

Habibova Z.

УДК 32;32.008

## EURASIANISM AS AN "ALTERNATIVE" GLOBALIZATION PROJECT

## ЕВРАЗИЙСТВО КАК «АЛЬТЕРНАТИВНЫЙ» ПРОЕКТ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ

**Summary.** Eurasian idea since its inception and before the registration of the Eurasian movement in the Russian emigration is undoubtedly one of the first conscious globalist projects as the most important design features - the integration of Western and Eastern civilizations; the unity of the European and Asian cultures on the basis of Russian culture; overcoming the limitations of ideological Euro centrism. It's all the same features as specific forms of globalization, over the centuries, but declared themselves as such only in the twentieth century.

**Keywords:** Eurasian Russian, Eurasian, Globalization

**Аннотация.** Идея евразийства с момента ее создания и до регистрации евразийского движения в русской эмиграции, несомненно, является одним из первых сознательных глобалистских проектов, в качестве наиболее важных конструктивных особенностей - интеграция западных и восточных цивилизаций; единство европейской и азиатской культур на основе русской культуры; преодоление ограничений идеологического Евро центризма. Это все те же особенности конкретных форм глобализации, на протяжении столетий, но заявили о себе как таковой только в двадцатом веке.

**Ключевые слова:** Евразийская Россия, евразийство, Глобализация

**Анотація.** Ідея євразійства з моменту її створення і до реєстрації євразійського руху в російській еміграції, безсумнівно, є одним з перших свідомих глобалістських проектів, в якості найбільш важливих конструктивних особливостей - інтеграція західних і східних цивілізацій; єдність європейської і азіатської культур на основі російської культури; подолання обмежень ідеологічного Євро центризму. Це все ті ж особливості конкретних форм глобалізації, протягом століть, але заявили про себе як такою тільки в двадцятому столітті.

**Ключові слова:** Євразійська Росія, євразійство, Глобалізація

The idea of Eurasian since its inception and until the registration of the Eurasian movement in the Russian emigration, is undoubtedly one of the first conscious globalist projects, as the most important design features - the integration of Western and Eastern civilizations; unity of European and Asian cultures on the basis of Russian culture; overcoming the limitations of ideological Euro centrism. It's all the same features of the specific forms of globalization, down through the centuries, but declared themselves as such only in the twentieth century.

Globalization is the field of integrative struggle of different tendencies, competing among themselves for the priorities and cultural hegemony in the world - historical process, and this means that inevitably there are different configurations of globalization processes (for example, Western European, Islamic, Pacific, etc.). On-site is very fractional gradation of ethnic and national cultures, which collectively form the whole world culture in the globalization process are added consolidated (regional- continental) units of local cultures, each of which is characterized by its strategy of globalization, the integration of their results, specific trends in the development of integration processes in each specific region of the world, his vision of the whole world.

In such a complex multi-cultural identities are formed in individual "large" crops and especially multicultural conglomerates (refers to what are the multi-ethnic Russian) special properties of potential "universality" - "globaliteta" [1, c. 206-226].

In many cases globalitet of a multicultural conglomerate depends on the "culture of mediating." For example, in ancient Greek culture served as a scientific and artistic culture of the Roman Empire, the Mediterranean as a whole. In the East, a similar role in the Islamization (the idea of Muslim religion) of the plurality of Turkic and Indo-European peoples (a kind of medieval "globalization" of Asian peoples and their cultures) played classical medieval Arab culture period of the Caliphate.

During the existence of the Russian Empire and the USSR globalizing "culture-mediator" performed consolidating, integrating supra-and supranational function with respect to the entire set of cultures multiethnic state was Russian culture, interpreted as a means globalization of the peoples of Russia and the Soviet Union. Actually, this, interpreted over ethnic and extra-national Russian culture and has been organizing and semantic core of the entire multinational Soviet [1, c. 206-226].

And if the formation of the USSR was a triumph Eurasian ideology, despite the fact that Eurasianism emerged in Russian aristocratic emigration, the collapse of Soviet power and the collapse was Eurasianism as a social utopia. Attempts revival Neo-Eurasians USSR this is utopian recurrence of imperial thinking. For the imperial idea - an important component of the theoretical constructs of neo-Eurasianists.

Meanwhile, in the classical Eurasianism important was the idea of «symphonic». Eurasians for small ethnic groups of the first wave of Eurasia were no less significant for the development of culture, they gave more (Russian) ethnicity originality, uniqueness [2, c. 90].

In the same way to understand the diversity of axiology and specific values of different people in Eurasia. NS Trubetskoy wrote: "Life and development of any culture consists of a continuous emergence of new cultural values". Cultural value - "any suitable creating man made common property of his country men: it can be the rule of law and artwork, and the establishment and maintenance tool, and scientific or philosophical position - because all of these things meet the physical or spiritual needs or to meet these needs taken all or part of the representatives of this nation"

PN Savitsky thought that the idea of a special nature of culture of Russian civilization and its values lies in its geographical location. "Values of Russian civilization are not by nature neither eastern nor western ... Russia was a unique Eurasian world with unique values, which were formed by this civilization. Because of its geographical

position history of Eurasia was an example of a compound of various types of cultures, dialogue, and the interpenetration of these crops. Eurasians for the main event was the conquest of Eurasia Mongol - Tatars, it was not just the enslavement of one crop with another, "Turan component" - the culture of the Mongols determined the fate of nature and historical development of Eurasia" Mongols formulated the historic task of Eurasia, beginning its political unity and its basics political system " [4, p. 45]. According to PN Savitsky, Moscow Russia is the successor to the Golden Horde. PN Savitsky said tolerance Mongol-Tatar «Tatars - neutral cultural environment, to take" all sorts of gods "and" Hurler any cults " [5, p. 333 – 334]. Because Tatars «did not change the spiritual being of Russia" [5, p. 333 – 334]. Sawicki insisted not only on the special role of the Mongols, he believed that they were the reason for the formation of the Russian state.

"Without Tatarism Russia would not be" - this statement from the article Savitsky" Steppe and sedentary "was the key formula of Eurasianism. Hence, a direct transition to a purely geopolitical statement: "Let's face it: in the space of world history Western European sense of the sea, as an equal, although polar, is opposed to the only Mongolian feeling continent; Meanwhile, in Russian "explorers in the extent and development of Russian conquest the same spirit , the same feeling of the continent " [5, s. 341 – 356]. And further: «Russian heiress Great Khans continuer case Chingiz and Timur, obedinitelnitsa Asia. It combines both historically «resident «and» steppe elements" [5, c. 341-356].

Another obvious blunder Savitsky and Eurasians is the idea that liberal democracy is alien to Asians and Russian. Allegedly the basis of everything must lie "ideocracy" led by "spiritual leaders." This is not true in fact, and even from a historical perspective: Turkic- Mongol khans, so revered by Savitsky, democratically elected at the Congress. Furthermore, Sawicki again avoids specifics: "Ideocracy - a term that integrates all forms of undemocratic, illiberal government. And Sawicki consciously avoids clarify this concept, which can be embodied in a theocratic catholicity, and in people's monarchy and dictatorship in the national and state party Soviet-style« [6, c. 52].

It makes sense to say about other relapses imperial thinking in Eurasians. This is primarily a «syndrome" of "big brother», the apology Russian hegemony in Eurasia. Thus, according to P.Bitsilli , " the formation of the Russian nation was not indifferent pounding in a mortar one wide variety of ethnic particles; he proceeded under the leadership of one nationality, which reported "Eurasian" nation its identity " [7, s. 280]. Generally speaking ethnography unknown nation that calls Bitsilli "Eurasian». Nevertheless P.M. Bitsilli continues, and quite eloquently: " Russian Empire in Eurasia and has always been, and Eurasia" [7, s. 279]. Then, as they say, no comment. However, we note a significant difference of views Bitsilli views Savitsky and student Savitsky, an outstanding Soviet ethnologist and historian Lev Gumilev .

For Savitsky and especially for ENU Turkic factor was decisive in shaping the Eurasian integrity. Furthermore, it should be noted that Sawicki and especially Gumilev made a great contribution to the dialogue between the Turkic and Slavic cultures. But for some fundamental Eurasians were Slavs and Orthodox. Moreover, some Eurasians tried to impose orthodox Muslim and Buddhist nations of Eurasia. It is sufficient to cite only one quote: "Eurasia is understood by us as a special - symphonic ally personal individuation Orthodox Church and culture. Base its unity and its being in the Orthodox faith ... "etc. [8, c. 583].

One of the main ideas of the Eurasian flow is a protest against the European culture. N. Trubetskoy historical mission of Russia announced so: "liberation of the world from the power of the Roman-Germanic predators" [9, c. 391].

Therefore Eurasianism deeply alien to the main trend of the Azerbaijani thought of the nineteenth-century, which is the Europeanization of Azerbaijani culture, which can be said that almost completed successfully.

In addition, the Eurasians clearly misunderstood how much Europeanized (from the time of Patriarch Nikon and Peter the first (I)) Russian culture [6].

A. Dugin does not keep in secret of his belief in the need for the Russian imperial policy. Thus, the leader of the "Eurasia" writes: "Geopolitical" gathering of the Empire "is for Russia not only one of the possible ways of development, one of the possible relations between the state and space, but a pledge and a prerequisite for the existence of an independent state, and furthermore independent state on independent continent.

If Russia did not immediately begin to recreate Big space, ie return in the sphere of strategic, political and economic influence temporarily lost Eurasian expanses, it would plunge into a catastrophe and herself, and all the peoples living in the "world island" [6, c. 98].

Dissociating himself from the extreme nationalists A. Dugin nevertheless remains the position of "Great Russian" nationalism, which is evident from the following quotation: "The Russian people certainly belongs to the messianic people. And like any messianic people, it has a universal value of all mankind ... " [6, c. 107].

On the basis of this kind of illusions and nationalist ideas A. Dugin leads anti-Western propaganda, "Russian universalism, the foundation of Russian civilization, radically different from the West in every way ... Therefore, the strategic interests of the Russian people should be targeted anti-Western (...), and in the future and possible civilizational expansion " (6, p. 108 ). And further A. Dugie continues: "Russian cares and just to all, and therefore in the long run interests of the Russian people is not limited to any Russian ethnos or Russian Empire, or even Eurasia (! ?)

The third chapter of the book A. Dugin "Foundations of Geopolitics" is called: "Russia is unthinkable without the Empire" [6, c. 110]. A. Dugin wrote in this connection: "The refusal of empire founder function means the end of the existence of the Russian people as a historical reality as civilization phenomenon. Such refusal to have a national suicide» [6, c. 112].

Russia supposedly should not even hold the status of «regional power A. Dugin." "Regional Power" is a modern geopolitical category, which is characterized by large and fairly advanced state whose political interests, however, are limited to only the areas immediately adjacent to its territory or its constituent" [..., p. 113 -114]. This

is not enough for Mr. A. Dugin. He needs a «civilization expansion" of Russia. «Gathering Eurasian Empire" should be geopolitical unit, «surpassing the usual parameters of the state, it should be super state for A. Dugin [6, c. 121].

A. Dugin suggests overcoming the "weakness" of previous empires (Russian and Soviet). So, he advises to "fill religious monarchical formula truly sacred content, lost under the influence of the secular West to Romanov dynasty implement orthodox" conservative revolution "to return to the roots of genuine Christian worldview" [6, c. 122]. Mr. Dugin Russian offers the project to return to the Middle Ages.

Beside A. Dugin offers back to the "Cold War" period: "The basis of the geopolitical structure of the Empire [Eurasian] must be put to the fundamental principle of" common enemy". Denial of Atlanticism, strategic control of the U.S. rejection and abandonment of the rule of economic, market-liberal values - that is the common civilizational framework that overall momentum that will pave the way lasting political and strategic alliance will create the axial skeleton of the upcoming Empire [6, c. 125].

For civilizational expansion A. Dugin Russia proposes to build three Russian geopolitical influence axis: axis "Moscow -Berlin" axis» Moscow-Tokyo " axis and " Moscow-Tehran ". Last axis - «Moscow-Tehran " practically built by the Russian leadership and strategic concerns of Azerbaijan's interests, sometimes contradicting them. A. Dugin writes: "Iran takes a position on the map of the continent, that the creation of the Moscow-Tehran axis solves a huge number of problems for the New Empire» ... It "access to warm seas " [6, p. 137]. Creating axis «Moscow-Tehran" "Russia opens limitless prospects to acquire more and more new bridgehead inside and outside of Eurasia."

Next pops familiar to us of some Russian politicians voiced by A. Dugin: " In the matter of the Moscow-Tehran axis occupies an important place the Armenian issue, as it traditionally serves as the center of destabilization in the Caucasus. It should be noted that the Armenians - Aryan people clearly realize their nature and close relatives of Indo-European peoples, especially the Iranians and Kurds. On the other hand, the Armenians Christian people, their Monophysite tradition fits exactly in the general attitude of the Eastern Church (although it is recognized as heretical over Orthodoxy) and geopolitical ties with Russia recognized them very much alive ... [6, c. 139]. Next A. Dugin flatly concludes: "In the Moscow-Tehran axis Yerevan automatically becomes an important strategic link, further bonding Russia with Iran, Turkey and cut off from the inland areas" [6, c. 139]. Thus, Mr. Dugin directly threatens the strategic security of Azerbaijan.

From the above it follows that the Eurasian and especially (new) neo-Eurasianism are alien to Azerbaijan and its geopolitical interest's ideologies.

#### **Источники и литература:**

1. Kondakov I. V. Eurasian globalitet : origins, status and prospects // Dialogue of Civilizations in the epoch of global culture. Moscow Research Institute of educational art 2012.
2. Seregina T. Eurasian theory of values // Culture of Sustainable Development : from idea to reality. B. : Elm, 2013.
3. Troubetzkoy N. S. Look at Russian history not from the West and from the East // The Legacy of Chengis Khan. M. Agraf, 2000 .
4. PN Savitsky Evraziysvto // Eurasia Continent. M. Agraf, 1997.
5. PN Savitsky Steppe and sedentary // Eurasia Continent. M. Agraf, 1997.
6. Dugin A. G. Foundations of Geopolitics. M. Arktogeya, 2000.
7. Bitsilli P. M. The Two Faces of the Eurasian // Russia between Europe and Asia // Eurasian temptation. Anthology. Moscow : Science, 1993.
8. Eurasianism. Experience systematic exposition // Reader on the Russian social thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Moscow : Logos, 2000 .
9. Troubetzkoy N.S. The Legacy of Chengis Khan. M., 2000