw foreign trade as a means of compensating for short-term scarcity to one that saw imports as a long-term alternative to domestic production. The persistently poor economic performance led to a series of radical reforms under Mikhail Gorbachev. Instead of trying to uphold the socialist ideal of central control as a primary social goal, he aimed to decentralize economic activity and open the stagnant Soviet economy to foreign trade.

The collapse of the Soviet Union not only sent the economic system and trade relations with Eastern Europe into a tailspin but also triggered unrest in many Eastern European countries and led to rising crime rates and corruption in the Russian government. One consequence of the political and economic changes of the 1990s was the emergence of Russian organized crime. On the other hand, under Yeltsin, in the years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia seemed to be on the road to a liberal market economy [38, 39].

Modern challenges also kept the post-Soviet space warm in terms of economic indicators. The 2008 global financial crisis and the fall in the price of oil have highlighted the nature of Russia's commodity-dependent economy and the need for continued structural reforms. China's economic freedom index, as measured by the Heritage Foundation, is roughly the same as Russia's in recent years, but the two countries' economic performance differs considerably. Countries in Central Asia, especially Belarus, have opted for an authoritarian path that blocks political and economic reforms while avoiding a dramatic recession in Russia [38, 40]. This perspective invites us to understand the relationship between ideology and economics one more time in the context of modern economic challenges.

6. Concluding Remarks

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the creation of fifteen new countries in December 1991 changed the world. Many other post-Soviet countries were founded after Gorbachev's resignation. From the analysis of this paper, we can conclude one...
main thing that, even after 30 years, the post-Soviet space struggles to find out its unique way to build institutions, reform the state, enforce the laws, and ensure long-term sustainable economic development. On the one hand, surely certain reforms and transitions have been taken place. On the other hand, the dubious positions of the politicians, unyielding power of the interest groups, and foreign interests have influenced the former Soviet countries in a multiple way.

Economics gets influenced by non-scientific factors over time. It is not a secret that various economic outcomes are the results of the political and ideological underpinnings. Thus, as a case study, post-Soviet economies show an interesting view to analyze the ideological shift and its consequences. Over time, as the generations will replace one another, the unwanted legacy of the Soviet heritage will also disappear. However, the damage of the underdeveloped institutions or political systems that stem from the hidden connection between ideology and economy in a given country may do enough damage to create irreversible results. Hence, the study of the ideology, political economy, institutions, and state-building bear significance when it comes to the former Soviet countries which this paper slightly tried to shed light.
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