



ARTÍCULOS

UTOPIA Y PRAXIS LATINOAMERICANA. AÑO: 25, n° EXTRA 10, 2020, pp. 354-367
REVISTA INTERNACIONAL DE FILOSOFÍA Y TEORÍA SOCIAL
CESA-FCES-UNIVERSIDAD DEL ZULIA. MARACAIBO-VENEZUELA
ISSN 1316-5216 / ISSN-e: 2477-9555

Classical Eurasianism Variations During the Second Half of the 20th and Early-21st Centuries

Variaciones del eurasianismo clásico durante la segunda mitad del siglo XX y principios del XXI

OKSANA SERGEEVNA ISAEVA

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2771-3049>

oksana.s.isaeva@inbox.ru

Penza State University, Russia.

Este trabajo está depositado en Zenodo:
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4155672>

ABSTRACT

This article explores classical eurasianism as a specific branch of russian philosophy abroad in the early twentieth century, the ideas of which remain relevant and are currently revived by its followers. The author highlighted the main features and ideas of classical eurasianism (the idea of Russia-eurasia as a unique developmental space, the doctrine of *sobornost*, and the philosophy of an organizational idea) and compared them with the theories of L. N. Gumilyov and A. G. Dugin. However, the teaching of L. N. Gumilyov and the Neo-eurasianism of A. G. Dugin do not possess the original philosophical component of classical eurasianism.

Keywords: A.G. Dugin, classical eurasianism, L.N. Gumilyov, neo-eurasianism, Russia-eurasia.

RESUMEN

Este artículo explora el eurasianismo clásico como una rama específica de la filosofía rusa en el extranjero a principios del siglo XX, cuyas ideas siguen siendo relevantes, y actualmente son revividas por sus seguidores. El autor destacó las principales características e ideas del eurasianismo clásico (la idea de Rusia-Eurasia como un espacio de desarrollo único, la doctrina de *sobornost* y la filosofía de una idea organizativa) y las comparó con las teorías de L. N. Gumilyov y A. G. Dugin. Sin embargo, la enseñanza de L. N. Gumilyov y el neo-eurasianismo de A. G. Dugin no poseen el componente filosófico original del eurasianismo clásico.

Palabras clave: A.G. Dugin, eurasianismo clásico, L.N. Gumilyov, neo-eurasianismo, Rusia-eurasia.

Recibido: 28-08-2020 Aceptado: 31-10-2020



INTRODUCTION

Eurasianism was formed in the emigration movement of the 1920s and was an original, vibrant, and specific movement of Russian philosophy, a new ideology, and a new worldview. Later, its participants transformed Eurasianism into a sociopolitical movement and created a party. The first representatives of this trend in the Russian diaspora were geographer and economist P. N. Savitsky, linguist and ethnographer N. S. Trubetsky, philosopher G. V. Florovsky, and art critic P. P. Suvchinsky. They worked in various areas of science, but their life and views were united by love and longing for Russia – the lot of the “rejected” sons of their country. Eurasianism united their very diverse interests and eventually elicited such a strong response that it is still noticeable today.

Many talented thinkers of that time were immediately involved in the Eurasian movement; for instance, lawyer and philosopher N. N. Alekseev, historian and philosopher L. P. Karsavin, historian G. V. Vernadsky, and literary scholars and historians V. P. Nikitin and D. P. Svyatopolk-Mirsky. The whole of Europe was infatuated with Eurasian ideas. People spoke and polemicized about Eurasianism, supported or rejected the views of Eurasianists, agreed with this theory or strongly criticized it. For example, one of the critical remarks made about Eurasianism soon after its emergence was the accusation of a lack of consistency and excessive reliance on emotions. In his recent paper, A. V. Semushkin claims that the Eurasian worldview cannot be considered a system built on solid foundations (Semushkin: 2002, pp.121-131). V. V. Vanchugov argues that Eurasianism does not have an original philosophy. According to Vanchugov, classical Eurasianists only had a concept of philosophy based on some ideas from the history of Russian pre-revolutionary theories (Savitsky: 1997, pp.279-294). However, regardless of such reproaches, one can state that the philosophy of classical Eurasianists represents a specific organic integrity of both practical and theoretical nature. Their philosophical concept rejects all of the widely-accepted Western canons of that time.

The philosophy of classical Eurasianists is a fragmented, inconsistent system as far as its presentation is concerned. On the other hand, it is fully organic and original. P. N. Savitsky wrote about this: “We are metaphysical and at the same time practical, ethnographic, and geographical” (Introduction: 1923, pp.5-8). Eurasianists sought to combine thought with practical actions, and therefore, their projective developments clearly dominated over their theoretical constructions. As a result, the metaphysical teaching of Eurasianists formulated by L. P. Karsavin as the methodological basis, the foundation of their project, was not as elaborate as their geopolitical, historiosophical, economic, and cultural concepts. It is no coincidence then that the social project of the future state and social structure of Russia was the main brainchild of Eurasianists because the destiny of their homeland was their chief concern. Who are we: people of the East or people of the West? Or are we special? Which way, therefore, should our country follow? These were the burning questions that Eurasianists posed and that have always been relevant. Many philosophers have dedicated themselves to the search for the answers to these questions. The Eurasian project was an attempt to find the right direction for Russia’s development. However, the practical ideas of classical Eurasianists have never been implemented. In the late 1930s, there was a split in the Eurasianist movement, and it actually ceased to exist.

Nevertheless, the ideas of Eurasian thinkers were not forgotten. In the 1970s, the works of L. N. Gumilyov, who called himself “the last Eurasianist,” revived interest in them. Later, other concepts emerged, which in some way developed the views of Eurasianists. In this connection, it became necessary to differentiate between Eurasian ideas themselves and their modern versions. Therefore, we call the 1920-1930s Eurasianism “classical” and its modern interpretations – “post-Eurasianism” or “Neo-Eurasianism.”

The purpose of this study is to find out how the socio-philosophical views of classical Eurasianists transformed and were reflected in the works of Neo-Eurasian thinkers. The novelty of this study stems from the fact that the author focuses on the formation of philosophical principles, categories, concepts, and the projective developments of classical Eurasianists in post-Eurasian teachings. It seems viable to compare the views of classical Eurasianism and post-Eurasianism and to either find links between them or to identify contradictions.

METHODS

In order to achieve this objective, we adopted the following approaches and methodological principles: historicism, comparative studies, as well as a systematic and integrated approach to the problem under investigation.

In this work, we used the following methods of philosophical and historical analysis. First, the specific historical method facilitated the analysis of both sociopolitical conditions and the conditions for forming and developing classical Eurasianism of the 1920-1930s and post-Eurasian teachings. The comparative historical method of studying texts was another important element, which allowed us to examine myriad aspects of the creative heritage of classical Eurasianists in detail, to compare philosophical positions, concepts, and principles, and projective developments of both classical Eurasianism and Neo-Eurasianism. In particular, our application of the historical reconstruction method made it possible to interpret the content and manifestation of the ideas espoused under classical Eurasianists in the teachings of Neo-Eurasian thinkers, to identify the fundamental concepts and provisions underlying the projective developments of Neo-Eurasian thinkers, as well as to establish the relationships between the philosophical teachings of classical Eurasianism and Neo-Eurasianism. Additionally, the author employed the hermeneutics method to interpret the hidden philosophical, psychological, sociocultural, political, geopolitical, and religious factors found in the original works of not only the founding fathers of classical Eurasianism, but also the texts of Neo-Eurasian thinkers.

Furthermore, such general scientific methods as deduction, analogy, synthesis, comparison, and generalization were a significant part of this research.

Through the application of all these principles and methods, we were able to conduct a systematic analysis of the philosophy of classical Eurasianism of the 1920-1930s and Neo-Eurasianism.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many researchers in various fields have explored the teachings of classical Eurasianists and Neo-Eurasian thinkers. Here, it would be prudent to name such researchers of classical Eurasianism, as L. Luks, L. I. Novikova, I. N. Sizemskaya, N. A. Omelchenko, A. V. Sobolev, S. S. Khoruzhiy, M. A. Maslin, and V. P. Kosharny. Their articles studied various aspects of multifaceted Eurasian teachings. L. Luks considered classical Eurasianism as one of the most original and interesting emigration movements, placing his focus on the Asian component in the theories of Eurasianists. I. N. Sizemskaya and L. I. Novikova examined sociophilosophical issues related to the ideocratic state developed by Eurasianists and its Orthodox foundations. These researchers also studied the manner in which classical Eurasianists solved the national question. N. A. Omelchenko and V. M. Khachaturian examined the historiosophical problems in the teachings of classical Eurasianists, while V.P. Kosharny and V. Ya. Pashchenko focused on the projective developments of classical Eurasianism.

K. V. Pishun, M. A. Gavrish, and A. V. Samokhin explored classical Eurasianism from the perspective of political sciences.

Yu. B. Melikh and O. B. Kravtsova studied the works of L. P. Karsavin – one of the leaders of the Eurasian movement.

V. V. Vanchugov and A. V. Semushkin critically examined the philosophy of classical Eurasianists. The thinkers questioned the validity of the philosophical and metaphysical teachings of Eurasianists.

Analyzing classical Eurasianism, S. I. Dudnik, L. S. Kamneva, and A. M. Sokolov focus on the teachings of P. N. Savitsky and N. S. Trubetskoy and consider the Eurasian worldview as a product of revolution.

Examining the Eurasian concept, S.V. Bazavluk highlighted the role of Orthodoxy and the church in the development of Russia.

Neo-Eurasian concepts were studied by M. A. Maslin, O. V. Lushnikov, V. A. Senderov, S. S. Khoruzhiy. In addition to this, O. V. Lushnikov examined the current ideas of classical Eurasianism from the perspective of geopolitical, civilizational, and geoeconomic aspects. The thinker highlighted relevant issues in classical Eurasianism that can be incorporated into Russia's foreign and domestic policies. V. A. Senderov analyzed the prospects for the development of Neo-Eurasian ideas. M. A. Maslin attempted to compare and contrast classical Eurasianism and the teachings of A. G. Dugin and A. S. Panarin. S. S. Khoruzhiy considered classical Eurasianism and Neo-Eurasianism in the framework of traditionalism and called the Neo-Eurasianism of L. N. Gumilyov a conservative development of the Eurasian teachings.

French scholar Marlene Laruelle made a huge contribution to the study of classical Eurasianism and Neo-Eurasianism. She critically evaluated the continuity in the concepts of P. N. Savitsky and L. N. Gumilyov (Laruelle: 2001, pp.5-19).

D. Shlapentokh analyzed the teachings of L. N. Gumilyov as a representative of Eurasianism, focusing on the influence of the thinker's views on the formation of Russian national identity. M. Bassin also studied the works of L.N. Gumilyov as a representative of the Eurasian tradition.

Numerous works analyze classical Eurasianism and interpret Eurasian teachings. However, there has been no systematic analysis of the post-Eurasian teachings and classical Eurasianism within the framework of historical and philosophical research, nor have researchers attempted to highlight the main philosophical principles and ideas that unite them into a single tradition or to show the development vectors of Eurasianist ideas.

RESULTS

Socio-philosophical doctrine of classical Eurasianists

Eurasianism was a very controversial movement. As M. A. Maslin notes, it was not a universal paradigm (Maslin: 2012, p.362-380). It was a multidisciplinary direction, and its participants admitted the lack of unity in their first joint collection of works "An exodus to the East. Premonitions and accomplishments. The formation of the Eurasianists." For instance, as Eurasianists noted in the introduction to it: "The articles of this collection do not claim to fully solve the problems they concern, nor to be integrated and represent the full agreement of their authors; they were written by people who think differently on some issues" (Introduction: 1921). What is clear to us is that Eurasianism has become a powerful ideological historical and philosophical movement, creating an original theoretical synthesis of sciences due to its versatility. P. V. Logovikov (it was a pen name of P. N. Savitsky) noted that many teachings regarding Russia-Eurasia (geopolitical, geo-economic, geo-ethnographic, geo-linguistic, and geo-archaeological) can be combined into a single "system-picture," bringing about "a completely unknown hitherto synthetic image of Russia-Eurasia" – diversified Russian studies (Logovikov: 1931, pp.53-63). Eurasianism strove to become a link in the "connection of sciences," a connection which would result in an integral understanding of the world and the preservation of the unique individuality of independent phenomena. From our perspective, the creation of such an organic synthesis of sciences largely contributed to the fact that Eurasian ideas survived into the future and revived again in a situation where Russia was at a crossroads.

So what was the basis of this synthesis of sciences? What was the reason that such different views merged into a single concept, despite disagreement on many issues? We believe that the basis of classical Eurasianism was the idea of the indestructible integrity of Russia. It was this idea that initially cemented the Eurasian teaching and contributed to its popularity. Eurasianists considered Russia to be a strong and powerful country, which occupied a middle position between Europe and Asia and was neither the first nor the second. Russia-Eurasia represents a special developmental space, that is, it is something more than a single territory inhabited by its peoples. The developmental space (a term coined by P. N. Savitsky) is a "geographical individual," a synthetic category where the socio-historical environment and territory merged and are mutually

conditional. Russia-Eurasia represents a similar integrity and is an organic unity of geographical, ethnic, economic, and historical “landscapes”. We would like to note that the concept of developmental space, as Eurasianists themselves claimed, is a concept that unites geography and history.

Therefore, the historical and geographical integrity of Russia-Eurasia as a common developmental space, in turn, was the basis for justifying its cultural, political, religious, and ethnographic unity. Russia-Eurasia is a special world regarding all its aspects, a special civilization. Russia-Eurasia also has its own peculiar culture, one for all – the Eurasian. This great culture emerged from the fusion of Byzantine and Russian cultures, and the subsequent layering of European and Asian cultures only strengthened and formed it. According to classical Eurasianists, Russia-Eurasia is a single political formation, an ideocratic, demotic, and “guarantee state of the common goal.” The peoples living in this state form a special fellowship with “pan-Eurasian nationalism.” Within this, they all have the right to freedom of expression and are equal to each other. The common history of the peoples of Russia-Eurasia also manifests itself through the formed “language union”. Russia-Eurasia is also a special economic world, an “ocean-continent,” self-sufficient and autonomous in its specific way. Classical Eurasianists put together and expressed all these beliefs of about Russia-Eurasia in their social project, where, as Eurasian thinkers planned, the principle of social service would permeate all areas of social life. This principle implies the mutual service of the parts and the whole: that is, the service of the state to their people, and the people to their state, and thus, reaching the common goal.

Thus, Eurasianists proposed a new vision of Russia’s development in the future, a new one, neither right nor left – the “third” path of development. The social project was their main idea. At the same time, as noted above, the project had a sound philosophical foundation: the religious and philosophical doctrine of the symphonic personality of L. P. Karsavin and the philosophy of the organizational idea of P. N. Savitsky.

In the doctrine of the symphonic personality, L.P. Karsavin gives philosophical justification for the principle of sobornost – universal unity and devotion. According to classical Eurasianists, sobornost implies unity “everywhere and in everything”, unity “in whole and in all parts” (Eurasianism: 1997, pp.13-78). As follows from Eurasianism, the principle of sobornost permeates all spheres of public life and plays a fundamental role in this socio-philosophical teaching. It is sobornost that determines the indestructible integrity of Russia-Eurasia as the integrity of the personality (Isaeva: 2019, pp.95-98). Indeed, according to Eurasianists, not only the individual has a personality, but also groups of individuals – family, people, culture, state, etc. have symphonic personalities, reflecting the principle of sobornost. The very concept of “personality” acquired a special meaning in the philosophy of Eurasianists. Personality is always a living and organic unity of diversity. This is a unity of the multitude (states or manifestations of the personality): “its unity and multitude do not exist separately from each other and beyond each other,” that is, the unity is associated with “sobornost” (Eurasianism: 1997, pp.13-78). According to L.P. Karsavin, personality is all-unity.

This organic unity is directly determined by the idea of sobornost – a deeply moral and religious idea. Sobornost implies organic interconnection and interdependence of people and God (represented by the church) as subordinates and one superior perfect personality. The individuation and self-fulfillment of the latter, according to classical Eurasianists, is the true goal of all people. For Eurasianists, sobornost implies self-giving, suppression of pride, understanding of the fact that everything that happens to a person comes from God. In addition to this, Eurasian thinkers highlight the fact that the development of the whole occurs through the development of its constituent parts. The dialectical dependence between them cannot be broken, and one cannot exist without the other.

In the works of classical Eurasianists, Russia-Eurasia as an integral symphonic or composite personality is a state in which people are united by the principle of sobornost – faith and love of God, based, in turn, on the suppression of their own egoism and self-sacrifice for the common goal and the good of all. The principle of sobornost as the principle forming the whole, the principle of organic unity, permeates all spheres of human life and is one of the fundamental principles in the philosophy of classical Eurasianists. In social life, it manifests itself as a principle of social service.

Another metaphysical basis of the Eurasian teaching is the philosophy of the organizational idea of P. N. Savitsky (Maslin & Lupanova: 2014, pp.17-75). According to the ontological beliefs of the philosopher, the whole world is in the state of organization. The core of organization is the spirit that abides in the matter. According to Eurasianists, God, manifesting Himself through the Orthodox Church, is the Predestinator responsible for the organization of the world. Thus, the ability of the matter to organize and self-organize is something predetermined, a law we cannot change, and a process of nomogenesis. In society, it expresses itself as an organizational idea – the “ruling idea”.

Therefore, the philosophical teaching of classical Eurasianism synthesizes knowledge from many fields of science and substantiates the organic integrity of the state formation of Russia-Eurasia. Eurasianists establish the religious and moral unity of the Russian-Eurasian world based on the principle of sobornost as well as the idea of universal organization, which manifest themselves in the philosophical, legal, cultural, and economic aspects of classical Eurasianism of the 1920-1930s.

The development of the ideas of classical Eurasianists in the works of L. N. Gumilyov

L. N. Gumilyov is a thinker and philosopher, whose theory simultaneously represents the development and transformation of the ideas of classical Eurasianism. L. N. Gumilyov shifted the philosophical context of Eurasianism into the field of natural sciences. M. A. Maslin and V. Yu. Ermolaev support this assumption. However, many modern scholars note only the continuity of classical Eurasianists and L. N. Gumilyov, defining the theory of the latter as part of Eurasianism (Ermolaev: 2006, pp.7-26; Maslova: 2018, pp.94-115; Lushnikov: 2019, pp.174-186; Shlapentokh: 2012, pp.483-492; Bassin: 2016). A. G. Dugin names Gumilyov as “a direct heir to the Eurasian philosophy of culture, the Eurasian historical tradition” (Dugin: 2002, pp.534-540). V. S. Erasov, V. Shnirelman, and S. S. Khoruzhiy regard L. N. Gumilyov as a Neo-Eurasianist (Erasov: 1994, pp.57–67). Also, there are researchers who doubt that L. N. Gumilyov shared the ideas of classical Eurasianists, and deny the continuity between these theories.

The single general methodological principle of classical Eurasianism is the principle of polycentrism. Prince N. S. Trubetskoy substantiated it in his work “Europe and Humanity” (1920), which, as M. A. Maslin claims, laid the foundations of Eurasianism (Maslin: 2019, pp.161–178). N. S. Trubetskoy argued that there is no ladder of cultures, all peoples and their cultures are equal, and each culture is unique and specific. Therefore, the thinker criticized and denied Eurocentrism, describing its very existence as “universal progress,” and demonstrated the inconsistencies in these concepts. L. N. Gumilyov also claimed that the concept of Eurocentrism should be abandoned as unreliable, and that human history should be perceived not a single whole, but a “mosaic integrity,” comprising various landscapes. Like classical Eurasianists, L. N. Gumilyov believed that the world embraces numerous cultural centers. For instance, China and Palestine are world centers comparable to Europe. According to L. N. Gumilyov, “ethnic diversity is the optimal form of human existence” (Gumilyov: 1991, pp.19-26). The thinker expanded upon classical Eurasianism with his own conclusion that “there is no universal human culture, the same for all peoples since all ethnic groups have a different accommodating landscape” (Gumilyov: 1991, pp.19-26). Thus, he rethought the philosophical teaching of classical Eurasianists in connection with his ideas on the formation and development of ethnic groups.

As noted above, classical Eurasianism is an organic synthesis of various sciences. L. N. Gumilyov also attempted to define this. He believed that the strongest point of classical Eurasianism was a harmonious combination of natural sciences and humanities – both history and geography. Eurasianism actually considers the geographical factor as the central, system-forming factor. The origin of the very name of the movement – Eurasianism – is geographical. Russia-Eurasia primarily represents a single geographical area; a single developmental space. Eurasianists claimed that the geographical features of Russia-Eurasia in many ways predetermined the course of the historical development of the Russians. However, the developmental space is not just a place where people live. According to Eurasian thinkers, people create their own developmental

space. The Russians themselves created it – Russia-Eurasia as a single country in the cultural and economic sense. P. N. Savitsky noted that racial characteristics and the races themselves should be considered as directly belonging to the developmental space. He argued that the developmental space “forms a race,” and the race, in turn, “selects and transforms the developmental space” (Savitsky: 1997, pp.279-294). As a result, the cultural traditions of peoples “grow into” the landscape and establish themselves in culture, forming their own distinctive cultural type. Thus, classical Eurasianists claim that historical and cultural development is directly linked with the territory where people live, and they substantiate the unity of a cultural, historical, and ethnic character within the framework of the developmental space.

L. N. Gumilyov also used the concept of “developmental space” when he explored ethnological processes. The thinker considered the phenomenon of ethnogenesis and tried to understand how natural processes influence the development of ethnic groups and human civilizations in general. According to L.N. Gumilyov, to get an idea of a particular ethnic group, one should single out and study the developmental space of this ethnic group. This concept in the theory of L. N. Gumilyov is often close to or even synonymous with the concepts of an accommodating landscape or “a feeding landscape,” which he also used in his works. L. N. Gumilyov believed that “the life of superethnic formations occurs in special developmental spaces, to identify which one should know historical geography, namely, the connection “ethnos – landscape” (Gumilyov: 2009, pp.216-231). In his opinion, ethnogenesis is primarily a process of active adaptation of groups of people to the natural or ethnic environment. At the same time, the landscape forces people to develop “sets of adaptive skills – ethnic stereotypes of behavior”. This means that the originality of the ethnos (behavioral and, mainly, cultural) is the result of a unique combination of landscapes in which the ethnos has developed. Definitely, ethnic groups can change their forms, but “the basic principle of their connection with the landscape persists”. Thus, L. N. Gumilyov defined “the developmental space” within the framework of classical Eurasianism, focusing his attention on the study of the interdependence between ethnic groups and landscapes. Following classical Eurasianists, the thinker perceived Russia as a whole, both in its geographical and ethnic aspects.

Another concept, which is actually fundamental for Eurasianism, is the concept of Russia-Eurasia, and L. N. Gumilyov interpreted it similarly to classical Eurasianists. Eurasia (as the thinker called Russia-Eurasia) is an integral developmental space, unified in its ethnographic and geographical aspects and inhabited by peoples who have adapted to its landscapes. The border of Russia-Eurasia, separating this inner central region of the Eurasian continent from Western Europe, “goes along the January isotherm ... To the east, it is negative, which results in severe frosts, and to the west, it is positive – thawing”. This is similar to P. N. Savitsky’s definition of the borders of the Russian-Eurasian world.

As we can see, L.N. Gumilyov focused on the study of the relationship of the natural environment and the life of ethnic groups in this environment. The concept of developmental space, which is the basis of the organic integrity of Russia-Eurasia for classical Eurasianists, is the determining element in the process of ethnogenesis in the philosophy of L. N. Gumilyov. Considering ethnogenesis, the thinker argued that at the time of its origin, the ethnos already acts as “a group of similar individuals that transformed a certain geographical landscape to their needs and at the same time adapted to it,” that is, as a population (Gumilyov: 1972; Hernández et al.: 2018; Ramírez et al.: 2018; Villalobos et al.: 2016). In the future, in order to maintain the established “ethno-landscape equilibrium,” the descendants should follow the course of action developed by their ancestors within the boundaries of this population “at least regarding the surrounding nature” (Gumilyov: 2009, pp.216-231). This is how traditions are formed, and as a result, an ethnos emerges. However, not to disappear as quickly as it arose, the ethnos, according to L. N. Gumilyov, should immediately become a system, dividing various functions among its members. The ethnos must develop social institutions so as not to perish. L. N. Gumilyov believed that the need for self-affirmation underlies the rapid growth of the ethnic system, while the power for the development of an ethnic group comes from passionarity. According to the thinker, passionarity is the element that classical Eurasianists lacked in their description of ethnogenesis. Classical Eurasianism substantiated the unity of Russia-Eurasia within the framework of “developmental space” as the synthesis of geographical and historical factors, whereas L. N. Gumilyov considered the concept

of developmental space mainly as the place of origin of a new ethnic group. The main feature characterizing the developmental space is its energy – the possibility of a passionarity push (or the burst of passionarity).

According to L. N. Gumilyov, passionarity (from Latin *passio* – passion) is the characteristic that underlies the formation and destruction of all ethnic groups. It represents the “energy of the living matter of the biosphere,” as well as a geographical phenomenon complementing historical and biological factors. Passionarity is not only transmitted from parents to children, it can also occur in certain regions under the influence of natural factors. L. N. Gumilyov believes that passionarity can be found in every ethnogenetic process. The reason for the initial passionate pushes (or bursts of passionarity), as L. N. Gumilyov puts it, remains unclear. However, this passionarity push itself is a mutation or rather a micromutation that occurs in a population of a certain range and which later brings about passionarity. Because of a mutation, a certain number of passionaries emerge – people who are likely to take action to achieve their goal (and sometimes these actions seem to them more valuable than their own lives), and if there are certain favorable conditions, a new ethnos emerges. Passionarity is not a constant characteristic of an ethnic group. Depending on the changes in its intensity, L. N. Gumilyov singled out several stages in the development of ethnic groups. The number of passionaries in an ethnic group is estimated with the concept of “passionary tension.” L. N. Gumilyov compared the identified stages of ethnogenesis with the corresponding age of the ethnos, as well as with the number of subsystems in the ethnos and with the frequency of events occurring in the history of the ethnos itself.

Thus, presenting the entire history of the development of humankind as the history of ethnic groups, L. N. Gumilyov identified various periods in it, and each of them is based on a certain amount of energy – passionarity. That is, L. N. Gumilyov added another factor – energy – to the three factors of cultural genesis already identified by classical Eurasianists (time, space, and ethnocultural integrity). Ethnogenesis acts as a source of culture in the energy aspect. According to the scientist, we can distinguish the periods when passionarity rises and falls, that is, passionary tension. These rises and falls form an ethnogenesis curve. L. N. Gumilyov identified these rises and falls of passionarity according to the number of events, their nature and intensity, the actions of people – passionaries and sub-passionaries. This is how the thinker explained the heterogeneity of historical time, singling out the epochs of stagnation and the epochs rich in events. L. N. Gumilyov singled out the periods of passionary growth, climax, tension, breakdown, and depression.

In this paper, we will not consider the theory of ethnogenesis developed by L. N. Gumilyov in detail, but only stress that in this aspect of his teaching, L. N. Gumilyov, in his own way, developed Eurasian ideas, transferring them to the sphere of ethnology. P. N. Savitsky, like his friend and student L. N. Gumilyov, singled out the periods of rises and falls, but in the development of organizational ideas. Classical Eurasianists believed that any organizational idea that governs the cultural world has its own development rhythm, and they tried to identify this rhythm in the historical process. P. N. Savitsky and G. V. Vernadsky singled out cultural “mutations” in each cultural cycle: a change in cultural traditions and the emergence of new ones, the review and reassessment of already accepted views. The philosophers determined various indicators and causes of these periods of rises and falls. For instance, according to classical Eurasianists, the features of a rise in the development of organizational ideas are the construction and development of cities, economic growth, active foreign policy, political stability, and focus on strong actors. The signs of depression include cultural regression, psychological instability (treason), political fragmentation, and turning on the strong. Any rhythm of the development of the organizational idea includes the phases of depression (dip), pre-rise (stabilization), and rise. P.N. Savitsky paid special attention to such periods as a “century-long rise,” a “recovery,” and a “new rise.”

Therefore, we can justly call L. N. Gumilyov a follower of classical Eurasianism. His theory develops and modifies the Eurasian idea of the synthesis of sciences, as the thinker tried to combine not only geography and history, but also natural science, in many respects substantiating the Eurasian idea of the integrity of the Russian state.

Neo-Eurasianism of A. G. Dugin

Another example of the transformation of classical Eurasianism is the Neo-Eurasian teaching of A. G. Dugin, who, according to M. A. Maslin, tries to “dissect and reform Eurasian ideas, to revive them in the party-political Neo-Eurasian style, and to use them as a lever for establishing personal and group political influence” (Maslin: 2015, pp.201-210). S. S. Khoruzhiy also made this observation (Khoruzhiy: 2017, pp.104-120).

When developing the Eurasian concept, A. G. Dugin focuses on the political aspect, as he is interested in Eurasian ideas regarding their application in his political activity, and pays less attention to philosophical reasoning. On the one hand, this demonstrates a certain similarity between the Neo-Eurasianism of A. G. Dugin and classical Eurasianism, because Eurasianists, as we have already noted, strove for “action,” practical implementation of their ideas. Classical Eurasianism was not just a philosophical trend, but also a socio-political movement. They created their own party and had a certain ideology. Emerging as a special attitude, as a historiosophical movement, this attempt to be heard and to realize their social project resulted in the stronger focus on politics in the 1920-1930s. Nevertheless, classical Eurasianism is a synthesis of sciences. In addition to specific projective developments, it has sound metaphysical foundations, which cannot be said about the concept of A. G. Dugin. Researcher M. Laruelle believes that the teaching of A. G. Dugin denies the intellectual complexity and richness of Eurasianism (Laruelle: 2004). We would like to note that the Eurasian theme represents only a small share of Dugin’s ideas along with, for example, his concept of “total traditionalism.” Nevertheless, his version of Neo-Eurasianism is a peculiar development of the Eurasian idea.

Like L. N. Gumilyov, A. G. Dugin relies on the terminology of classical Eurasianism. In the theory of A. G. Dugin, the concept of Russia-Eurasia, central to all Eurasianists, is reduced to Eurasia: “Russia is Eurasia,” he claims. By this, the philosopher means that the civilizational identity of the Russian state is determined precisely by its geographical location, as it is the central part of Eurasia, its “core land.” (Dugin: 2004). Like classical Eurasianists, A. G. Dugin proceeds from the justification of the integrity of Russia. He claims that Russia has its own path and believes that all epochs of its development are united by a “common line – the focus on Eurasia, the Eurasian essence of Russian history”. Following the classics of Eurasianism, A. G. Dugin argues that Russia is a peculiar world, a unique civilization. M. Skladanovsky airs the same idea in his research when he considers the theory of A. G. Dugin as the concept justifying the civilizational uniqueness of Russia and its exceptional place in the world history (Skladanowski: 2019, pp.423-446). In the Neo-Eurasianism of A. G. Dugin, Russia also acts as a historical community (or people) and as a unique economic and social organism. According to the thinker, Russia is a peculiar geopolitical entity, an independent integrated system embedded in the general planetary balance of cultures and civilizations, religions, peoples, and states. We may find similar statements in the philosophy of Eurasianists. However, while classical Eurasianists perceive Russia primarily as a unity, namely, as a unique cultural integrity, A. G. Dugin puts emphasis on geopolitics. The thinker initially defines Russia as a geopolitical phenomenon. Classical Eurasianists also considered geopolitics as a crucial element. For them, the unity of Russia-Eurasia is the geographical unity. However, classical Eurasianists proposed a synthetic concept of “the developmental space,” which combined geography, history, and social features and contributed to the emergence of the world with original culture. In the Neo-Eurasianism of A. G. Dugin, the unity of the Russian state is determined by the territory it occupies, that is, the specifics of its continental location. The thinker reduces the very concept of the developmental space to determining its location.

A. G. Dugin also supports and develops the Eurasian idea about the diversity of various cultures and peoples. Like classical Eurasianists, who deny and reject everything Western, the thinker has a very negative attitude to the values imposed by the West, namely the USA. A. G. Dugin believes that globalization, which manifests itself as Americanization when the ethnic and religious diversity of national states is reduced to a single American standard, is unacceptable. A. G. Dugin does not accept America’s unipolar dominance and argues that Russia is clearly opposed to the Western Atlantic community. Russia should strengthen and maintain its identity and civilizational specifics and pit Eurasianism against Western Atlantism and

globalization. A. G. Dugin sees Eurasianism as the philosophy of “multipolar globalization,” which is intended “to unite all societies and peoples of the Earth for building an original and unique world, each component of which would organically continue historical traditions and local cultures”.

DISCUSSION

The description of the existing realities of multipolarity given by A. G. Dugin takes us back to the field of geopolitics. The philosopher considers multipolarity as a “revolutionary perspective” and notes that not individual states, but “large spaces” become the poles of a multipolar system. He identifies four such “spaces”: the Euro-African pole, the Eurasian pole (which Russia belongs to), the Pacific pole (with Japan and China, according to A. G. Dugin), and the American one. However, the thinker reduces the global geopolitical confrontation to a bipolar one: to the dualism of the Land and the Sea civilizations. Here his views differ from classical Eurasianism. At the same time, A. G. Dugin notes that the history of peoples and states is determined by the geographical conditions and features of the territory they occupy. Definitely, this statement repeats the ideas of classical Eurasianism. At the same time, A. G. Dugin claims that the confrontation between the civilizations of the Land and the Sea dominates the logic of historical development and determines it. As a rule, Land civilizations have a constant landscape, which predetermines the static model of the world outlook, stable social institutions, and the traditionalism of such civilizations.

Land is the starting point of such a civilization, and the bodies of water are secondary for it. On the contrary, the civilizations of the Sea are dynamic. They are mobile, fluid, and flexible, with frequent and easy territorial changes. Land is secondary for such a civilization. Therefore, A. G. Dugin believes that either Land or Sea determines the strength and power of a state. This confrontation manifests itself in the concepts of “tellurocracy” and “thalassocracy.” Talasocracies are not “continental” states and do not have a single land space (for example, they have colonies). Tellurocracies are the states whose territory is a single spatial continuum. However, A. G. Dugin notes that this classification is not rigid since the elements of the land and water pair may complement each other and form “the sea land” and “the land water.” Accordingly, the “sea land,” that is, an island or a pole, is the basis of thalassocracy, while “the land water,” that is, rivers that determine the development of the state, is the basis of tellurocracy. In addition, another important aspect is the specifics of the imperial consciousness of the people in a particular state. Therefore, the United States is a maritime power, while Japan is a continental state.

According to A. G. Dugin, Russia acts as a Land civilization. The country is the center of the Eurasian continent, the “heartland” of Eurasia, the “core land.” At the same time, Dugin notes that there are “civilizational positions that are extremely close with one of the poles”—that is, as close as possible to the “sea” or to the “land”—so it could be argued that the two countries share a “single fundamental vector” rather than a dialectical combination of these two principles (Dugin: 2014). Dugin believes that the Eurasian and Atlantic regions are such civilizations, with Russia and the United States playing leading roles.

Therefore, as a true follower of classical Eurasianism, Dugin perceives Russia to be a unique civilization. He also tries to synthesize the historical, geographical, and cultural characteristics of Russia in his theory, regarding the country’s geography as its most important characteristic. Classical Eurasianists believe that because Russia-Eurasia occupied a specific and defined territory, it initially emerged as a cultural world, developmental space, and integral organic formation with predetermined political, legal, linguistic, ethnographic, and economic characteristics; Dugin, on the other hand, considers Russia only as a geopolitical entity. He elaborates on the views of the Eurasianists only within the framework of geopolitics, defining Russia as a “middle state.”

Dugin also relies on one of the ideas central to classical Eurasianism—the concept of sobornost. Describing the future state structure of Russia, he highlighted its social orientation as follows: “we put public interests, the goals of the whole above the interests and tasks of the private and the individual. The spirit of

Eurasia is the spirit of sobornost". He proclaimed that solidarity, justice, mutual assistance, and the need for the strong and successful to care for the weak and disadvantaged to be the highest values of Eurasian society. As part of his social project, Dugin has also spoken about interconfessional solidarity and brotherly love between different religions. He believes that faith has always permeated all of the philosophical, social, and economic teachings of Eurasianism. He has also noted that the peoples inhabiting Russia should merge into a "political symphony".

According to Dugin, each ethnos is an organic whole, and the individual is a product of his or her nation. People should act as subjects of law and should have sovereignty in all issues connected with the jurisdiction of the nation, its internal structure and organization, except for those issues related to the geopolitical and strategic interests of Russia as a whole. Dugin calls this state structure Eurasian federalism—that is, a federation of peoples as political subjects, within which ethnic groups have internal freedom of development. We can trace the same ideas in the philosophy of classical Eurasianists. However, Dugin only repeats these phrases and terms; in his teaching, they do not carry the same meaning. In classical Eurasianism the term sobornost was fundamentally justified in the metaphysics of L. P. Karsavin, whose justification was of a religious nature. In Dugin's Neo-Eurasianism, however, although the unity of sobornost is implied to be organic, it does not carry the deep classical philosophical meaning that underpins all of the social constructions of classical Eurasianists.

CONCLUSION

The ideas encompassed by the label "classical Eurasianism," which actually ceased to exist in the late 1930s, were developed by their followers—Neo-Eurasian thinkers. Having analyzed the views of Gumilyov and Dugin, we can conclude that these successors of the classical Eurasianists have different opinions and principles and explain the fundamental provisions of their philosophies in different ways. The only similarity is that both Gumilyov and Dugin, each in his own way and to varying degrees, rely on, develop, and transform the views of Eurasianists. Classical Eurasianism was not a monolithic movement whose participants always had the same views: their opinions were sometimes contradictory. Nevertheless, classical Eurasianists adopted specific philosophical principles and theses that united their teachings and were shared by all representatives of this philosophy to some extent.

The basic thesis for all classical Eurasianists was the integrity of Russia-Eurasia, which was primarily due to the geography of the region. Recognizing its integrity enabled these thinkers to justify the proposed union of Russia and Eurasia on cultural, historical, political, linguistic, and economic grounds. Gumilyov, like classical Eurasianists, substantiated the integrity of Russia as a single developmental space. He developed Eurasian ideas and applied them in ethnography, thereby founding a new science—ethnology. After introducing the concept of passionarity as an energetic characteristic of the development of an ethnos, he created an organic synthesis of sciences (geography, history, and natural science), just as the classical Eurasianists did. Passionarity was the foundation of his theory, and he used it to elaborate on P. N. Savitsky's philosophical doctrine of organization. Following his teacher and responding to the views of G. V. Vernadsky, Gumilyov explored the pattern of the historical development of ethnic groups, claiming that such development is determined not by an organizational idea but by passionarity tension. Nevertheless, we cannot call Gumilyov "the last Eurasian."

Dugin also proceeded from an idea about the integrity of Russia as Eurasia, but only in the geopolitical sense. Like the classical Eurasianists, he perceives Russia as a single geopolitical space, the core and heartland of Eurasia, and seeks to synthesize the geographical, historical, and cultural characteristics of Russia. He also follows the Eurasianists in his effort to develop a Slavophilic Russian philosophy: Dugin believes Russia to be a unique civilization. Unlike the projective developments of classical Eurasianists, his concept does not have a solid philosophical basis. Dugin revives, transforms, and develops the Eurasian

theme in his own way but within the framework of his political interests, often expressing ideas of a Eurasianist nature while citing Western sources.

The Neo-Eurasianism of L. N. Gumilyov and the Neo-Eurasianism of A. G. Dugin are independent theories. Both use the concepts of classical Eurasianism and incorporate Eurasian ideas and views, but neither has the philosophical depth of classical Eurasianism or the original philosophical Eurasianist worldview of the 1920s and 1930s, which has a unique spiritual and cultural emphasis.

Acknowledgments

This study was carried out with the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research as part of scientific project No. 19-011-00591 "Philosophy of Classical Eurasianism of the 1920-1930s and post-Eurasian concepts."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BASSIN, M (2016). *The Gumilyov Mystique: Biopolitics, Eurasianism, and the Construction of Community in Modern Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell univ. press.

DUGIN, AG (2002). "He returned two thousand years of our life history to us! In *Fundamentals of Eurasianism*". Moscow, pp.534-540.

DUGIN, AG (2004). "Eurasia" Project. Moscow: Eksmo, Yauza.

DUGIN, AG (2014). *Eurasian revenge of Russia*. Moscow: Algorithm.

ERASOV, BC (1994). "Russia in the Eurasian space". *Social Sciences and Modernity*, pp.57-67.

ERMOLAEV, VYU (2006). "Black legend: The name of the idea and the symbol of fate. In L. N. Gumilyov *Black Legend: Friends and Foes of the Great Steppe*". Moscow, pp.7-26.

EURASIANISM (ATTEMPT OF SYSTEMATIC PRESENTATION) (1997). "In *Continent Eurasia*". Moscow: Agraf, pp.13-78.

GUMILYOV, LN (1972). "Ethnology and historical geography: (Landscape and ethnos: 13)". Retrieved from <http://Gumilyovica.kulichki.net/articles/Article114.htm> (Accessed February, 1, 2020).

GUMILYOV, LN (1991). "Notes of the last Eurasianist". *Our Heritage*, 3(3), pp.19-26.

GUMILYOV, LN (2009). "Rhythms of Eurasia. In *Rhythms of Eurasia: Epochs and Civilizations*". St. Petersburg: Leningrad Publishing House, pp.216-231.

HERNÁNDEZ G. de VELAZCO, Judith J; & CHUMACEIRO H., Ana C (2018). "Acercamiento histórico a la participación ciudadana en Venezuela: Modelo de relación Estado-Sociedad (1958-2012)". *Revista de Ciencias Sociales (RCS)*. Vol. XXIV, No. 2, pp. 56-67.

INTRODUCTION (1921). *Exodus to the East. Premonitions and Accomplishments. The Formation of the Eurasianists*. Sofia.

INTRODUCTION (1923). "In *Eurasian Chronicle. Book 3*". Berlin: Eurasian book publishing, pp.5-8.

- ISAEVA, OS (2019). "The idea of sobornost in the philosophy of classical Eurasianism". Manuscript, 12(5), pp.95-98.
- KHORUZHIIY, SS (2017). "The misadventures of tradition, or Why it is necessary to protect tradition from traditionalists". Problems of philosophy, 9(12), pp.104-120.
- LARUELLE, M (2001). "When intellectual property is purloined, or On the opposition of L. N. Gumilyov and P. N. Savitsky". Bulletin of Eurasia, 4(15), pp.5-19.
- LARUELLE, M (2004). "The two faces of contemporary Eurasianism". An imperial version of Russian nationalism. Nationalities Papers, 32(1). Cambridge University Press.
- LOGOVIKOV, PV (1931). "Scientific objectives of Eurasianism. In The 1930s". The Formation of the Eurasianists, pp.53-63.
- LUSHNIKOV, OV (2019). "The Eurasian idea at the present stage: Civilizational, geopolitical, and geoeconomic aspects". The Echo of Centuries, pp.174-186.
- MASLIN, MA (2012). "Eurasianism as a post-revolutionary ideological movement". Historical and Philosophical Yearbook, pp.362-380.
- MASLIN, MA (2015). "Classical Eurasianism and its modern transformations". Notebooks on Conservatism, 4(14), pp.201-210.
- MASLIN, MA (2019). "At the origins of Eurasianism. To mark the 100th anniversary of the publication of the book of Prince Nikolai Trubetskoy "Europe and Humanity". Philosophy Journal, 12(4), pp.161–178.
- MASLIN, MA & LUPANOVA, AA (2014). "Evolution of the Eurasian idea. In Russian Abroad: History and Present: Collection of articles. (Ed.) Yu. V. Mukhachev. Moscow: RAS. INION". Center for Integrated Research on Russian Emigration, pp.17-75.
- MASLOVA, EK (2018). "Socio-natural approaches to history: the influence of subjective factors on the recognition of the scientific nature of the theory on the example of the concepts of L. N. Gumilyov and E. S. Kulpin". History and Modernity, September, pp.94-115.
- RAMÍREZ MOLINA, R; LAY, N; AVENDAÑO, I & HERRERA, B (2018). "Liderazgo resiliente como competencia potenciadora del talento humano". Opción. Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, 34(86), pp. 826-854.
- SAVITSKY, PN (1997). "Geographical overview of Russia-Eurasia. In Continent Eurasia". Moscow: Agraf, pp.279-294.
- SAVITSKY, PN (1997). "Geographical overview of Russia-Eurasia". In Continent Eurasia, Moscow: Agraf, pp.279-294.
- SEMUSHKIN, AV (2002). "The ideological limits of Eurasian metaphysics. In Eurasian Idea and Modernity: Collection of Articles". Moscow: Publishing House of RUDN University, pp.121-131.
- SHLAPENTOKH, D (2012). "Lev Gumilyov: The ideologist of the Soviet empire". History of European Ideas, 38(3), pp.483-492.
- SKLADANOWSKI, M (2019). "The myth of Russian exceptionalism: Russia as a civilization and its Uniqueness in Aleksandr G. Dugin's Thought". Politics Religion & Ideology, 20(4), pp.423-446.

VILLALOBOS ANTÚNEZ, JOSÉ VICENTE & GANGA, FRANCISCO (2016). "Bioética, dignidad e intertemporalidad de los Bioderechos Humanos". In Revista de Filosofía. Vol. 83, N°. 2: 7-24.

BIODATA

O.S. ISAEVA: candidate of philosophical Sciences (specialty: history of philosophy), associate Professor of the Department of philosophy and social communications of the Law Institute of Penza state University (Penza, Russian Federation). She has more than 60 scientific works. Research interests: Russian philosophy; classical Eurasianism; neo-Eurasianism.