"TOWARDS THE SUN": EURASIAN HISTORIOSOPHY

"The Russian people have spontaneously striven for the East, towards the sun". In his poetical observation of the fate of the Russian nation, Georgy Vernadsky revealed the soul of the Eurasian historiosophy.

The Eurasianism (Евразийство) is the most contentious ideological issue in the Russian social thought in the 20th century, which had provoked, and still is provoking fierce and mostly emotional, rather than scientific, criticism. Definitions accompanying it, launched by both supporters and opponents, resemble in their controversy and excessive reaction of the Russian society, the "Philosophycal Letters" ("Философические письма") of Pyotr Yakovlevich Chaadaev. Formally Chaadaev and the early proponents of Eurasianism were on the opposite sides of the fence. Metaphysical Westernization or intuitive Neo-Catholicism in a Chaadaev's fashion, and the metahistorical "Orientalism" ("восточничество"), and doctrinal Eastern Orthodoxy in Eurasian fashion, were, however, equally a manifestation of the sense of enforced isolation. Unrealized Decembrist feelings of Chaadaev, kept locked in Russia of Nicholas I, and the unrealized revolution of consciousness encapsulated in the Eurasians’ immigrant life, were united by one word: protest. Protest of desperation or another "shot in the dark night," if were are refer to Alexander Herzen, on the one hand, and protest about unfulfilled revolution, on the other.

Russian emigration most often had summed up their position in a word: “catastrophality”. For Nicholas Trubetskoy it was the "atmosphere of catastrophic worldview" that joined the Eurasians in the collection of articles “Exodus to the East” of 1921. And they had found a way out of this catastrophe in turning it into a something positive, into a catalyst for the future, "We see in the catastrophic present a knowledge of emerging, intensifying migration and rebirth of culture".1. Georgy Florovsky, who in 1926 still belonged to the Eurasian circle, has defined their worldview as pernicious, and defended the Eurasian in the acute controversy in the journal “Path” ("Путь"), the main opponent of the movement Nicholas Berdyaev: “We, the “Eurasians”, have from the beginning emphasized that our opinon is based on a worldview of
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catastrophe, that the main and essential for us is the vision of historical tragedy. And we are being opposed by precisely those who do not see and do not want to see this tragedy, by people of idyllic attitude."^2

Eschatological premonitions were especially characteristic of the Russian idealism of the early 20th century, of which some of the Eurasians belonged. Prince Eugene Trubetskoy wrote in his book on Vladimir Solovyov about the “catastrophe”, collapse of the utopias and "worldview for global disaster generated by the wars, revolutions, social disasters and countless failures of social reforming."

The archetypes of historiosophical consciousness, especially of the Russia one, can hardly be captured and categorized. Eurasian individuality is eclectic, its springs were both in the Russian romanticism of Slavophilism and religious messianism, and the conservative, liberal and even radical thought in the 19th century.

Chronological frame

In order to find what was original and what was borrowed in the Eurasian historiosophy one must clearly define chronological frames, internal and external, by which to synchronize its specific representatives.

The rebirth of Eurasianism in post-Soviet Russia have imposed splitting it into an “old” and “new” one. And both, the "old" and "new" Eurasianism arose after the collapse of the empire, of the Romanovs after 1917, and Soviet one after 1991.

Key figures among the “old” Eurasians were the talented scholars Prince Nicholas Trubetskoy - a linguist, Georgy Vernadsky - a historian, Pyotr Savitsky - a geographer and economist, Nicholas Alekseev - a jurist and philosopher of law. Among them should be placed “semi-Eurasians”, champions of the idea in its original form: Pyotr Bitsilli - a historian of Russian social thought, and Georgy Florovsky - historian of Russian culture, who later dissociated themselves from the movement. A reverse process followed, former critics of the doctrine have became its ardent followers, one of them being Lev Karsavin.

Three internal stages can recognized in the conceptual life of the “old” Eurasianism. Such a division into three periods is given by Marlene Laryuel. Coincidence is purely chronological, and it is imposed by geographical route of
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the Eurasians in Europe: Sofia - Prague - Paris and Berlin. The French scholar evaluated the period of 1926-1929 as a “period of greatest productivity and deepening of the theory and politicization.” The assessment offered by this study, is just the opposite, the genuine Eurasianism was formed before the official publication of the first collection in Sofia in 1921, and continued until the end of the first period, that is, until 1925, then the Eurasianism was not only politicized, but lost its individuality.

The first stage, of the “early” or “genuine” Eurasianism, started with the formal establishment of the movement in 1921, when the collection “Exodus to the East” was published in Sofia, and until 1925, when, alongside with the continuity of the 19th century, original ideas were generated.

The genesis of Eurasianism started long before the first stage, and chronologically can be placed in time after the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907, and before the February and the October Revolution of 1917.

In 1920, the book of N. S. Trubetskoy “Europe and the Mankind” was published in Sofia. Bulgaria became accidentally a host of Eurasianism, an ideology which, however, was addressed primarily to the Russians, and not to the Bulgarians. In his first and basic book for Eurasian ideology N. S. Trubetskoy stated that “for me the most important thing is my thoughts to be understood and accepted by my own countrymen”.4

In a letter to Roman O. Jacobson of February 1921, N. S. Trubetskoy told he was considering Eurasian ideas before 1917: “This book I contemplated a long time before (1909-10) as the first part of a trilogy entitled "Justification of nationalism". The first part had to carry the title "For egocentrism", and was to be devoted to the memory of Copernicus, the second dedicated to the memory of Socrates, should be called "For true and deceptive nationalism", and lastly, the third, entitled "The Russian element", had to be dedicated to the memory of Stenka Razin or Emelka Pugachev”. N. S. Trubetskoy felt Eurasianism was “floating in the air”, and he felt it in the verses of M. Voloshin, A. Block, S. Esenin, and in “The Paths of Russia” (Пути России) of I. I. Bunakov-Fondaminski, as well as in the words of some right-wingers, and even of a die-hard Kadet (member of the Constitutional Democratic Party).5

4 Трубецкой, Н. С. Эвропа и человечество. С., 1920, с. V.
5 Письма и заметки Н. С. Трубецкого. М., 2004, с. 12, 21. Trubetskoy meant poems “Инония” of Sergey Esenin, “Скифы” на Aleksandr Blok and “Ангел времен” of Maksimilian Voloshin from the collection “Демоны глухонемые”, или “Европа”.
P. N. Savitsky also admitted that he formed his geographical or geosophycal doctrine in 1910, that is, long before the organization of the Eurasian movement: "I can assure the my honorable opponents that my geographical research proceeded my Eurasianism". Savitsky placed the beginning of the Eurasian organization after the revolution, which was one of the main advantages of Eurasianism, defined by that geosoph as an "experiment in creative response of the Russian national consciousness against the fact the Russian Revolution. In that sense, Eurasianism was really post-revolutionary. Chronologically it was the first Russian "post-revolutionary" movement.6

Eurasianism was exported from Russia, it was not created in exile. The movement, and later the party, was organized in emigration, but its genesis remains in pre-revolutionary Russia. In 1925 N. S. Trubetskoy, while returning to the question of the emergence of Eurasianism, defined the role of emigration as a catalytic factor for its formation: "As a movement of ideas, the Eurasianism first clearly announced its existence, and began to crystallize in the conditions, and in the midst of the Russian emigration".7

The second inner stage was from 1926 to 1928, when the Eurasianism passed under the shadow of the Lubyanka, on the one hand, and from a movement of ideas, it became an organization of declaratory nature, on the other. From 1926 onwards the Eurasianism began to lose its historiosophical vigour, and to politicize to the left. There are two dates associated with its infiltration of the Eurasian movement by the organs of the GPU (State Political Department) - 1926 (according to the minutes of the interrogation of L. P. Karsavin on August 8, 1948), and 1924 (according to Allain Brossat, researcher of the life of Sergei Efron, the husband of the poet Marina Tsvetaeva, who was known to be an agent of GPU).8

The relations of the Eurasians with the Soviet government were largely informal, no records have been published on this subject. Sparse data such as transcripts of the interrogations of L. P. Karsavin, and statements of representatives of the GPU in connection with Operation "Trust" (1922-1926), and others, as well the personal doubts of the Eurasians sneaking in their correspondence, however slight, definitely confirm Lubyanka serious interest in the Russian emigration. The interest of the Cheka functionaries in the old intelligentsia dates back from the time of the revolution, when a significant part
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of this intelligentsia was deported from Russia. Documentary evidence of the special interest towards future immigrants is the publication of a collection of reports, records of interrogations and other documents of the GPU, which included the cases of N. A. Berdyaev, A. A. Kizeveter, L. P. Karsavin and others.

The characteristics of the third inner stage, which dates from the late 1920's to the late 1930's, were the progressive Sovietization of the Eurasianism, and the shifting from the cultural and philosophical issues to economic and political problems.

The "new" Eurasianism of the post-Soviet period is represented by three imitators, each of whom gives it one’s own variant of continuity: Alexander Dugin, a publicist-philosopher Alexander Panarin, political scientist, and Nursultan Nazarbayev, a philosopher and President of Kazakhstan.

Between the "old" and "new" Eurasianism during the Soviet period, Lev Gumilyov was born, the second after Nikolay Trubetskoy, and brighter and original Eurasian. The author of the theory of passionary impulses in Russian history, was a consummate authority on the steppe nomads of the Eurasian area, but he is outside the Eurasian historiosophy and is, therefore, subject to special study.

The aim of this study is to offer a typology of the "old" version of Eurasianism, from historiosophycal point of view, as a variant of the negative identity of the "Russian idea" and as a part of the Russian national ideal.

Eurasian historiosophy created its own terminology, its own periodization of Russian history, its own myths, its own answers to the old Russian questions (about the role of intelligentsiya and the Europeanisation of Peter I), its own national idea. An important part of the identification of Eurasianism is its attitude towards the Eastern Orthodoxy, the state, the revolution, the liberalism, the Bolshevism, the Communism. All the above components of the Eurasian ideology constructed the negative identity, subject to confrontation "We - Other", "East - West", "Land - Water", "center - periphery".

**Conceptual apparatus**

"Eurasianism"

The concept of "Eurasianism" had the effect of an advertising slogan, it detonated the public opinion of the Russian emigration and continued to live

---

long after the end of the Eurasian movement. The old Eurasians accepted this term in a different way. N. S. Trubetskoy believed, in 1921, that the term "Eurasianism" "might not be very felicitous, but was conspicuous, challenging, and that is why suitable for promotional purposes."

The Eurasians, each of whom had one’s own conviction, were brought together by the "general mood" and worldview." N. S. Trubetskoy regarded a closest to him Pyotr Suvchinsky and the farthest, George Florovsky, because of the "great abstractness of his thinking (he is a philosopher, and I just like to ‘philosophize’ a little), and Pyotr Savitsky, because he was of "old leaven", as a student of Peter B. Struve, an influence of which he "has not fully released himself".

For N. S. Trubetskoy the Eurasianism was a continuation of the revolution, a true revolution of consciousness that would "destroy the old idols [...] will sweep away all the old ideological lines, and will create new on totally different foundations". Bearer of this revolution is the intelligentsia that belongs to the non-Roman-Germanic peoples. The essence of revolution is "to understand that neither "I" , nor anyone else is the navel of the earth, that all the peoples and cultures are equal, there is no higher and lower races [...] it is not enough to understand this, it must be experienced to be suffered, it must permeate all you".

Eurasianism of N. S. Trubetskoy was also a reaction of Europe’s disregard of Russia. The talented linguist had shared his personal observations about attitudes of the Western Slavic scholars towards the Slavic scholars from Eastern Europe: "From the depths of their soul the French Slavic scholars despise everything Slavic, Central European Slavic, and Russian, and consider it barbaric. Slavic scholars might be good as gatherers of material, but when they start to think, they reveal their manque de culture* and their âme slave**: these are baseless fantasies sectarian circle activities, etc. Therefore a French Slavic scholar would in no way allow a Russian or Slav ones to teach him, unless the Russian or Slav ones Frenchify themselves".10

G. V. Florovsky, who regarding his general worldview considered himself "a much more" student of Pyotr B. Struve than Eurasian, in a letter to his teacher in 1921 said: "If I am moving away from you in a number of particular moments, I think, I remain faithful in principal premises". G. V. Florovsky perceived the Eurasianism as a "domination of culture over the "society", as a response to the abuse of the term "policy", and as "cultural-philosophical reflexion" of the national ideal as part of the "Russian Resurrection" and Russian "internal
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10 Письма и заметки Н. С. Трубецкого… с. 21, 13, 301.
manque de culture (French) – lack of culture.
âme slave (French) – Slav soul
rebirth". G. V. Florovsky defined the Eurasian group as "neither a political party nor a sect of fanatics" but as a "league of Russian culture." "We are not bound together by any dogmatized and tactically crippled "religious doctrine", we are brought together by the similar tone, by which we perceive and experience the impression of modernity. The best way to describe that tone is polemically - this is the pathos of "criticism" that Fichte [...] opposed to "dogmatism" or what is the same - the doctrinairism".11.

P. N. Savitsky brought geographic sense into the notion of the "Eurasianism," which he regarded as a cultural concept of "rejection of cultural and historical" Eurocentrism "[...] as a rejection of the universalist perception of culture". For P. N. Savitsky the Eurasians were representatives of the "new thinking", of "a new geographical and historical understanding of Russia and the world, which they call Russian or "Eurasian" and their name is of "geographical" origin". The Eurasianism for P. N. Savitsky was not only a historyosophic concept, it would be also a methodology.12

N. N. Alekseev likened the Eurasianism "not as a party or a league" but to "ideological union" of the type of the Catholic orders: "In spirit, we seem to be the first type of a Russian order [...] a particular Eastern order [...] We not only have a program, we are united by a doctrine, a set of dogmas, complete worldview, complete philosophy". For N. N. Alekseev the Eurasians were primarily a "special ideological group".13

N. S. Trubetskoy was close to the definition of N. N. Alekseev, for whom the Eurasianism was a "brotherhood", an "order" that would unite all, will soften the "pan-isms", and would connect the Eurasians "with their common historical destiny ". N. S. Trubetskoy most often used term "Eurasian brotherhood."

Ya. A. Bromberg, who joined the Eurasians later and developed their concept on the Jewish question in Russia and Eurasia, specified Eurasianism as "geosophy".14

11 Флоровский, Г. В. Письмо к П. Б. Струве об евразийстве. – Русская мысль, 1922, № 1–2, 267–269.

12 Савицкий, П. Н. Евразийство. – В: Россия между Европой и Азией..., М., 1993, с. 105, 100, 111.


And V. N. Ilyin saw Eurasianism as a "system of historyosophic and state constitutional organics".15.

"Eurasia"

The concept of "Eurasianism" is derived from the term "Eurasia". For the Eurasians "Eurasia" replaced the terms "East" and "West" from any perspective: cultural, philosophical, geopolitical, geographical. The revision of the terms "East" and "West" was one of the main tasks of the collection "Exodus to the East", to which the article by P. M. Bitsiilli "East" and “West” in the History of the Ancient World” (“Восток” и “Запад” в истории Старого света”), was dedicated. Pyotr Bitsiilli who was related to Eurasianism without being its follower, defined it as "a recognition of an indisputable and exceptionally important fact: that Russia, that is, the Russian Empire, is Eurasia and has always been Eurasia".

Even after separating from the Eurasian movement, P. M. Bitsiilli stood categorically behind the correctness of the term "Eurasia": "Because of their point of view (which I think is irrefutable) Russia is "Eur-Asia", that is, somehow organically enters into Europe, the differences between Russia, as Europe, and the rest of the European world can only be relative".16.

Unlike P. M. Bitsiilli, for whom the Eurasian culture was a synthesis of Eastern and Western ones, the other Eurasians used the term "Eurasia" above all to separate Russia from Europe. "We had our "Europe" in the face of pre-revolutionary ruling strata", - said L. P. Karsavin, "it is the "Russian Europe" [...] and from the destruction of the "Russian Europe" is Eurasian Russia regenerated”. L. P. Karsavin accepted the term "Russia-Eurasia" as an extension of the problem "Russia - Europe" posed by the Slavophiles, and as a solution "Russia - Asia" problem. L. P. Karsavin was, however, compelled to abandon extreme isolationism and to smite in his dispute with N. A. Berdyaev that the Eurasian nature is "ancient, Asian and partly European".17.

15 Ильин, В. Н. Евразийство и славянофильство. – Евразийская хроника, 1926, № 4, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 10, л. 96.
G. V. Vernadsky saw Russia as a "geographical unity - Eurasia": "In my use of the term "Eurasia" is not an unspecified socio-historical combination between Europe and Asia, but huge specific geographic area of the globe in the center of the continent," for which he coined the term "development place" ("месторазвитие"). The "development place" determines the historical consciousness of the people. P. N. Savitski defined the "development place" as "geographical landscape" influencing historical development. G. V. Vernadsky and other Eurasians, exaggerated the role of geography in Russian history, being in that respect followers of Sergey Solovyov. On the other hand, G. V. Vernadsky was against the historically imposed term "European Russia", which was artificial: "The concept of "European Russia" was artificially created in the 18-19th century, and was accepted in the Russian and European historical and geographical science [...] Ural is not a natural boundary and can not be. No one can change the fact that geographically European and Asian Russia are but one". "Cradle of the Russian statehood" was "West Eurasia".

The term "Eurasian" was the foundation of the geosophic concept of P. N. Savitski, for whom "Eurasia is not a "mixstum compositum" of East and West. It is an unique personality. But its very uniqueness does not allow to identify Eurasia with Asia, which includes a number of worlds, peculiar and different, from Eurasia. P. N. Savitski was a follower of the late 19th century geographer V. I. Lamansky., for whom Russia is the third continent of the Old World - Eurasia with Europe and Asia. P. N. Savitski developed the thesis of V. I. Lamanski that "Russia-Eurasia" is "the center of the Old World", while Europe is for Russia "nothing more than a peninsula of the old mainland that stretches to the west of the Russian border. Russia itself occupies the main space of that mainland. [...] Russia has more reason, than China, to be called "the middle state" [...] Russian world is destined to unite the Old World, or Eurasia. Russia is a "continent in itself", in a sense, "equal in Europe." P. N. Savitski complemented the geosophic meaning of the word with cultural-historical one: "The name "Eurasia" is for us, among the other things, the connection of the Russian element with some non-Russian ethnic elements from her surroundings". There are three constituent elements of Eurasian cultural-historical perspective – the South or Byzantium, the East, or the "steppe", and

---

the West, or Europe. Unlike P. N. Savitski, N. S. Trubetskoy regarded "Eurasia" only as territory of the Eurasian nation. In order to avoid accusations that they replace "Russia" as a geographical notion the Eurasians, all of them, without exception, used most commonly the term "Russia-Eurasia". Ya. D. Sadowsky paid special attention to this issue, and clearly stated: "Do not try to replace the word "Russia" with the word "Eurasia". The only one the early Eurasians, who avoided using the term "Eurasia" or "Russia-Eurasia" was D. V. Florovsky, to whom it was "morphology and nothing more".

"Eurasian" - "Rossiysky" - "Russian"

The term "Eurasia" gave rise to a reasonable question: what in the Eurasian concept is "Eurasian", what is "Russian", and what "Rossiysky"?

Russian is the language of Eurasia. For G. V. Vernadsky the "Russian language is the main element of Eurasian culture". For the linguist N. S. Trubetskoy Russian literary language could not become "an instrument of communication between the Slavs." In that respect he repeated the thesis of the zealous ideologue of the Slavic idea N. Ya. Danilevsky, who admitted that the Russian language can not be introduced as an official state language in a Slavic federation. The Russian language cannot unite the Slavs, but, according to N. S. Trubetskoy, it could unite Eurasia "and will be a tool for cultural, political and business communication between the peoples of Russia-Eurasia". Eurasia would have an common state language - Russian, "regardless of what changes over time will occur in the state structure and the system of that Union".

N. S. Trubetskoy introduced the notion of "literary language radiation" or zone of influence of the Russian language, which would be not Slavic, but Eurasian. P. N. Savitski "expanded", the "zone" over the entire scholarly world: "Every serious scholar in the world must read Russian. And Russia-Eurasia (USSR), in its turn, can and should be cultivated on its territory the study of all languages in the world".

---
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Going to extremes P. N. Savitski stated, he was against publishing the abstracts of scholarly articles are into English or French, calling that "servile obsequiousness to Romano-Germans", "second-class complex" of "Europeanised Russia."\(^{22}\) In fact, his concepts revealed the same complex.

If the Eurasians agreed that the language of future Eurasia would be Russian, which was a national concept, in their supranational concepts they used the term “Rossiysky” as synonymous of “Eurasian”.

G. V. Vernadsky used interchangeably the terms “Rossiysky” and “all-Eurasian”, but putting in them political rather than national or cultural meaning, and used them to denote the statehood.

Ya. D. Sadowsky saw the term "Eurasian" as a cultural, not national self-determination notion; for to him a Russian is an Eurasian, just like as a German is an European, and a Japanese is an Asian. V. P. Nikitin agreed with him: "We the Russian Eurasians [...] would be in the eyes of the true Asians [...] bad Asians to the same extent as bad Europeans come out of us".\(^{23}\)

P. N. Savitski explained the need for "super-national" concept with the vast expanses of steppe, which determine the development of the "continental" all-Rossiysky or, if you will, "Eurasian" culture. "Eurasian" and "Rossiysky" were synonyms for P. N. Savitski who put in them and geographic, cultural and historical meaning: "In the name of "Eurasia" we include some concise historical and cultural characteristics of world that we would otherwise call "Rossiysky"- its characterization as a combination of the cultural and historical elements of "Europe" and "Asia", which while not in complete analogy with nature, which are geographically neither in Europe nor Asia".\(^{24}\)

N. S. Trubetskoy used the terms "Rossiysky" and "Eurasian" exclusively from a national perspective. With his "Rossiysky" nationalism N. S. Trubetskoy distinguished the Eurasianism from "Russian chauvinism" or the conservative slogan "Russia for the Russians": "In matters secular our mood is the mood of nationalism. But we do not want to put it within the constraints of national chauvinism. Moreover, we think that natural and creative Rossiysky nationalism, due to its very nature, breaks and tears the constraining frames of the "nationalisms" of the Western scale. [...] And we direct our nationalism [...] to a whole range of peoples from the "Eurasian" world, among whom the
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Rossiysky people occupies the medial position. [...] Russians and peoples of the "Rossiysky world" are neither Europeans nor Asian. Merging with national and environmental elements of culture and life, we are not ashamed to admit that we are Eurasians".25.

The Eurasian V. V. Ilyin stated that he was opposed to the "provincial great-Russian patriotism", however, he modified the slogan "Russia for Russians" with "Russian is larger than Russia", as an example of a Eurasian patriotism: "This aphorism contains all of historiosophy of the national-cultural world, the space stretching to the east of the Vistula and the Neman. In a more accurate translation "Russian is larger than Russia" means that the Eurasian is bigger than Russia. [...] The centre of Eurasian unity are the Russian state and the Russian tribe".26. V. V. Ilyin’s thesis was carried further by other Eurasians: "We, the Eurasians, are distinctive ones (самобытники), our slogan is "Russia in itself".27. The term " distinctiveness" was one of the most favorite among all the Eurasians. L. P. Karsavin spoke of "distinctive Eurasian development", N. S. Trubetskoy – about the "distinctive culture", the “culture of each nation should be different [...] universal culture of the mankind, same for all nations is impossible". Calling themselves "distinctive ones" the Eurasians were successors of the nineteenth-century Russian "soilers" ("почвеникі").

L. P. Karsavin also rejected nationalism, but he believed nationalities must not dissolve, but to develop, and the development for him was "above all of the peoples of Eurasia and especially the Russian people", and he was categorical that Eurasianism was a "Russian affair". That line did not change in the first programmatic document of the Eurasians of 1926 – an attempt at systematic exposition, which confirmed that "we must realize ourselves as Eurasians in order to realize ourselves as Russians".28.

The only Eurasian, who was opposed to the "Russian affair" in Eurasia, was K. A. Chheidze, who rejected the identification of the statehood idea with the "Rossiyskost"; he considered that "irrational and impractical", and reminded that


26 Ильин, В. В. О евразийском патриотизме. – Евразийская хроника, 1927, № 8, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 12, л. 51 об., л. 52.
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Eurasianism "rises above the nation-state idea". But K. A. Chheidze had spoken rather as a Georgian than as an Eurasian. For him Eurasianism had to decide the Georgian problems, not the imperial ones: "You can not demand from the Georgians some special gratitude to the Russians [...] the contract concluded between Russia and Georgia at the adoption of the latter under the patronage of the former, was disturbed by Russia, it was violated without any need and in a form offensive to the Georgians".29

The Eurasianism, as understood by N. S. Trubetskoy, P. Savitski, L. P. Karsavin, P. P. Suvchinski and V. N. Ilyin, could solve the Russian national question and the Russian national task - through Eurasia to strengthen the "Russian" nation! The Eurasians were, however, unsuccessful in their attempt to combine "Russian" (national) and "Eurasian" (supranational, imperial) patriotism, that is why tried actively to introduce the term "Rossiysky" patriotism.

The internal conflict in the Eurasian historiosophy was between "Russian nation" and "Eurasian super-nation". That was one of the main reasons that they had been rejected by the majority of the Russian emigration. N. A. Berdyaev was also seeking the truth about Russia's future and super-nationalism, which he perceived as "hoisting the national existence to universal human, and global significance", and to him "Asian" was a symbol of "savagery" and Tatar: the “Tatar is still in us and that Tatar should be expelled from Russia”. N. A. Berdyaev's super-nationalism was "Russian".30

The philosopher P. N. Novgorodtsev, to whose inner circle D. V. Florovsky belonged, was against the notion of "Rossiysky" as a purely geographical one, and he criticized the immigrant communities, using it to "hide shy their own belonging to the Russian people". The old Russian intelligentsia was particularly sensitive to encroachment on the "Russian" and "Rossiyskost" and it was partly right, for the Bolsheviks used the term "Rossiysky" to depersonalize the "Russian" national idea. Vladimir Lenin directly stated that "in order to destroy any thought of its national character, they called the party is not Russian but Rossiyska".31
The Bolsheviks also replaced "Russian" with "Soviet", turning a national ideal into social and political one. The Eurasians offered an alternative to the "Russian", in order to keep it in the "super-national ideal" - "Eurasian". Center of Eurasia remained Russia, which should become "ideological centre of the world", bearer of the Eurasian remained the Russian people remained, and Russian remained the language of the Eurasians.

The Eurasians saw themselves as Russians, and at the centre of their historiosophy was the assessment of the national character and role of the Russian people in a future Russia-Eurasia.

Following the philosophy of F. M. Dostoyevsky (from the speech the writer gave for the anniversary of A. S. Pushkin), N. S. Trubetskoy defined the Russian as a creator of a high type culture. "A type of high culture, unseen anywhere, had been formed in our country over the centuries, with no analogy in the entire world, the type of global concern for all. This is the Russian type, but since it was taken from the best cultural strata of the Russian people, I therefore have the honor to belong to it". Eurasianism is a product of Russian culture, and not vice versa.

N. S. Trubetskoy was a follower of F. M. Dostoyevsky in his attitude to Europe; he lacked the extreme isolationism and rejection of all things European, which brought him close to Pyotr M. Bitsilli. "I immigrated and do not regret for anything left behind. I have served Russia to the best of my abilities, and I kept serving her after I left, only I have expanded the idea. But serving so I gave her much more than if I were only a Russian, just like if a Frenchman was only French [...] every Frenchman can only serve his France, even humanity, only if he remains French first of all [...] Only the Russian [...] was given the ability to become Russian when he is the most European. That is our most important national difference from all [...] I have brought here my Russian sadness [...] For the Russian Europe is so dear as Russia herself [...] now, almost for a century Russia definitely has lived not for herself, but only for Europe! And what about them? Oh, they are doomed to dreadful agony before they reach the kingdom of God".32.

For N. S. Trubetskoy the true European is the Russian! The real "complete human" ("всечеловек") for Dostoevsky's "complete European" ("всеевропеец"), and the purpose of the Russian, according to the writer, was "pan-European and universal".

The Russian national character, according to N. S. Trubetskoy, is "highly and sufficiently distinguished from both by Finno-Ugric and Turkic, yet it is...
decidedly not like the national character of the other Slavs [...] tendency to contemplation and adherence to ritual characterizing Russian piety, are formally based on Byzantine traditions, but they are completely foreign to other Orthodox Slavs, and it rather links Russia with non-Orthodox East. “Bravery” that the Russian people so highly values in its heroes is purely steppe virtue, understood by Turkic peoples, but incomprehensible for the Romano-Germans, or the Slavs”.

By "Russian people" L. P. Karsavin meant the bearers of the cultures "individualizing and expressing the all-Russian culture, all the "nations", if you like, that have entered, are entering and are expected to enter in the composition of that culture". Leading role among those peoples, however, belonged to the great-Russians, while the others "are obliged to reveal the Russian idea, each in his own way," while he admitted that they have their own sources of culture. L. P. Karsavin did not consider the Russian people from ethnic point of view but as "unity of many (or, if you will, a subject uniting many), some partly existing, others partly disappeared, third partly defining themselves or defining their future self-determination, in front of us, nationalities in self-submission to the great-Russian, for now".

The most typical of the Russian national character, the "Russian soul", L. P. Karsavin found in the "pursuit of the absolute". "The Russian can not exist without absolute ideal [...] If he is religious, he goes into extremes of asceticism, to orthodoxy or heresy. If he replaces the absolute ideal with the Kantian system, he is ready to jump from the fifth floor window in order to prove the phenomenalism the outside world. [...] The Russian would not become reconciled with empiricism, contemptuously called Philistinism, he rejects it, in himself, and in the West, both in theory and in practice. He does not want and does not know how to be “gradualist” ("постепеновец")*, dreaming of a sudden coup".

Like N. S. Trubetskoy, L. P. Karsavin was not an extreme denier of the European influence on Russian culture, but he explained the incompleteness of nation building process with the Russian nation with the "naive identification of a national ideal with the Europeanisation", on the one hand, and a "naive negation of all European values, on the other". L. P. Karsavin was the only one among Eurasians who gave characterization of some of the shortcomings of the Russian national character: "The Russian is doing good and beautiful stealthily, with affectation, he values deeds in which his own "I" is lost [...] we are brazen when looking for the absolute, or when with inexpressible sadness are convinced that we have lost it. Our "obscenity" is not atrophy and hypertrophy

of shyness [...] "Russian inertia is a vice, and at that vice national, hereditary, but along with that it is peculiar fault of the people and of every individual belonging to it [...] Russians really lazy that quite corresponds to the potential of the whole Russian culture. It is not devoid of sloth engendering concentration on absolute, meditativeness of the national character." 34.

N. S. Trubetskoy and L. P. Karsavin viewed the Russian people primarily in terms of mentality and culture. G. V. Vernadsky paid more attention to the statesmanship role of the Russians: "The Russian people are the lifeblood of the Eurasian state'; the 'main ethnic element of Eurasia today is, on the one hand, the Russian one, and the Mongolian-Turan, on the other. Overwhelming importance belongs to the first, mainly because of the simple quantitative ratio of these elements". The greatest quality of the Russian people, defined by G. V. Vernadsky was "amazing ability to absorb in themselves foreign ethnic elements and assimilate them". 35.

In their assessment of the Russian people the Eurasians repeated the opposition people – intelligentsiya of the Populists (Narodniki). For the Eurasians intelligentsia was a symbol of Europeanisation. P. S. Suvchinsky accused the Russian intelligentsia that it accepted the European culture not as equal, but with a sense of its superiority: "It's like noviciate, even a self-betrayal [...] Developing in itself the genius of accommodation of ideas, the Russian intelligentsia combines, absorbs in its mind, all the varieties of European foreign cultures until complete kinship with them, at the expense of self-realization [...] the Russian intelligentsia turns internationally enlightened, but deprived of individuality". Communism, he stated, was "a new dictatorship the same intelligentsia". 36

The greatest sin of the Russian intelligentsia, according to N. S. Trubetskoy, was not only its grovelling admiration for the West, but its self-identification as an "European nation". On the other hand, N. S. Trubetskoy was against Lenin's slogan "To cleanse Russia for a long time", that legitimized the extermination of the old Russian intelligentsia: "The most terrible is that eradication of the intelligentsia is popular among the masses, and is indeed 'common cause', which

* gradualist (постепеновец)* - adherent of slow, gradual development, opponent to decisive, revolutionary methods.


all help with enthusiasm. Together with the intelligentsia is eradicated and all religious culture, and comes complete brutalization in all spheres”.  

N. S. Trubetskoy preferred the European culture of the Russian intelligentsia to the proletarian culture of the people, which he identified as "low, elementary and wild." He feared that proletarian culture or communism would conquer the world.

G. V. Florovsky blamed the intelligentsia for the death of "Old Russia": "I am not afraid to admit that I consider the "Old Russia" being the "sick Russia ", but she is "sick" not because the “ancien regime” was" terrible", on the contrary, I acknowledge and I have always acknowledged it being quite appropriate and reasonable in its highest achievements [...] It was not that the state power was sick, although sometimes it was sick, sick was Russia herself, the Russian "society", the Russian "intelligentsia". The biggest faults of the intelligentsia to the religious philosopher, were its "weak state consciousness, irresponsible opposition, sickly and hysterical lingering in the clouds of theory, detachment from the national roots, lack of practical life habits, half-education along with refined taste".  

The Eurasian observations of the Russian character and the intelligentsia, with few exceptions repeated those of the Russian social thought of the 19th century. The novelty offered by the Eurasians was their concept of the origins of the Russians and the essence of the Russian idea. In that respect, Eurasianism created its own myths, while rejecting the old ones.

_The myths rejected_

The first myth that the Eurasians rejected was the one of the entirely Slavic origins of the Russian people and of Russian culture, on the one hand, and of the leading role of the Slavic question in the Russian idea, from the other hand.

The Eurasians created the myth of the Turanic element in the Russian national character. In that respect they were successors of Konstantin Leontiev, who, without developing the question in theoretical terms, in one of his reproaches of Nikolai Danilevsky for the latter’s belief in the Slavic tribe said: "It is necessary to have faith not in the whole of that negative tribe, but in a happy combination of him with all that half-foreign, mostly Eastern (and in some aspects, of Western, too), which is more noticeable in Russia than in other


Slavs. It is necessary to have faith in [...] in the fruitfulness of the Turanic admixture in our Russian blood".39

Of all the early Eurasians, N. S. Trubetskoy was the major and most original theorist Turanism, followed by the more moderate G. V. Vernadsky. (Vernadsky's moderation was due to his profession. As a historian, it would be difficult for him to be tempted to create myths, the work of the historian is to destroy them, which he did with regard to the Slavic idea, but he did not participate in creating the image of Turanic Eurasian).

N. S. Trubetskoy admitted that the main element forming the Russian nationality, was the Slavic one. G. V. Vernadsky also admitted that "the Russians are basically Slavs". P. N. Savitsky divided Slavs into "European" and "Eurasian" ones: "In its historical and cultural development the Slavdom belongs not to one but to two geographical and historical-cultural worlds [...] the world of Europe [...] the world of Eurasia [...] It is important to determine [...] the boundaries between the Eurasian and European Slavs".40 Similar division was made by the Eurasian V. P. Shapilovsky for whom the "creative and cultural profiles of the Bulgarians and of the Serbo-Croato-Slovenes belong to the future, while the Poles and Czechs in their "real" policy must be attributed, to a greater extent, to the Western European world".41

N. S. Trubetskoy was, however, categorical that "the Russian people in ethnographic terms was not exclusively representative of the "Slavdom". The Russians, together with the Ugro-Finns and the Volga Turks, were a special cultural zone with links to the Slavs and the "Turanian" East, and it was difficult to say which of those links were more vigorous and stronger. The relationship of the Russians with the "Turanians" was reinforced not only in ethnic, but also in anthropological terms, since in the Russian veins, doubtless, besides the Slavic, Finno-Ugric and Turkic blood flows".

"Slavic character" or "Slavic psyche", continues N. S. Trubetskoy, were myths. "Slavic culture" was also a myth.42 N. S. Trubetskoy considered "Slavdom" just as "linguistic" concept, but not as ethnographic, historical, and


40 Савицкий, П. И. Русские среди народов Евразии. — Б: Русский узел евразийства, с. 405.

41 Доклад В. П. Шапиловского. — Евразийская хроника, 1925, № 1, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 7, л. 19.

cultural anthropologist ones. By this logic, "Eurasianism", too, can be considered only as a geographical and geopolitical concept because there is no Eurasian culture, but Russian culture, and it is European! Even K. N. Leontiev, considered by the Eurasians as one of their archetypes, acknowledged that Russian culture was European one, and the European heritage was "eternal, and so rich and high, that nothing like it has been seen in history". Moreover, K. N. Leontiev, in a quite a Chaadaevian and anti-Eurasian fashion was convinced that "there is no more uncreative; people than the ours. Except, maybe be, for the Turks".

The aim of N. S. Trubetskoy was not to be objective, but to create a new mythology – the Eurasian one. "There can be objective scholarship at university, - he confided in a letter to P. M. Bitsilli, - but in secondary school history, in particular, must necessarily be tendentious [...] the youth should be educated in protest against the claims of the Romano-Germans for world domination and universal character of their culture. It is in that direction that history book for Russian secondary school should be tendentious".

Like in the case of the cultural-historical types of N. Ya. Danilevsky, N. S. Trubetskoy made a "Turanian ethno-psychological type" using primarily linguistic analysis. He argued with P. M. Bitsilli about the role of the Turanians in Russian culture. In a letter of 1922, N. S. Trubetskoy reproached him for underestimating of them: "You do not indulge in indiscriminately reducing the Turanians to the level of half-animal barbarians, you do not repeat with Bunakov unfairly popular opinion of the "Asian feet". But in some places where you are talking about Turanians as ethnic type a hint of disdain can be seen through in your words. You speak of the cultural passivity of the Turanians, of their inability for creation, of their religious mediocrity. First of all, it is not entirely fair: the Turanians just have had "hellish bad luck", for due to historical necessity, they fell under the influence of the religions most depriving of individuality and crushing of national cultural creativity, namely Mohammedanism and Buddhism [...] But even apart from the question of creativity of the Turanians in the sphere of spiritual values, we should not deny their statesmanship talents and temperament for establishment [...] And since we, the Russians, owe immensely in our state building just to these features of Turanian peoples, to emphasize their cultural mediocrity is not only unfair, but also ungrateful and tactless. Dismissive tone to Turanian site is especially tactless, for us, the Eurasians".

Moreover, N. S. Trubetskoy saw the relationship between the Russians and the South Slavs through the Turanian element: "On a number of issues the Russian folk culture is close precisely to the East, so that the line between the "East" and the "West", sometimes passes just between the Russians and Slavs,
and when sometimes South Slavs get close to the Russians it is not because both of them are Slavs, but because both of these groups have experienced strong Turkic influence".43.

N. S. Trubetskoj denied the Slavic mission of Russia: "There was much talk that the historic mission of Russia lies in the integration of our "brother" Slavs. It was usually forgotten that our "brothers" (if not language and faith, then in blood, nature and culture), are not only the Slavs but also the Turanians, and that in fact Russia had already united under the shadow of her state the major part of "Turanian" East. The Turanians had brought the Russian nation a state based on the "unquestioning obedience". The "all-Eurasian state" of the Turanian nomads of Genghis Khan passed to the Turanians. “Russia-Eurasia” was for N. S. Trubetskoy equivalent of "Russian-Turan" instead of "Russian-Slavic". Very rarely he used the term "Slavo-Turan". “The Russian national type is actually not purely Slavic but Slavic-Turanian. The Russian tribe was created not through forced Russification of the aliens (инородцы)* but through their fraternization with the Russians".

P. N. Savitsky also used the term "fraternization": the "national conditions in Eurasia [...] different construction of the relations between the Russian (российская) nation and other nations in Eurasia, than what is found in areas involved in the sphere of the European colonial policy, in the relations between the Romano-Germans and indigenous peoples. Eurasia is a region of a certain equality and "fraternization" of the nation, having no analogy in the international relations of colonial empires".44.

For both, N. S. Trubetskoj and P. N. Savitsky Europeanisation was tantamount to colonization. But when it comes to Russification, instead of colonization they speak of "fraternization" of the nation - the substitution of concepts was part of the Eurasian ideology.

N. S. Trubetskoj found Turanian psychology in the relation of the Russian towards the Orthodox faith: "Due precisely to the Turanian psychology the Russian of the olden time was not able to separate his faith from his life [...] the

---


* Aliens (инородцы) – in the Russian empire persons from the Eastern periphery, persons of the minorities.
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psychological differences between Russian and Greek approach to faith and the ritual that was so vividly manifested in the era of the emergence of schism, is a consequence of the fact that Turanian ethno-psychological elements, completely foreign to Byzantium, had put down deep roots in the ancient Russian national character".45.

P. N. Savitski also developed the Turanian concept: "Russia is a successor of the great khans, continuator of the cause of Genghis Khan and Timur, unificator of Asia". P. N. Savitsky spoke about historical and economic-geographical perspective on the ancient World - "peripheral-seaside" region - Eastern – China, Southern - India and Iran, Western – the Mediterranean and Western Europe, on the one hand and, and the "central world" – the "elastic mass" of nomadic steppe peoples, on the other. Russia combines both the "sedentary" and "steppe" element. Along with "people agricultaralist", the "people horseman" was "within the Russian national entity".46.

An extreme follower of N. S. Trubetskoy but without significant effect on the Eurasian ideology was the Orientalist V. P. Nikitin: "We are Indo-Europeans, we have a great deal Turandom but we are Aryans".47.

The thesis of N. S. Trubetskoy was confirmed in the first program of Eurasianism of 1926: "It turns out that the core of Russian culture – the Great Russian culture is related to Slavdom [...] the language indicates in favour of that [...] but which is completely unfair regarding Finnish and generally Turanian blood [...] there is no reason to speak of Slavic-Russian cultural world as an entity [...] we are not Slavs and we are not Turanians, we are Russians".48

In search of confirmation that a new cultural type is arising, more related to the East than to the West, P. S. Suvchinsky referred to the historian Platonov, "there is some reincarnation of the average Russian, this new type has rather steppe, Eastern character. Owing to the quite complex internal processes, to movements of the masses, to the general elementarization, Russia has become
an Eastern country. P. P. Suvchinsky was convinced that not knowing Eurasianism, S. F. Platonov confirmed its correctness, but the historian does not invest in the positive sense in this change towards the Eastern, but just the opposite.

It would be too simplistic to say the Eurasian were as a whole imitators of the concept of cultural-historical types of Nikolay Danilevsky as they were categorized by N. A. Berdyaev. Berdyaev himself was much closer to N. Ya. Danilevsky because he perceived the Slavic projection of the Russian idea. The world mission of the Russian people, he said, was to be "at the head of the Slavic race [...] Russian imperialism is associated with the calling of the Slavs in the world." "The knell of world history tolls, - N. A. Berdyaev wrote - when the Slavic race led by Russia is called for a decisive role in the life of mankind [...] Slavic race, which stands at the head of which is Russia must reveal its spiritual potential to reveal the prophetic spirit [...] that is the race of the future".

The historical time in which the Eurasians lived and that of N. Ya. Danilevsky was very different for both Russia and Europe. For N. Ya. Danilevsky some of the key issues of Russian geopolitical orientation focusing public attention, were the Eastern Question and the accompanying it Slav question, hence the relevance of the idea of Slavic federation. The all-Slav union of N. Ya. Danilevsky and Slav federation of K. N. Leontiev of the 1870s legitimized the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78, or the "Second Eastern War," as it was called in the journalism of the time. The dominating principle in the model of N. Ya. Danilevsky was the political one, and in that of K. N. Leontiev – the religious one.

The end of the 1870s marked the peak of the Slavic idea in both the Russian foreign policy, and the Russian public thought, then the priorities gradually shifted to the Middle and Far East. The Eastern question which for N. Ya. Danilevsky would have been the "center of the future destiny of the Slavdom" rather than to unite the Slavs with Russia, separated them. The newly founded Slavic Balkan states enjoyed political freedoms banned in the Russian society.

The idea of control of the Straits continued in the projects of A. L. Nelidov under Alexander III, and during the First World War - in the diplomatic efforts of S. D. Sazonov, who was able to reach an agreement with England and France for their fate after an eventual victory. After the disappointment of the Berlin Congress, however, the Russian society ceased to be interested in the Slavic
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idea. Its last ardent champion Ivan Aksakov, who advocated it until the mid-1880s, remained without serious followers.

The time when the Eurasian historiosophy was formed, was far before its official birth in Sofia in 1921. This happened in the period from 1908 onwards, during the war and the two revolutions. After the losses of the First World War, the collapse of the Romanov Empire, followed by a civil war, the forced immigration, new realities emerged before the surviving "old" intelligentsia, some of which were the Eurasians. The Slavic idea has long ceased to be seen as part of the Russian idea. They looked for new horizons for the Russian national consciousness. "Slavic" was for the Eurasians equivalent to Eurocentric.

The Turanian myth was not just a debate about the ethnogenesis of Russians, but a prelude to the main objective of the Eurasians - to keep the Russian Empire, expanding it into Eurasian and to proclaim it as successor of Genghis Khan. The Turanian myth of N. S. Trubetsky legitimized the geopolitical status of Russia-Eurasia in the East. The Eurasians created an alternative to the Slavic idea whose geopolitical directions were to the West and to the South to the Bosphorus, and to reorient Russia to the Middle and Far East. The Eurasians were ancestors of globalization in a Russian fashion. Not surprisingly, the "new" Eurasians since 1991 have employed the Eurasian ideology to return to the post-Soviet space to the Russian Federation, if not institutionally, economically, culturally and geopolitically.

"Jews-Eurasians"

With their rejection of the Slavic element in the Russian idea the Eurasians tried to solve one of the most neuralgic issues of the Russian society – the Jewish question.

The Jewish question became especially relevant in the Russian society in the late 19th century. The policy of Alexander III, limiting the rights of the Russian Jews in every respect - exile, banning possession of real estate, limiting quotas in higher education, etc., accompanied by Jewish pogroms, had shown that Russification did not solve but deepen that question.

Unlike the government the Russian public thought offered different solutions or answers to the Jewish question: V. S. Soloviev saw it from a Christian perspective, or theocracy, as a mutual ideal of Jews and Christians, P. B. Struve - from legal and economic perspective or ideal of "Great Russia", L. Z. Slonimsky and G. K. Gradovsky - from a Russian, or freedom for the Russians could not be at the expense of injustice of the Russian Jews.
The Eurasians had put the question in religious-cultural and historiosophic perspective. Projections of Russian and Jewish messianism intersected in the Eurasian ideology. The main authors of the Eurasian concept of the place of the Russian Jews in Eurasia were in Ya. A. Bromberg, or the "Jew" as he called himself, and N. S. Trubetskoy. L. P. Karsavin also wrote on the topic.

N. S. Trubetskoy referred to the Jewish theme to distinguish the Eurasianism from the anti-Semitism of the Russian intelligentsia, and the racism of National Socialism as a philosophy of anthropological materialism. N. S. Trubetskoy saw the main reason for anti-Semitism in the psychology of the question. The Jewish psychology is the psychology of immigrants. N. S. Trubetskoy saw "Jewish behavior" in the Russian emigration: "In order to understand properly the specific set of Jewish traits, it should be taken into account that the Jews are immigrants for two millenia, with strong emigration tradition. Watching the Russian emigration was not difficult to discern in it embryonic form of mental traits which under "favourable" conditions should lead to the typical Jewish features [...] Russian immigrants at every turn show regarding the foreigners striking unity. Enough was for a Russian immigrant to get a good place in a foreign institution or enterprise, and he began to draw his countrymen there, so after a while downright "Russian dominance" can be observed in that office. There were two ethical standards the Russian immigrants, one for "theirs", the another for the natives [...] just like the Jews with their two different moral, one for the sons of Israel, another for the Goyim".

The problem was even more complicated with the second generation immigrants: "On the one hand, they seem to be ashamed to be Russians, on the other - seemed to be proud of, on the one hand, they passionately want to be "like all", to merge with their surroundings, on the other - somehow alienated from that environment, and despise it".

The result was the "decaying psychology", as N. S. Trubetskoy called it, caused by "this biting, decaying irony peculiar to the Jews. This irony is, on the one hand, a vengeance that "they" (foreigners, Gentiles) have their national enthusiasm, have real, concrete sacred place - home, while with the younger generation of Russian emigrants all that is lost; on the other hand, this irony is instinctive self-defense, because without it, the immigrants would cease to be themselves and would be swallowed by the foreign people".

Frequent criticisms of the materialism of the Jewish mentality, according to N. S. Trubetskoy were prejudice: "The typical Jew finds equal delight in denying the spirit as well as in the denial of matter".51

---
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Ya. A. Bromberg accepted fully the views of N. S. Trubetskoy, but developed them further in a Eurasian concept of the Russian-Jewish question. Ya. A. Bromberg rejected the positivist approach to the Jewish question, which was rationalist, secular and presents the problem from racial, political and legal standpoint. According to him Eurasianism had for the first rationalized the fate of the Russian Jews in its “religious-tragical and providential side”. Ya. A. Bromberg accepted the Eurasianism as a "broad historical-cultural, religious, philosophical and socio-political" movement whose aim was to "give meaning to the great culture and historical catastrophe", not in rationalist and positivist terms, and in terms of the "messianic promise" for the historical path of Russia and her peoples.

"East Eurasian" as Ya. A. Bromberg called Russia-Eurasia had to overcome against "Western cultural principles" which were destroying the Jewish messianic nature". As a result of long historical development in captivity of rationalism (partly inherited, partly borrowed) and social atomism, the Jewry was seduced by the false wisdom of immaterial scheme. It seriously believed that the world will ever be ruled by high and noble ideas\textsuperscript{52}.

Ya. A. Bromberg wanted to return to the Jewish intelligentsia to the religious and moral philosophy of the Jewish national idea through Eurasianism . The revolution was fruit of "godless socialism" which caused the "great Russian catastrophe", and the blame was put on the Jewish intellectuals who had renounced their own national ideals and turned Russia a "testing ground" for the West. Regarding the revolution Ya. A. Bromberg took the firm position of G. V. Florovsky, differing in that respect from the other Eurasians. The revolution destroyed the "canonized image of the Jewish teenager-enthusiast, fanatic freedom lover, over optimistic utopian, idealistic and selfless ascetic-disinterested person".

West European Jewry, according Ya. A. Bromberg, despised the Eastern European one, especially its "religious ritual principles". While the "Jewish spirit adopted sincerely the pathos of the organic Russian autocracy [...] in the soul of the common Jewish people lives the same continuously created religious and historical legend of the White Tsar, the most powerful, the most real and most legitimate of all the kings of this world, which it unites him with the nomadic Kirghiz, grazing his herd of horses in the opposite end of the state". Ya. A. Bromberg opposed the true Jew to the "Faustian type" of Spengler.

Even in emigration the Jewish intelligentsia remained in the grip of revolution. Ya. A. Bromberg painted the portrait of the Russian Jew in New York: "Russo-Jewish New York is one of the few places where one can still meet
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this museum piece - people whose internal clock mechanism ever stopped on the year 1900 [...] When one visits the Russian department of the great New York Public Library one can often see at the tables elderly men and women of the Jewish type, browsing all the canonical and apocryphal writings of the prophets of the old revolutionary underground [...] and from outside comes floating the clatter of global crossroads of Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street, the lights of thousands advertisements peek through the windows, the multifaceted temples of modern Babylon\textsuperscript{53}.

Ya. A. Bromberg shared the views on N. A. Berdyaev in "The Meaning of History" about the peripheral intelligentsia and its social aspirations, associated with the Jewish eschatological traditions of religious dogma. L. P. Karsavin also defined the Jewish intelligentsia as peripheral. N. A. Berdyaev gave a faithful portrait of Jewish-peripheral radical, but according to according to Ya. A. Bromberg he was in error that in this portrait he summed up the whole religious and historical Jewry. Ya. A. Bromberg divided the Jewry into of Western and Eastern one. The Western Jewry was fascinated by "pan-Europeanism" and pacifism, and by the "deeply decadent phenomenon the League of Nations" which provides "supervision" of the major European Powers over the vanquished, to whom it suggested resignation.

Ya. A. Bromberg continued the tradition of Eurasianism to distinguish between "Asian" and "Asiite" ("азийски") or even "Assiite" ("асийски") cultures. According to him the Eastern Jewry had to "rationalize in a new way the fact of finding the starting point of his historic journey within - not Asian, by the way, but the Aziiite, and even more true of "Assiite" Middle Eastern oykumene. This fundamental fact creates immediately certain genetic community of religious-cultural principles with the "people-master", which introduces another meaning in the reception of Byzantine Orthodoxy in the circle of the Assiite cultures\textsuperscript{54}. Assiite culture is magical.

Ya. A. Bromberg repeated Spengler's typology of the magic nation, coinciding with the concept of Church. One who belongs to faith, belongs to the nation, and vice versa. Spengler's magic nation had no earthly homeland, just like the Jews (Ya. A. Bromberg wrote in the 1930s, when the state of Israel did
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not exist yet). Hence the mystical connection between the Jewish and Russian messianic destiny. If earthly homeland of the Eurasian nation must be the territory of the Golden Horde, the unearthly ideal was the Holy Rus. Zionism was a part of the “Faustian” culture, a rationalist solution to the Jewish question, and was fruit of the Western Jewry. According to Ya. A. Bromberg the Zionist ideal “substitutes the sublime dream of tomorrow’s city […] seductive flesh-seductive false ideal of the material seizure of the Holy Land”. For him, the West was the destroyer of mystical and irrational, which had been kept as an ideal of Eastern European Jewry and could be realized only in Russia-Eurasia, and not in Palestine. The decline of the West would lead to the decline of Western Jewry.

A major fault of the Jewish national character, both of the Western, and the Eastern European Jewry, according Ya. A. Bromberg is: the "Jewish terror" to recognize even their most irrefutable flaws, especially in front of people, i. e., to public opinion of the nations surrounding us. This feature of our national character is diametrically and irreconcilably opposite to the Russian one, in which the need and taste of the public self-destruction and self-denigration, by contrast, reaches much exaggerated proportions. We, the Jews, do not understand that the Jewish problem concerns not just us, and that is why it not only can, but must be the subject of loud and wide discussion”.

Ya. A. Bromberg distinguished himself from both by the Russian Zionists around V. Jabotinsky, and the theory of Jewish-Masonic plot, he called "The Protocols of the Elders of Sion" and "Three Capitals" (“Три столицы”) of V. V. Shulgin, "psychopathic". Ya. A. Bromberg qualified the book of V. V. Shulgin "What We Do Not Like In You" (“Что нам в вас не нравится”) as provincial thinking, which did not outgrew the South Russian position on the Jewish question.

The Eurasianism should resolve the real tragedy of the Jewry, which according to Ya. A. Bromberg, "in its purely historical, though not in its deepest aspect, lies in the fact that in its over-selfishness it [the Jewry] had gradually come to the absurd absolutisation of its idea of election, which inherently includes a definite relation, namely to the mankind".

Eurasian Russia was "the new Israel and Rome simultaneously", i. e. the Jewish messianism would participate in the "future service of Russia to the whole mankind". By means of Eurasianism Jews would be saved as "a kind of national peculiarity with a millennial national-religious tradition of its own", while in the West they would dissolve in "philistine ignorance."
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Eurasian Russia would not mean turning the Jews into Russians, according to Ya. Bromberg it was "neither feasible nor desirable." This did not prevent him, however, from recognizing the Russian people as "the main and connecting nation of the Eurasian in the world." V. S. Solovyov's conception that the Jews would voluntarily become Christians, was according to Ya. A. Bromberg, impossible. "The Christian idea of the First Coming within the earthly history of man [...] is fully and irrevocably unacceptable for the Jewish religious consciousness [...] Jewish religious conscience will not accept the Resurrection of the earthly image of the Saviour".

The union of the two churches is impossible and unreal; in that Ya. A. Bromberg sided with N. S. Trubetskoy, and together with all other Eurasians he recognized the Orthodox Church the only universal church, and the Roman ones as "pseudo-theocratic utopia". According to him it was possible and necessary, that Russian religious thought and "prophetic pathos" united in Eurasianism, would "return the unbelieving Jew in the bosom of the faith of Israel".

The Russian Jews were part of the Eurasian geosophy. Ya. A. Bromberg introduced the term "geosophy" because of the notion of "place of development." He traced the Jewish question in geopolitical terms. Eurasia would resolve "the contradiction between the narrow geographical localization of the settlement of Jews in the Russian plain, and the Russian-Jewish cultural and political conflict in its general imperial significance, between the rejection and overcoming of the local-provincial resignation, revealing the historical fate of Russian Jewry, and full state-territorial painlessness of this process, even in the utopian peripheral sphere.\textsuperscript{57}.

The Russian Jews were a part of the Eurasian mythology, too. Following the mythologem of N. S. Trubetskoy of the succession of the empire of Genghis Khan by Russia-Eurasia, Ya. A. Bromberg discovered historical kinship of the Eastern European or Russian Jewry with the Eurasians through the connection between "plain Khazaria and the Golden Horde". Ya. A. Bromberg legitimized the right of the "Eastern European people" to fight for the creation of "a new culture with world imperial, supranational character".\textsuperscript{58}.
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Eurasian periodization

Alongside with the new mythology the early Eurasians created a new periodization of Russian history, authored by G. V. Vernadsky, who wrote a history of Russia for the American students at Yale University, where he taught until 1956. The Eurasian periodization was subjected to the internal logic of the "place of development" that defined the attempts to create an "unified all-Eurasian state".

The Eurasians denied the division of the Russian history into three periods: Kievan, Moscow and Petersburg. One of the followers of G. V. Vernadsky made the extreme statement that "Kievan Rus was not directly related to the formation of the Russian state". P. N. Savitski also believed that the culture pre-Tatar "Kievan" Rus was overrated and exaggerated; he did not deny it, but claimed it was in decline before the Tatars - "political and cultural fragmentation [...] "a tendency to degradation". According to P. N. Savitski without the Tatars would not have been Russia: "The West would "have taken the soul of Russia", while the Tatars did not alter the spiritual essence of Russia", while providing her with the "quality to become a powerful" horde". Hence the opposition of the land civilization to the water one that governs the Eurasian concept: the "Western European sense of the sea" was equal to the "Mongolian sense of the continent". The Russian state was a continuation of Scythian, Hun and Mongolian state rather than pre-Tatar Rus. Until the 15th century Russian history, according to P. N. Savitski was provincial.59.

G. V. Vernadsky offered his scheme of the "periodic rhythm of the state-building" process: Scythians - Huns - Mongols - the Russian Empire, the USSR. In 1927, G. V. Vernadsky was convinced that the Soviet Empire had the best conditions "for all-Eurasian state unity" which did not exist earlier. "Rossiysky or all-Eurasian state", he said, can only exist in a "particular form of federation" based on two legacies: Mongolia (Eurasian state) and Byzantine (Orthodox statehood), the ratio of which was "the ratio between the power of the fact (Mongolian) and the power of idea (Byzantine). G. V. Vernadsky justified and insisted on "strong state organization strong and steady governmental power." The most Eurasian sustainable form of government was "the form of a military empire" whose strength depended on the relationship with the people.

G. V. Vernadsky’s periodization of Russian history covered five periods: until the end of the 9th century - "attempts to unite the steppe and forest", since the end of the 10th to mid-13th century (972-1237) - "the relationship between
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forest and steppe is broken", "victory of the steppe over the forest"(1237-1452); "victory of the forest over the steppe "(1452-1696), and "unification of the forest and steppe in economic-colonization terms"(1696-1917). If the "flesh of Eurasia" was united in the 19th century, the sense of the "Eurasian mission of Russia" was lost, and that should waken up the Eurasians.  

Unlike P. N. Savitski and N. S. Trubetskoy, G. C. Vernadsky did not idealize the Mongolian rule, and he defined it as "a catastrophe of the urban civilization". It was during the Mongol period, that Russia turned into an agrarian country. N. S. Trubetskoy adhered to the traditional view of the Tatar yoke. From historiographical perspective Eurasianism not only added a new periodization, but rehabilitate the Tatar-Mongolian period of Russian history.

The rejection of Eurocentric periodization by the Eurasians was caused by their attitude towards the Europeanization of Russia under Peter I, which led them to the other extreme: "Russian history is not part of the history of Europe". Since the had accepted Byzantium and Eastern Orthodoxy, by "Europe" they meant only Western Europe. The main objective of the Eurasians was "spiritual differentiation from Europe" and "the destruction of all principles and forms of the Western culture, foreign and organically adverse to the Russian spirit, on the native soil".

The isolationism of the Eurasians repeated that of the old Slavophile Konstantin Aksakov, that is why P. B. Struve labeled their ideology a "new Slavophilism." Such a generalization, however, concealed the internal differences among the early Eurasians on this subject.

N. S. Trubetskoy did not reject completely the European culture, but he did not accept Russia's place in that culture given by Peter I, either. "If Russia by Peter the Great in his culture could be considered almost a most gifted and prolific continuator of the Byzantine Empire, after Peter the Great on the road to Romano-German "orientation", it turns tail of European culture".

N. S. Trubetskoy's Eurasianism was also a revanche of the Russian culture. The talented scholar expressed his regret in a quite a Chaadaevian way: "The number of actual contributions of the Russian genius" ot the treasury of European civilization "remains negligible compared to the mass of foreign cultural values that are instilled continuously and mechanical continuously on Russian soil".

---
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If for P. Ya. Chaadaev the cause for the disadvantageous position of the Russian culture in relation to Europe was the Byzantium, for N. S. Trubetskoy it was the Romano-Germanic world, forcibly introduced in Russia by Peter I. While P. Ya. Chaadaev can be understood - yet during his own time the golden age of Russian culture had only begun, but such a thinking of N. S. Trubetskoy is strange, for the Russian culture had enriched the European one in the 19th century, namely. Peter I’s greatest sin, according to N. S. Trubetskoy was “viewing of Russia and the Russian people only as a material for producing powerful European state”, for her “crooked "separation" into “barini” (masters) and "mouzhiks" (peasants )”.63

In the Eurasians terminology introduced by N. S. Trubetskoy, the concept of "Russification" was equivalent to "Europeanization". The "governmental Russification" had made Russia an imitator of the West. The government borrowed militarism, imperialism, chauvinism and worship of the state, and the society, respectively liberalism, socialism and parliamentarism.

The negative attitude of N. S. Trubetskoy to Peter I was for only for the "spiritual essence" of the imperial autocracy, for the "ideology of sheer imperialism and government’s role of bearer of culture", but not for the foreign policy successes or geopolitical character, which he unquestionably acknowledged.

P. N. Savitski repeated the views of N. S. Trubetskoy of Peter I’ Europeanisation in entirely negative aspect: "The Romano-Germanic ideology obliterates the distinctive ideology of a people and replaces it with itself. Such an event occurs in respect of Russia under Peter the Great and later, when the ideological sense Russia was prostrated herself before "Europe".

P. N. Savitski reproached N. S. Trubetskoy that he defined cultures by racial indicators, which created conditions for speculative allegations of an Eurasian racial theory and likened Eurasianism to fascism: the Western European culture "was called Prince Trubetskoy "Romano-Germanic" culture after the racial origin at the main nations of Western Europe".64 In N. S. Trubetskoy, however, it was rather culturological than anthropological definition, and in that respect he was a follower of N. Ya. Danilevsky.

The most moderate assessment of Peter I was given by G. V. Vernadsky – in a quite a historical matter, without emotions. He differentiated from explicit
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epithets of Peter I as "Westernizer" and "European". For G. V. Vernadsky Peter the Great “in all his intemperate passions” remained “a deeply Russian man”.

The historian’s reproach was for the successors of Peter I, who had turned his name into "a symbol and a program entire trend of Russian thought - a submission to the West." G. V. Vernadsky distinguished between "historical Peter" and "Peter the program" that had nothing in common. G. V. Vernadsky was the only one among the early Eurasians who saw Europeanisation as a necessity for Russia: "It was necessary for the preservation of Russian independence to get the European technology".65

Close to the views of G. V. Vernadsky were those of G. V. Florovsky, who also heaped all the blame of "superficial Europeanization" of Russia on the successors of Peter: "No Russian dare to forget either his unparalleled genius of statesmanship, nor his superhuman patriotic work, or his selfless love for Russia. At least it would be unwise to turn a blind eye to the tragic image of Peter [...] and if titanic Father of the country was able to counter that Panurgian flock, and war able to arrange it in the patriotic army, the petty generations of "chickens from Peter's nest" were infatuated by the glamor of ostensible Europeanism [...] If Peter had "given the Russians heat", then who gave their soul? And was the hotchpotch of Voltaire and Rousseau, Hegel and Maistre, Darwin and Marx a "soul"?66 . For G. V. Florovsky (while was part of the group) the Eurasians’ mission was to preserve the Russian soul.

The most extravagant definition of Peter was given by N. N. Alekseev, in his opinion the autocrat was the first Eurasian “The Eurasians have always emphasized that the Russian Empire built by this tzar on European models, was actually neither Europe nor Asia”.67

Of all the early Eurasians it was Ya. D. Sadowsky who saw Peter I in most positive light: “for us Peter the Great was a great Russian reformer and a passionate patriot”.68

While N. S. Trubetskoy viewed Europeanisation from a cultural point of view, P. N. Savitsky- from ideological, D. V. Vernadsky - from political, then L.
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P. Karsavin emphasized on its religious interpretation. All of them, however, have treated the theme of Peter I for one purpose: revanche of the Russian culture to European one, on the one hand, and legitimization of the "original" Russian-Eurasian national idea.

The repudiation of Europeanization by the Eurasians was refusal to accept the "universal" values of European culture. In 1922 P. N. Savitsky wrote that "Russia’s quitting the mould modern European culture" was a fact.

L. P. Karsavin distinguished between "Romance" and "German" Europe, predicting the death of the former and birth of the latter. But even while sympathetic to the "German" culture when talking about the future, L. P. Karsavin was emphatic: "Western culture does not match with the grandeur, of the absoluteness of our designs". Eurasian culture was absolute because it was Orthodox. L. P. Karsavin assessed the European culture from a religious perspective.

N. S. Trubetskoy did not believe in the universal values the of the European culture: “Eurasianism categorically rejects the categorical authority of the European culture [...] Eurasianism puts requirements of national culture [...] proclaiming as its slogan Russian national culture, Eurasianism distances itself ideologically from the post-Petrine, St. Petersburg, imperial-oberprokuror period of Russian history”.

N. S. Trubetskoy rebelled against cultural monism of Europe. Europe was not the only civilized world: "For us, the Eurasians, the "Asian steppe" is also a "civilized world. "Universal civilization" and the desire to be "truly European" at all costs, is a lie, that every nation which is not Romano-Germanic have to fight.

On the one hand, N. S. Trubetskoy was follower of N. Ya. Danilevsky who also did not accept European civilization as common to all mankind [...] “Universalism [...] does not really exist [...] all-human is a different matter that we should distinguish from common to all mankind”.

On the other hand, N. Ya. Danilevski considered "universal civilization" as an "unattainable ideal", while for the Eurasians Russian-Eurasian civilization was such one, and it was attainable. The idea of F. M. Dostoevsky for "all-humanity" would receive from Eurasianism "its scientific design" and
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Eurasianism would lead to universalism - "and on the foundation of its own peculiarity Eurasianism would build a general philosophy of universalism". Eurasianism was a presentiment of globalization!

Distinguishing Russia from Europe, the Eurasians followed N. Ya. Danilevsky who opposed the Slavic culture to the Romano-Germanic one on the principle of negative identity – “us” and “them”. Russian or Slavdom against Europe, or the West.

It should be remembered, however, that when N. Ya. Danilevsky wrote "Russia and Europe", the Russian Empire was actually in heavy isolation from the Old Continent, imposed on her after the Crimean War. The book was first published in 1869 in the journal "Zarya", i.e. two years before the brilliant diplomatic victory of A. M. Gorchakov, who won denunciation of the Paris Peace by Russia in 1871, taking advantage of Franco-Prussian war. N. Ya. Danilevsky wrote with a sense of the vanquished, seeking for revenge - first cultural-historial, and then political.

The Eurasians, on their part, were also on the side of the vanquished, which explains their identification with "us" against the "others". Hence their common weakness – of N. Ya. Danilevsky and the Eurasians - to the word "identity" that builds illusory barrier between Russian and European culture.

After the decline of Europe the Eurasians claimed for the European heritage. Their moods were not different from those of Spengler, who wrote "The Decline of the West" before the end of the First World War, i.e. just at the time of the genesis of the Eurasian ideology. Unlike Spengler, however, the Eurasians, in their attempt at systematic exposition in 1926, explained the decline of Europe "heretical" nature of European culture, to which they opposed the "pagan power" in Asia.

The Eurasians compared their cultural mission with that of Hellenism. P. N. Savitsky posed an interesting question: "Was the rise of Russia a rise of one of the "European" countries in the field of "European culture [...] or it was the birth of a new culture, although genetically related to the West, but representing such a radical change in its tradition, like that, for instance, which Hellas accomplished in relation to the "legacy" of the Ancient East or the New World in relation to the ancient? ", P. N. Savitski repeated logic N. Ya. Danilevsky for whom the term "Slavdom" was equivalent to "Hellenism", "Europeanism" and "Latinism".

P. N. Savitsky was not so explicit about the "decline of Europe" as N. S. Trubetskoy was, but he was confident that "if the future does not belong to Western Europe, it is possible in a conceivable perspective of the cultural and geographical evolution that Russia-Eurasia is the immediate successor of
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cultural continuity of the "western part of the Old World". In an attempt to escape from the provincial thinking, what actually is isolationism, P. Savitsky reached to a comical denial of all things Western (condemning Moscow's passion for jazz in 1934, and reproached the Soviet authorities complained that they had "not created their own clothing, and their own dance! "). which does not prove that "Russia-Eurasia" embodies a completely independent tradition, superior to the Romano-German one.

The attitude of the Eurasians to European culture repelled from their group P. M. Bitsilli, who did not believe that Eurasianism can be an incentive for cultural creativity. "Culture" is not a custom made garment. Culture is self-revealing of individual spiritual potential, creative work of individual persons, who in their spirit never correspond exactly to the people’s one. "P. M. Bitsilli did not deny the separation of "Eurasia" from "Europe" culturally, but he considered it as a temporary phenomenon, while for the Eurasians it was "an ideal goal, to which, seemingly, regardless of people's misconceptions (the "loss of Eurasian sense"), the geographic providence directs the course of Russian history, and at that - as the ultimate goal." Russia was not only a continuator of the historical mission of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan., not only a mediator between East and West, she is a synthesis of Eastern and Western cultures. The future of Russian culture, which always belonged to the European cultural circle, was to become "the culmination of European culture." The reason was the nature of culture, which, according to P. M. Bitsilli was "tragic, that's why it is unusual for it to take a blissful, idyllic course [...] then culture is threatened by the most horrible and insurmountable danger – to be absorbed inconspicuously, slowly by civilization as it happened consecutively with many European cultures".

The Eurasians’ attitude to the Russian culture, however, attracted P. M. Bitsilli to the Eurasian group in the early and most creative period of its existence. The power of Eurasianism was, according to him, in "the individualization of Russian culture" on the one hand, as "spontaneous learning" on the other - as opposed to Europe culture.

To develop into a great power, one have to beat another, to turn a culture into high one – it should rise above another. The Eurasians tried in the way of negation to offer Russia alternative variant of cultural values, but the destructive
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element in their ideology was stronger than the creative one. Unlike the other spheres of life, culture does not bend under the harsh political pressure, and does not submit to the straightjacket of doctrinaire ideologies.

Eurasians’ mission

The seeking for their own culture by the Eurasians was a searching for their own historical sense, for the Russian idea, and was a denial of the theory of progress. “The meaning of our historical existence is not Europeanization”, wrote L. P. Karsavin, “If it was so, we should be unhistorical people [...] and there would be no Russian idea to talk about. And we should look for this idea not in the “European” tendencies of the Russian thought, public and statesmanship”\textsuperscript{74}.

G. V. Florovsky also welcomed symposium ”Exodus to the East” not as symbolic of "a public trend", but as one posing the problem of the cultural-philosophical sense of Russian history, and thus to draw attention to spiritual creativity, “to arouse the waning taste for culture, for pure rather than applied values”\textsuperscript{75}.

L. P. Karsavin rejected progress because it was limited in time, and he opposed to it the Christian culture. Progress was rejected from a religious perspective by P. N. Savitsky for whom Europe was developing science and technology at the expense of "religious poverty".

N. S. Trubetskoy did not accept progress because of the linear thinking: "The development of the human race was going and is going by the way of so-called world progress. This way looks like a clear-cut straight line. Humanity goes by this straight line, but different peoples have stopped at various points, as if treading in place".

N. S. Trubetskoy, however, was also thinking linearly, i. e. in a Christian mode, when he refuted the possibility of uniting the churches: "We believe and know that this wonderful true unification of all the Christians [...] will come in the last days, when all the prophecies will be fulfilled". That did not prevent him, of course, to reject the line European evolution as the only one possible. Progress can not be the sense of history, progress is "an ostensible concept, self-contradictory and therefore the "meaning" is reduced to "nonsense".

Historical thinking and reasoning was one of the main elements of the Eurasian ideology, with which it differs from conservatism. The expectation of a

\textsuperscript{74} Карсавин, Л. П. Восток, Запад и русская идея. Пб., 1922, с. 52.

\textsuperscript{75} Флоровский, Г. В. Письмо к П. Б. Струве об евразийстве. – Русская мысль, 1922, № 1–2, с. 274.
"new philosophical era", whose herald recognized in the ideology of Schelling and Hegel, or the German idealism, was according to them distorted by Positivism and the theory of progress. The Eurasians rejected rationalism, renounced the theory of an earthly paradise and situated Eurasianism in the philosophical scheme of idealism. In this respect they were part of the European philosophy and – paradoxically, in view of their goals - affiliated, rather than separated Russia from Europe. Eurasianism was an European philosophy!

The Eurasians raised history to the status of a cult. History can not be "predefined absolute goal," it should be "free and creative improvisation". "Historical spasm", as N. S. Trubetskoy called the change of epochs in world history, had begun and the Eurasian credo was that changing of the Western world, would come from the East. The Eurasian "evidence" obeyed the laws of historical providentialism. "The unity of the historical fate" explained the strength of "place of development", or Eurasia. G. V. Florovsky characterized the Eurasians precisely as "enchanted by the historical reality".

The historical fate of Russia-Eurasia was linked to the "super-historical" destiny of the Orthodoxy. If the Turanian element was the reason for the Eurasians to inherit the imperial space of Genghis Khan, the Orthodoxy gave them the right to inherit the cultural myth of "Moscow - the Third Rome" by which they became receivers of cultural and political orientation not only of Moscow, but also of St. Petersburg Russia. The new epoch was for the Eurasians an "era of great religious revelations", "age of faith", as it was called by P. S. Suvchinsky. "We confess the Eastern Orthodoxy" - wrote N. S. Trubetskoy, and that Orthodoxy according to the properties of our national psyche must occupy primary position in our culture, influencing many sids of Russian life".

N. S. Trubetskoy evaluated the Orthodoxy, also from the historical perspective of the fate of Russia: "Eurasianism stands on the grounds of the Orthodoxy, confessing it as the solid true form of Christianity, and acknowledging that in its quality of the one true faith, the Orthodoxy could play the role of a creative stimulus in Russian history". N. S. Trubetskoy even made an extreme statement that the Church Slavonic literary tradition established itself in Russia not because of being "Slavic" but for being "ecclesiastical", forgetting that the language the Church uses is Slavonic.
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N. N. Alekseev also spoke about the religious and spiritual mission of Eurasianism: "The transformation of the spirit is only possible through religious and spiritual rebirth. The state could outwardly help such processes, but it is unable to give rise to them. They are formed in the ideological trends [...] Eurasianism is precisely such a trend".\(^78\)

The Eurasians continued the Russian philosophical and religious thought of the late 19th and early 20th century, which developed the concept of religious nationalism. P. N. Savitsky described himself and the Eurasians as "an effective group consisting of church people, but not binding the Church to their works, in order to avoid staining her chasuble with mud, which one inevitably touches in dealing with people". The purpose of the Eurasianism was to make connection between religion and science: "It is necessary to re-create lost religious centre of science, proceeding from all which would be a center of natural revelation for the true empirical science".\(^79\)

G. V. Florovsky likened the Eurasians to the "God-seekers" (богоискатели) who did dare to “penetrate the religious-metaphysical roots of our destruction”, whose opponents “punished particularly the concerns of their searches”. "It does not particularly matter what the Eurasians think”- continues G. V. Florovsky, “but that they think about, that justice, they seek for and see.”\(^80\)

The Orthodoxy was for the Eurasians national, i. e. Russian. The Russian people was the "main confessor and bearer" of the Orthodoxy. For the Eurasians true Christianity was the Orthodoxy, and the true Orthodoxy – the Russian one. According to the "Eurasian catechism" as N. A. Berdyaev aptly called their programme of 1926, "The Orthodox Church" has "reached its largest revealing in the Russian Church". The Eurasians recognized the existence of only "Russian-Greek" Orthodoxy which they defined " as primarily " Russian "Orthodoxy.\(^81\) It was not even mentioned that there were other Orthodox nations with older Christian traditions. In that respect the Eurasians disagreed with the Slavophiles, whose conception of Orthodoxy was created by Alexei Homyakov - according to which the "Russian Church does not form, according to its tastes, a

---

\(^78\) Алексеев, Н. Н. Собственность и социализм. Опыт обосновании социально-экономической программы евразийства. Париж, 1928, с. 73.

\(^79\) Савицкий, П. Н. Переписка евразийцев 1924–1927 гг. – В: Русский узел евразийства, с. 429.

\(^80\) Флоровский, Г. В. Окамененное бесчувствие. (По поводу полемики против евразийства.) – Путь, 1926, № 2, с. 129.

\(^81\) Евразийство. Опыт систематического изложения..., с. 366, 363.
separate Church: it is nothing more than one of the dioceses of the universal Church".  

Identification of the Russian with the Orthodoxy was natural in imperial times, when religion was the only criterion for inclusion into the imperial nation and for elevation in the social hierarchy. In the Eurasians and a large part of the

Russian emigration, the national sense of Orthodoxy was exaggerated as an act of self-defense of the cultural self-identification. The representatives of the old intelligentsia who identified with neither left nor right, or with any political projects for the future of Russia turned to the Orthodoxy. Since the beginning of the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907 to the end of the Empire, the Russian society was able to get disappointed with the party struggles, which did not correspond to the declared political ideals. When G. V. Florovsky had left the Eurasianism, he retreated into Orthodoxy.

The main ideologists of the Orthodox element of Eurasianism after G. V. Florovsky were L. P. Karsavin and P. P. Suvchinsky. The interests of L. P. Karsavin in religious history dated since 1908, when in a letter to I. M. Grevs he noted that "it is well within my character because I feel in myself religious inclinations and sometimes I give myself to a skeptical mysticism".

L. P. Karsavin defined the Orthodox ideal of the Eurasians as the "ideal of the Russian Ecumenical Church" [italics mine – D. G.] that had the potential to "develop and update the universal into a particular "Russian "aspect". The "universal" for L. P. Karsavin was equivalent to "orthodox" and "Russian". The role of the Russian Orthodox Church was to achieve "the unique face of the universal as national". The Russian Church was "making the cultures ecclesiastical ones" [опыт] dissolving itself in them. Each culture according to L. P. Karsavin is potentially ecclesiastical, "this gives deeper significance of the so-called "Europeanization" of Russia and explanation of the religious attitude towards the "European", which is typical for us [...]. The tragedy of the Russian history is that in Russia either the tzar is without patriarch, or the patriarch is without tsar".  

82 Хомяков, А. С. Несколько слов православного христианина о западных вероисповеданиях. – В: Сочинения богословские. Спб., 1995, с. 64

P. N. Savitsky recognized the role of other confessions in the Russian state, but he had always associated them with the Orthodoxy as the leading one: "Russia is indeed an Orthodox-Muslim, an Orthodox-Buddhist country".\(^{84}\)

The Eurasian V. P. Shapilovsky was the only one to declare himself emphatically against the freedom of religion: "Today the liberal formula of modern times - "Religion is a private matter of everybody" is no longer acceptable".\(^{85}\)

P. M. Bitsilli reproached the Eurasians about the incompatibility of the Orthodoxy to non-Orthodox part of Eurasia. "Eurasia" and "Orthodox" were contradictory terms – the Orthodoxy was beyond the boundaries of Eurasia. P. M. Bitsilli reminded the Eurasians that besides the Russians Orthodox are the Bulgarians, Greeks and Romanians. The historian rejected the possibility to combine the two ideals of the Eurasians – the "Orthodox Rus" and the "Eurasian empire".\(^{86}\)

L. P. Karsavin saw the solution of this contradiction in the proposition of the potential Orthodoxy of the paganism: Eurasianism "esteems in the Eurasian peoples not their paganism but their potential orthodoxy". The Orthodox Russia will be at the head of Eurasia, only so the "Orthodox Eurasia and Orthodox Russia will become the cultural hegemons of the cultural world". Christianity is "panhistorian and extrahistorian" which, according to L. P. Karsavin made it stronger than the Eastern cultures, because it gives the ability to reveal both the universal and the individual, national identity. The Orthodox or Russian, thought is in possession of "intuition of complete unity"\(^{87}\), which is opposed to the Western mechanical perception of the world. The Russian Orthodox cosmism recedes Russia from the West and brings her together with Eurasia. In this respect, L. P. Karsavin was a follower of A. S. Homyakov according to whom "The West will never decide to recognize that for so long time the Divine truth was preserved by the backward and despicable East".

The link Eurasianism-Slavophilism can be found in the key concept of Orthodoxy "sobornost" (unity of people in loving fellowship). A. S. Homyakov introduced the concept of "sobornost" and "sobor" (assembly of leaders) in

\(^{84}\) Савицкий, П. Н. Поворот к Востоку. – В: Исход к Востоку, с. 54.

\(^{85}\) Доклад В. П. Шапиловского. – Евразийская хроника, 1925, № 1, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 7, л. 22.


\(^{87}\) Карсавин, Л. П. Ответ на статью Н. А. Бердяева об “евразийцах”. – Путь, 1926, № 2, с. 126; Восток, Запад и русская идея…, 34–35, 55–57.
theological and historiosophical aspect. "Sobor" in the definition of the old Slavophil "expresses the idea of assembly not only in terms of manifest, visible union of many people in a certain place, but in a more general sense, the constant ability of such a combination, in other words, expresses the idea of unity in the multitude". 88

Besides the Eurasians other representatives of the Russian emigration also spoke about "catholicity" ("sbornost"). In his book "Spiritual Foundations of Society" ("Духовные основы общества”) Semyon Frank explained the concept as "intrinsicallly organic unity of "I" and "you", growing from the primary unity of "we".

The Eurasians were believers, but for them personal faith was not enough. "The believing person," P. N. Savitski claimed, must be "all-encompassing". The Eurasians placed the Orthodoxy over the Eurasianism, just as F. M. Dostoevsky had put over the Orthodox idea over the all-Slavic. By getting nearer to the Slavophile archetype Eurasianism was moving away from the imperial element in the theory. The unity was expressed in the "sbornost", which united only the Orthodox people in Eurasia. What was left for the rest ones in the empire? For all the Eurasians remained the higher concept of the "symphonic" personality, which may mean "super-ethnos", and separate people, and separate church, and all mankind. "Soborny ("all-encompassing") or symphonic, subjects" possessed "super-individual consciousness". The true ideology according to the first programme of the Eurasians should be "symphonic" and "sborny" ("all-encompassing").

N. S. Trubetskoy introduced the concept of the "multi-ethnic" personality as a synonym of the "symphonic" super-individual, and replacement of the term "super-ethnos". N. S. Trubetskoy used the Russian word "face" ("лик") for the term "ethnos". The term "cultural-historical area" of N. S. Trubetskoy corresponds to "super-ethnos", and Lev Gumilyov agrees with that.

L. P. Karsavin defined the "symphonic" person as an intermediate link between the "unified person of the whole Church and individual personalities". In response to accusations of N. A. Berdyaev that there is no category for spiritual freedom in the Eurasian thought, L. P. Karsavin defined as such the term "sborny principle", without which, according to the Eurasians there can be no individual freedom. The highest form of freedom, according to P. N. Savitsky, remained the Orthodoxy.

The universal nature of Orthodoxy, according the Eurasians, determined the universalism of the Eurasian ideology, an important part of which was the Church. "For all of us the Church and the Orthodoxy are the main foundations of

88 Хомяков, А. С. Письма к Пальмеру. – В: Сочинения богословские, с. 289; О значении слов “кафолически” и “соборный”. Пак там, с. 279.
worldview" - stated P. S. Suvchinsky, for whom the Eurasianism and the church were fully compatible: "I personally do not see in what an area" Eurasianism " obstructs the establishment of the Church, quite on the contrary". In his essay "Christianity and Ideas of Monarchy" ("Христианство и идеи монархии") N. N. Alekseev had put the church over the state as an example of perfect spiritual community. P. N. Savitsky advocated independence of church from the state as "one of the fundamental values for which the Eurasians are struggling". L. P. Karsavin did not accept any spiritual creativity "outside the Church and religion," without which the freedom of the creator was limited.

L. P. Karsavin P. S. Suvchinsky shared the idea of unification of the Churches, formally continuing in that respect the religious-philosophical tradition of Vladimir Solovyov. L. P. Karsavin saw "the unification of the churches" not as a "formal act", although it should be expressed formally, and not as a diplomatic agreement. "The unification of churches" is unification of cultures, consciousness of unity of culture and religion".

N. S. Trubetskoy was the only one of the early Eurasians who opposed the unification of the churches as unrealistic: "Suffice it to get closely and concretely to the idea of unifying the churches, to understand that its piety is questionable, and its seemingly Christian spirit is in fact only on the surface [...] The separation of the churches is unquestionable fact. Speculative unity is not enough for the existence of unified church, real common life is needed. And that common life is gone. There are totally independent and separate lives [...] The real union of the churches can not be achieved by human means. It can be done only by the Divine Providence, as a miracle".89

The union of the churches, or "sobor" was difficult to achieve, according to A. S. Homyakov, too: "The sobor is impossible until the Western world, having returned to the very idea of the sobor, condemn their prior attack on sobornost [...] when rationalism is clearly understood and condemned". "A moral obstacle" did not allow the West "because of its naivety, to accept the truth that the Church offers".

If for the Eurasianism unifying of the church was a distant goal, the restoration of the church-state relationship was part of their program. The religious model of the Eurasian ideology was related to another of its important elements - statism. The Orthodoxy and the autocracy in Russia were the two sides of the political ideal of the empire. The relationship of the church to power was ideologized in the strongest in the doctrine of S. S. Uvarov during the reign of Nicholas I, summarized in the triad: "Orthodoxy - autocracy - people". Early Slavophilism arose as a reaction to mixing of the bureaucratic patriotism with the Orthodoxy

89 Трубецкой, Н. С. Соблазны единения. – В: История..., с. 307, 311, 317.
Unlike the Slavophiles, the Eurasians sacramentized the state, and in that respect they were followers of S. S. Uvarov and the Russian conservative tradition. N. S. Trubetskoy distinguished himself from the Uvarov formula, and defined it as "profound misunderstanding" that could be freely replaced with one word "autocracy", the Orthodoxy in this formula was "synodal-oberprokuratorial". An important principle of the Eurasianism, however, had to be "very close relationship between the private life, the state and religion", which closely resembled the triad. N. S. Trubetskoy replaced the notions - "life" instead of "nation", "state" instead of "autocracy" and "religion" instead of "Orthodoxy", but the essence of Uvarov's triad remained.

The political ideal of N. S. Trubetskoy was, however, more radical than the Slavophile model of Zemskoy Sobor or Country Elective Council (in its two versions - the conservative one of K. S. Aksakov, and the liberal one of A. I. Koshelev), and the conservative project of Christian monarchy (L. A. Tikhomirov). N. S. Trubetskoy saw future Russia as an "Orthodox Russian republic" in which "each one elected for a president ("posàdnik") would see himself as a responsible representative of the people before God, and as a defender of Orthodoxy, and in case the election for president and lawmakers in that republic does not be dependent on the game of people’s passions and hatred, the Eurasianism would not mind such a republic, and in any case, would have preferred it to "European-enlightened monarchy.**

Monarchical idea was discredited autocracy, which according to N. S. Trubetskoy, was a "degeneration of pre-Petrine genuine national monarchy". He opposed the Orthodox Russian republic not only to the Petersburg political model, but to the "Romano-Germanic republic", in his attempt to present a special, Russian version, but renaming the president as "posàdnik", he did not change its functions. P. N. Savitsky was also disappointed with the monarchy and was not sympathetic to Russian monarchists. It is considered that the monarchist movement in the Russian Empire, mostly belonging to the "poor quality elements of the Russian society", and even with ots revival, and that it is too early to talk about the restoration of the monarchy.

Unlike N. S. Trubetskoy P. S. Suvchinsky sanctified "autocracy", dividing the terms "great-powerlessness" and "state": "Russia was a great-power, and never was a state. State habit of every nation is determined by the state resultant state consciousness of all individuals who represent it. The great-powerness is a

90 Трубецкой, Н. С. Мы и другие…, с. 80, 84; Наследие Чингисхана…, с. 264.
* posàdnik – a governor of a city or a province in ancient Russia, elected by the population.
** droit sacré - (French) – sacred law.
predetermined capacity of the power, the scale and the nature of the entire people. This is the unconscious sense of power, it is the significance of the mass of the people, displacing, removing the environment. It is unintentional self-affirmation of the droit sacré* of its own life [...] it is determined by the characteristics of the Russian soul and will". P. P. Suvchinsky’s political ideal was "people’s autocracy" as the best form, combining popular sovereignty and the principle of "leadership of the people". Unlike N. S. Trubetskoy P. S. Suvchinsky sanctified "autocracy", dividing the terms "great-powerness" and "state": "Russia was a great-power, and never was a state. State habit of every nation is determined by the state resultant state consciousness of all individuals who represent it. The great-powerness is a predetermined capacity of the power, the scale and the nature of the entire people. This is the unconscious sense of power, it is the significance of the mass of the people, displacing, removing the environment. It is unintentional self-affirmation of the droit sacré* of its own life [...] it is determined by the characteristics of the Russian soul and will". P. P. Suvchinsky’s political ideal was "people’s autocracy" as the best form, combining popular sovereignty and the principle of "leadership of the people". He introduced the concept of "autocracy" instead of "monarchy" without making a significant difference between them.

L. P. Karsavin sanctified the state as a bearer of culture and national consciousness: "To designate the systematic study of culture as a whole, we choose the old Aristotelian term of "polity "[...] in such a way to "skim" the antithesis, prevailing today, of the society and the state, and along with that the state is recognized as moment, quality and attribute defining the unity and integrity of the cultural body".

L. P. Karsavin exposed the national consciousness of the new Russia and Eurasia as "unprecedented unity in their space and scope of the cultural world, the culture of the mainland, and the dream-land country". L. P. Karsavin defined ideology of Eurasianism as a "cultural-state" and Eurasian state is "the backbone of Eurasian culture."

L. P. Karsavin paid special attention to the pedagogical functions of the state. In Eurasia, it should educate the bearers of the Eurasian culture, not "universal humans"; in that respect L. P. Karsavin distinguished himself from F. M. Dostoevsky. Karsavin’s conception; any education involved "suggestion, coercion, even violence."

---


When talking about the state, L. P. Karsavin used the term "multiethnic whole" by slightly modifying the notion of N. S. Trubetskoy for "multiethnic personality": "The State is required form of the personal life of the people or the multiethnic whole [...] the state is different from the Church as self-organization of sinful world". To L. P. Karsavin the state was "relative good" that "is not evil, but it is sinful".\(^{93}\)

In his repudiation of democracy L. P. Karsavin was a follower of the most pronounced Russian conservative of the late 19th century Konstantin Pobedonostsev, for both of them it was the "biggest lie" of their time. Political ideal L. P. Karsavin was the Orthodox monarchy.

N. N. Alekseev saw the etatism as anti-bougeois and anti-liberal, in that he saw the mission of the state which, in the words of P. P. Suvchinsky should "lead the people". The Eurasian state for N. N. Alekseev was of "demonic character [...] built on deep national foundations and corresponding to the "popular will".\(^{94}\) The term "demonic" was introduced in the Eurasian literature by Ya. D. Sadowsky. N. N. Alekseev was a follower of him. Unlike N. S. Trubetskoy N. N. Alekseev did not idealize pre-Petrine Russia. The Muscovite absolute monarchy, according to him, was a pagan idea, faithfully reproducing the absolutism of the ancient East. N. N. Alekseev also distinguished himself from Lev Tikhomirov, who denied the pagan monarchy at the expense of the Orthodox one. The moral element was represented in the Eastern monarchical idea in no less degree than in the Russian one.

The political ideal of N. N. Alekseev was the "guaranteeing state", the perfect state which ensures its socio-political mission. N. N. Alekseev developed further P. I. Novgorodtsev’s idea of the social state.

The Eurasians reached the ultimate etatism and antiliberalism in their formulation of 1927, which affirmed the "principle of court depending on the state".\(^{95}\)

P. M. Bitsilli moved away from the Eurasianism because of his negative attitude towards etatism: "The Bolshevik statism, the expansion of the state at the expense of "the people " is liked by great many people [...] Our new

\(^{93}\) Карсавин, Л. П. О педагогике. – Евразийская хроника, 1926, № 4, Прага. ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. № 10, л. 105; Церковь, личность и государство. – В: Сочинения, с. 416.

\(^{94}\) Алексеев, Н. Н. Собственность и социализм. Опыт обосновании социально-экономической программы евразийства. Париж, 1928, с. 71; Евразийцы и государство. – В: Русский народ и государство. М., 2000, с. 178.

\(^{95}\) Евразийство (формулировка 1927 г.). – Евразийская хроника, 1927, № 9, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 13, л. 63.
nationalists do not see that increasing the expense of people, state is thus killing the nation, as a nation is not ready property, an amount of traditions, everyday habits and the like, but a process, and only with its own forces, in a constant self-determination, in "daily repeated plebiscite", as brilliantly put by Renan, it is realized. P. M. Bitsilli shared the liberal views of N. A. Berdyaev, for whom man stands over the state, and not vice versa.96

If for N. S. Trubetskoy and P. S. Suvchinsky the statism was a political-religious order, for L. P. Karsavin it was cultural, national one, and for N. N. Alekseev - sociopolitical one, for P. N. Savitsky it was primarily an economic one. In response to the accusation by N. A. Berdyaev of the "utopian statism" of the Eurasianism, P. N. Savitsky gave his view: "Being an etatist does not mean you can not admit anything, that is not the state. It means to eliminate certain forms of state activity and foremost - the crucial role of the state in the economy, in the form of "control" and in the form of state property". P. N. Savitski explained the anti-etatism of N. A. Berdyaev as "the intelligentsia’s fear of state".97

P. N. Savitsky had introduced the concept of "economic statism". The essence of power under it was to be achieved intuitively. The political ideal or intuition of P. N. Savitsky was "making the state economy Orthodox (opravosavljenie)", which was a synthesis between the "power of faith and habits of the state economy", which was to combine "tradition and revolution". By means of the "economic statism" P. N. Savitski legitimized the Eurasianism's orientation toward socialism, which was exhibited during the second half of the 1920s, and especially in the 1930s, thus betraying the ideas of N. S. Trubetskoy and P. P. Suvchinsky.

With the exception of Ya. A. Bromberg, the common political ideal of all the Eurasians was the "ideocracy" or the "ideopravstvo".

N. S. Trubetskoy specified as one of the foundations of Eurasianism the replacement of the modern democratic system with an "ideocratic system": "By democracy they mean an order under which the ruling strata is selected on the basis of popularity in certain circles of the population, and the basic form of selection is of economic nature, namely the competition. The "ideocracy" implies an order under which the ruling strata is selected on the basis of devotion to a common idea - dominatrix". N. S. Trubetskoy saw the ideocracy as a transitional state that united "people of Weltanschauung": "Every order can be O.

96 Бердяев, Н. А. Утопический этатизм евразийцев. – Путь, 1927, № 8, с. 143.
97 Савицкий, П. Н. В борьбе за евразийство. Париж, 1931, с. 45, 51–52.
considered as a "transitory one". Most probably ideocratic order will over time be replaced with another one". 98.

N. N. Alekseev defined ideocracy as a "religious-philosophical Weltanschauung of a grand style", based on the deep historical and traditional principles of Eurasian culture [...] "ex Orientis lux" coupled with Western "Enlightenment". 99.

P. N. Savitsky saw ideocracy from an emigrant perspective as an idea that had to replace "the state, the centre and the leader until our state, centre and leader are not actually created, transformed into an idea". 100.

The Eurasians were subjects of the idea that Russia-Eurasia would be the perfect ideocracy. Ideocracy was an attempt to prove the superiority of Eurasianism over the historical idea of communism. The attitude towards the revolution and Bolshevism, socialism and communism were integral part of the identification of the entire Russian emigration, of which the Eurasians were a part. All the Eurasians who remained in the movement until the end, took a firm stand behind the need for revolution as a factor in the creation of a new Russia. Unlike the emigration wallowing in nostalgy for the greatness of the empire the Eurasians were not willing its restoration. The Eurasianism was to continue the true revolution of consciousness which the Bolsheviks had interrupted.

The revolutionaries of consciousness about the Bolsheviks revolution

While imperial Russia did not solve the many of the socio-economic issues addressed by the Bolsheviks, the Soviet Russia left the Russian national question unresolved. According to the Eurasians the end of the revolution will come only when the Russian national idea would be rediscovered through the Eurasianism. P. P. Suvchinsky did not evaluate the revolution from a socio-political perspective. According to him the meaning of the revolution was in its
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"national-metaphysical nature", and its secret – in its "national-global result".\textsuperscript{101}

P. M. Bitsilli considered as one of the merits of the Eurasians that they "belong to people who not only understand that there is no “return to past”, but had been imbued with the belief that the Russian Revolution is not just a “shock”, “cataclysm”, “liquidation” of something, etc., but a “vital process”. P. M. Bitsilli assessed the Eurasians as being "sincere", "talented" and having "genuine culture".\textsuperscript{102}

N. A. Berdyaev followed P. M. Bitsilli in recognizing the Eurasianism’s merit of being the only post-revolution tendency in Russian emigration, while all the other ones were pre-revolutionary in their ideological convictions. Post-revolutionary nature of the Eurasianism made it participant in creating of a new religious-national intelligentsia, which was for N. A. Berdyaev, its contribution.\textsuperscript{103}

The Eurasians were willing to realize the creative potential of the revolution, whose main significance was for them religious; that was the thesis, supported by all the authors of the collection “Exodus to the East” of 1921. The difference between them was exactly which revolution they were upholding. N. S. Trubetskoy, P. P. Suvchinsky, and P. N. Savitsky were talking about the October Revolution, while P. M. Bitsilli accepted only the February Revolution as a true one: “The recreation of the Russian nation is conceivable only through continuing the work of the February Revolution [...], it was a common impulse, in which the "nation" was realized for a brief moment. But only for a moment [...] The purpose for which the "nation" was realized was purely negative. The will for replacing the power detached from the people with a nationwide one was gone. Moreover, there was a will to prevent that".

P. M. Bitsilli compared the February Revolution to the Great French one of 1789, in terms of setting national goals. While in France “the revolution became permanent nationwide cause, facilitating the process of specifying the horizontal barrier between “nation” and “empire”, in Russia the revolution removed that barrier and with that “nation” itself. In France, “the empire” was reborn into “nation”. In Russia - the "nation" disappeared! And only the "empire remained". The other Eurasians in a conservative fashion denied the French Revolution as an European experience that can be applied in Russia.

In P. M. Bitsilli’s Eurasianism the new era was symbolized by the revolution. The Romantic era revolution was social, political, national, while the new, post-
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modern revolution, according to him, should be "a revolution not of individuals and social collective bodies, but a revolution of the cultural spheres and their inherent "ideas" and spiritual qualities".104

The only one among the old Eurasians to take a firm stand against the revolution was G. V. Florovsky: "The Russian Revolution is not a universal world revolution, to signal the opening of a period of "paradise on earth", but a local, Russian misfortune, only an elemental accident, and not a result of someone's personal malice". The religious philosopher condemned the revolution as a "satanic element".105

L. P. Karsavin who had joined Eurasianism later on; also did not accept the revolution because of religious considerations. He denied revolution as anti-Christian because its being destructive, and for being the peak of Europeanization of Russia. For him the true Christian should be conservative in one’s politics.

The Eurasians did not deny that the revolution was a fruit of Western ideals, but they rationalized it in terms of Russian values. P. N. Savitsky noted that "there is a great contradiction historique* in the fate of the Russian Revolution: conceived as a conclusion of the "Europeanisation", the revolution, in terms of actual implementation, meant dropping of Russia out of the European way of life". The importance of the revolution P. N. Savitsky saw in distancing of Russia from the "Russian liberal idea", which with the aid of Eurasianism should had lead to the triumph of Orthodoxy, that is, of the East over the West.

In the 1030s, when the P. N. Savitsky had abandoned the idea of Eurasianism as an alternative to Bolshevism and presented it as a possible successor to the Soviet state, which was considered as a phase of Eurasianism, and the USSR was placed side by side with the Russia-Eurasia, he broadened his vision of revolution. The revolution was then presented as a means of emancipation from provincial complex of Eurocentrism: "Wasn’t the revolution made, in order to relieve the Russo-Eurasian “leading strata” of that complex?" For the Eurasians the French Revolution was "bloodthirsty" and "child of rationalism", while the Russian Revolution put an end to the Europeanization of Russia.106


* contradiction historique (French) – historical contradiction.

106 Евразийство. Опыт систематического изложения. – В: Пути Евразии..., с. 391, 406, 401.
The revolution, however, continued the Europeanizing mission of the state set by Peter I, but while under the empire Europeanization affected only the privileged aristocracy and the raznochintsi (the intellectuals not belonging to the gentry in imperial Russia), after 1917 it became a mass process and affected the people as a whole.

The bearer of the revolution, the Bolsheviks, also brought dissension among the Eurasians who did not reach a single assessment of their role. N. S. Trubetskoy, G. V. Florovsky, P. M. Bitsilli made completely negative assessments of Bolshevism. P. P. Suvchinsky, N. N. Alekseev, L. P. Karsavin and P. N. Savitsky accepted the Russian character of Bolshevism, contrasting it to the European communism.

N. S. Trubetskoy considered the "people’s Bolshevism" in Russia and in Asia, as a revolt of the poor against the rich, and of “those despised against the despisers": "For the Russian people, the word “bourzhuy” (bourgeois), means not a rich man, but a person of different culture, who considers himself superior by virtue precisely belonging to this culture. With the Asians it is even more striking". The Bolsheviks, or the leaders of the revolution, were part of the intelligentsia, which had not changed its mind, which was to N. S. Trubetskoy the purpose of a true revolution.

N. S. Trubetskoy did not profess the social ideas of Bolshevism, because they were placed above the national ones, nor could he adopt it take from a religious point of view: "Bolshevism is a destructive movement, the Eurasianism – a creative one [...] The Bolshevism is a theomachist movement, the Eurasianism – a religious movement, God-affirming one [...] The culture subject to revocation, the Bolsheviks called "bourgeois", and the Eurasians - "Romano-Germanic", and culture that must take its place, the Bolsheviks considered "proletarian", and the Eurasians - "national".

The Bolsheviks remained “in the grip of European prejudices”. N. S. Trubetskoy disagreed with the definition of Eurasianism given by his opponents as an "Orthodox Bolshevism". The formal similarity was in "the rejection of all the culture that existed in Russia immediately before the revolution [...] in calling for the emancipation of the peoples of Asia and Africa, enslaved by colonial countries".107

N. S. Trubetskoy did not agree with the linking of the Eurasianism and the "National Bolshevism", made in a quite conformist way in 1926 by P. N. Savitsky: "By "National Bolshevism" they are used to see a special variety of "Smena Vekh"-ism ("Changing of Signposts"). With no etymological analysis one can amend that persisting meaning [...] Why should we change that Christian name of ours with a more than ambiguous thievish nickname?".

107 Трубецкой, Н. С. Мы и другие …, с. 88, 85; Письма и заметки …, с. 14.
P. N. Savitsky recognized, though yet privately, in a letter to P. B. Struve of 1921, that he was "one of the few representatives of the Russian emigration who are supporters of N. V. Ustryalov". P. N. Savitsky and the National Bolsheviks were frustrated by the impotence of A. V. Kolchak and A. I. Denikin. Even then P. N. Savitsky was "inclined to tie together the future of Russia with the future of Soviet power"\textsuperscript{108}, because there was no choice.

N. S. Trubetskoy was opposed to the artificial distinction between the terms "Communist" and "Bolshevik", made by L. P. Karsavin, which was also the formula "For the Bolsheviks, against the Communists" of N. V. Ustryalov and the representatives of the "Smena Vekh".

G. V. Florovsky shared the opinion of N. S. Trubetskoy, and exposed Bolshevism as a non-Russian phenomenon and a "cultural perversion". G. V. Florovsky, however, was looking for the roots of "National Bolshevism" not in political assessments, but in metaphysics. Its overcoming should be done "not by empirical arguments and accounts, not even through abstract philosophizing about the law and the state, but only through the fiery "test of spirit" [...]

At the heart of "the adoption of the revolution" lies sick soul and to understand this disease, and to seek healing for it in tense pursuit of religious aspiration, is the only way to make oneself a real builder of the future of Russia".

The strength of Eurasianism, according to G. V. Florovsky, was in its apolitical nature. The Eurasian Weltanschauung could not be compared with National Bolshevism: "To seek to place it to the right or to left means to distort its true sense just as barbarically, as once was done by those opponents of the "Smena Vekh", who saw in it political sermon of the reaction or the voice of anti-social fatigue. To insert now the cultural and philosophical issues into the patterns of political tactic, would be tantamount to spiritual suicide. Or we can revive in cultural way and to be "inspired, or Russia is already dead".\textsuperscript{109}

P. P. Suvchinsky characterized Bolshevism and Communism as Russian phenomena, but if the former was "a phenomenon deeply popular in its element", the latter was "the last image, which adopted by the intelligentsia in its fanatical upholding the principle of egalitarianism and universalism".\textsuperscript{110} 

The confrontation was a populist one, the opposition was at people- intelligentsia.

\textsuperscript{108} Савицкий, П. Н. Еще о национал-большевизме. Письмо П. Струве. – В: Политическая история русской эмиграции…., 242–243.

\textsuperscript{109} Флоровский, Г. В. В мире исканий и блуждений. Знаменательный спор ("Переписка из двух углов" Гершензона и Иванова). – Русская мысль, 1922, № 4, с. 146; Письмо к П. Б. Струве об евразийстве. –Русская мысль, 1922, № 1–2, с. 269.

\textsuperscript{110} Сувчинский, П. П. Эпоха веры. – В: Исход к Востоку, с. 91; Сила слабых…, с. 63.
L. P. Karsavin did not give a simple assessment of Bolshevism. He saw the Russian connection in the "inherently Russian maximalism", in the "contempt for reality and its ruthless destruction in the name of an unattainable ideal". L. P. Karsavin divided the Bolshevism into two types - "Peter I's Bolshevism", which denied and the "modern Bolshevism", which he had found a positive content: "Striving for the good of humanity, for justice and truth [...] the Bolshevism is a conservative force, saving the Russian state and the Russian nation, despite its ostensible aspirations for destruction". On the other hand, L. P. Karsavin disagreed with "narrow Europeanism" and superficial division of secular and religious, while the "Bolshevik communism remains a kind of religion".111.

The program of Eurasianism of 1926 still distinguished between the Bolshevism and the Communism, in favor of the former. The ideology of Communism was condemned as being "unscientific", and a "semi-literate interpretation of Hegel", while the Bolsheviks "restored" the policy of Moscow", that is, the policy of "the oppressed", while the policy Petersburg was of the 'barin' (gentry). In that respect, the program moved away from the ideas of N. S. Trubetskoy, the most original of the old Eurasians.

P. N. Savitsky and N. N. Alekseev were the closest to the conformist model of convergence and Sovietization of Eurasianism.

N. N. Alekseev was looking for Eurasian features in Russian Marxism-Leninism, and he explained the Russian element in the Bolshevism with the national mentality of the Russians: "The view according to which the individual is inextricably linked to the community, and that one is only justified when being sent to a social mission, to a "common cause", is rather typical for the Russian psychology". Thus Bolshevism, as opposed to Western Marxism, is not trying to be associated with individualism". The only reproach to Bolshevism was that "in practical practical terms it solves the problem of the relation between the individual and society, in a rather "Asian" way, that the political and economic system of Russian Communism condemned the person under the complete sway of the state".112.

P. N. Savitsky evaluated the "political suitability" of the Bolsheviks, and according to him the Eurasianism should keep the political apparatus of the Bolsheviks. P. N. Savitsky had entered into a dispute with P. B. Struve, who accused the Bolsheviks of having dismembered Russia, Savitsky claimed that they had "put it together", except for one tenth of the territory and one fifth of

111 Карсавин, Л. П. О сущности православия. – В: Сочинения, с. 366, 376.

112 Алексеев, Н. Н. Духовные предпосылки евразийской культуры. – Евразийская хроника, 1935, № 11, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. № 15, л. 9, л. 11.
her population. "People’s Bolshevism" differed from Western Marxism in its striving to reshape "all capitalist" Europe in its own, essentially, Rossiyski, pattern"113, with which the Eurasians were sympathy. Significantly, P. N. Savitsky uses the term "Rossiyski" when referring to the Bolsheviks or the USSR - he equated the terms "Eurasian" and "Rossiyanin" as successors of the "Soviet citizen". In that respect the Eurasians exerted indirectly influence on the political and political correct dictionary of future post-Soviet Russia. P. N. Savitsky’s apprehensions were focused on the economic policy of the Bolsheviks, which would lead to the "embourgeoisement" of the economy.

From the world of ideas in the world of everyday life

The economic programme of the Eurasians was developed in greater detail by P. N. Savitsky and N. N. Alekseev, who had carried the movement close to the left spectrum. They had abandoned N. S. Trubetskoy’s liberal views on economic development of Russia-Eurasia, who had vindicated the individual principle of ownership versus the collective one: "In the economic field the existence of Russia can probably prove to be the most" westernist".

N. S. Trubetskoy rejected the economic collectivism in the Narodniks’ (Populists) aspirations for the peasant commune: "We do not share the views of the Narodniks of the peasant commune as the form of economic life, to which according the Narodniks’ view the economic future of Russia must belong".114 The peasant commune economy in the views of N. S. Trubetskoy was not part of the Russian identity. In that respect, N. S. Trubetskoy and the other Eurasians distinguished themselves from N. Ya. Danilevsky, to whom the Russian peasant commune was "sacred and inviolable property".

P. N. Savitsky and N. N. Alekseev were able to impose their views, which became part of the official documents of the Eurasian movement. If we can say that early Eurasianism’s economic programme was liberal and closer to social liberalism in Russia of the late 19th century, the post-1925 Eurasianism categorically accepted a far left economic orientation, resulting from the contacts of the Soviet authorities with the Russian emigration and among the Eurasian circles.


114 Исход к востоку. Статьи Н. С. Трубецкого. – В: Пути Евразии…, с. 314.
The economic programme of P. N. Savitsky and N. N. Alekseev was built around three key problems: "private property", "peasant commune" and "nationalization".

The Eurasians rejected completely the principle of private property, which was becoming for adherents of the Russian Populist tradition. N. N. Alekseev called that fundamental liberal postulate a "bourgeois dogma", leading to "unlimited enrichment of some people and the impoverishment of others." In his denial, he came to the absurd claim that the reason for the revolution was not a lack of private property among peasants but on the contrary, the possession of such.

The ownership was for the Eurasians primarily a "social phenomenon". N. N. Alekseev distinguished the Russian conception of ownership from the Roman law: "The Roman individualism, as well as natural-law views of ownership have always been extremely alien to the legal views of the peoples of Russia-Eurasia". The concept of ownership was replaced by the concept of "possession". N. N. Alekseev pointed out that retaining of ownership was the principal error of socialism: "All socialist projects seek to reform ownership by changing its subjects". 115

The Eurasian program of 1926 also defined private property as a fundamental difference between Russia and the West, but it was only against its inviolability, and not against its existence in general. The term "property" was considered primarily from a political point of view, or from the point of view the state interest, which also fit not in the Roman law, but in the religious-ethical ideas in Russia. There could be no individual ownership.

P. N. Savitsky legitimated ideologically "the government intervention and control in the contracts for lease, the state ownership of land and businesses," in the economic doctrine of the Eurasianism 1926, but unlike N. N. Alekseev, he recognized the necessity for "individual ownership of land and businesses".

P. N. Savitsky introduced new terminology, he distinguished between "hozyain" (master) from the "entrepreneur", the former being declared as typically Russian, subject to the "hierarchy of absolute values", the latter, as Western and pertaining to a values free system. He imposed on the "hozyain" the patriarchal image of "batiushka" (father), while the "entrepreneur" was presented as the social unattractive image of Russian "burzhuy" (bourgeois). (A positive image of the bourgeois as a representative of middle class was not formed in the Russian public consciousness). The terms "hozyainodzerzhavie" (economycracy), "hozyain-lichnost" (master-individual), "hozyain-society" (master-society), which was application of the economic version of "super individual", "symphonic" or "Catholic", were introduced. The

115 Алексеев, Н. Н. Собственность и социализм…., с. 4, 17, 62.
economic ideal of P. N. Savitsky was "business catholicity", which he equated with "the ultimate goals of socialism and communism", with the exception of "economic (socialist-communist) collectivism". Ya. A. Bromberg shared fully the economic doctrine of Peter N. Savitsky, paying particular attention to the special meaning of the word "hozyain" in the Jewish colloquial dialect.

P. N. Savitsky and N. N. Alekseev took from N. S. Trubetskoy only rejection of the peasant commune. Both ideologues of the Eurasian economic programme were unanimous in their rejection of the principle of economic liberalism "Laissez faire, laissez passer"*, or "militant economism" as P. N. Savitsky called it. The idea of absolute freedom of the market from the state had never been particularly popular in Russia, even among liberals who in the late 19th - early 20th century adhered to the welfare state.

In their denial of the free trade for the sake of statism, the Eurasians came in 1926 to justify the military communism. They had found in it "something just" - "prohibiting the free trade [...], expropriating and requisitioning, putting the urban population on scanty rations, which allowed only the strongest and adaptable to survive, the Communists believed in the triumph of communism, and in fact they were unwitting tools of a state in process of building [...], otherwise they could not have saved from complete destruction at least some [...] of the old ruling strata, to keep the remains of the state apparatus".116

N. N. Alekseev, however, elaborated the rejection of private property with the full acceptance of nationalization: "The land is precisely the object that requires special state intervention [...] here the positive meaning of the measures called nationalization of the land can be seen". In his definition nationalization meant an "extension of the rights of the imperium, rather than turning the state into a land owner", or putting the imperium over the dominium. N. N. Alekseev did not recognize the socialization as an evil legacy of socialism, which proclaims "the state as great individual or collective land owner". The Eurasian land program, according to him, had to follow the principle of nationalization: "If by nationalization of land is meant the promotion of active agricultural policy with the recognition in principle of the right of the state on part of the land rent, then the Eurasians do not object to nationalization".117

* Laissez faire, laissez passer (French) – basic economic principle of Liberalism, envisaging market free of protectionist restrictions and non-intervention of the state in economy.

116 Евразийство. Опыт систематического изложения. – В: Пути Евразии…, с. 390.

117 Алексеев, Н. Н. Собственность и социализм…, 74–77.
P. N. Savitsky did not share the views of N. N. Alekseev of nationalization, and its principle was denied in the first official program of the Eurasianism in 1926. Both agreed, however, on the principle of "government-private system of economy", or "economic statism", adopted in the program of 1927, and confirmed by the formulation of 1932, and the Eurasians’ "systematic attempt at exposition" of 1936. The Eurasianism declared its support for "broad government regulation and control of the economic life", for "planned economy". The Eurasian planned economy would stimulate private initiative - something like an Eurasian NEP, under which "sovhozes" (soviet farms), "kolhozes" (collective farms), and individual farms, would exist together.

In the formulation of 1927, the Communist Party was blamed for "symptoms of capitalist rebirth", "capitao-communism", and an "individual economic principle", which was distinguished from both communism and capitalism, was offered. The "broad government regulation and control of economic life" was recognized as guarantor of economic development.

In 1932 P. N. Savitsky developed a periodization of the rhythms of economic development of Russia. He discerned periods of boom from periods of depression. The former lasted for 7 years (1893-1899, 1910-1916, 1927-1934), followed by the latter lasting for 10 years (1900-1909, 1917-1926). The "planned economy" did not affect this rhythm, but the USSR made a lot in the "construction of autarchy", which according to him was the goal of the Eurasianism. P. N. Savitsky’s fina prognosis was that only the Eurasian state-private system could avoid periods of industrial depression, and fully implement the ultimate Russian autarchy.

Through the "economic statism" P. N. Savitsky associated the Eurasians with socialism: "Because socialism, in its implementation in practice, is transformed into statism (development of state economy), its aspirations are consonant with the aspirations of the Eurasians [...] The term "socialism" in its European meaning is not sufficient to describe the social nature of Eurasianism. With equal right we can say that we reject socialism, and that we are super-socialist". The weakness of P. N. Savitsky the definition of "super" is reminiscent of that of Lenin’s definition of "arch". In both of them it is a Napoleonic complex of philosophical impotence, the result of which can not be different from the experience of Baron Munchausen to extract himself by pulling his own hair.


The closeness of the Eurasian’s economic programs with the Soviet model was part of the strategy of the Eurasianism to become successor of the USSR. Contrary to the opinion of N. S. Trubetskoy and G. V. Florovsky, the other Eurasians supported the politicization of the movement and failed to keep the declared indifference to politics of the original concept of ideology. The Eurasianism remained apolitical only in its first internal stage.

N. S. Trubetskoy, an opponent of the politicization of the Eurasianism, noted as early as 1926, the consequent weakness of the movement: "We have only a particular method of combining conflicting concepts and ideas. This is because our attention from the very beginning did not focus on creating our own system, but the relations of the our system still unfinished system to others already existing. And this in turn is because (partly by external causes, partly voluntary), we were more engaged with declarations". In that regard, N. S. Trubetskoy was a follower of K. N. Leontiev, who distinguished "our national cultural ideal from the crude and simple political ideal".

N. N. Alekseev was the only Eurasian, who admitted that in political terms the Eurasianism was "far-left". The rest continued to claim they were apolitical, even after 1927, when their political organization was created.

The need for an Eurasian party was motivated by the program in 1926 that the decaying communist ideology should have a worthy successor. The Eurasian party would be different from European parties with "its power not shared with any other party, and even excluding the existence of any such parties. It is a state-ideological union [...] without coinciding with the state apparatus."

The Eurasianism replaced the term "party" with "ruling team", which according to the definition in 1926 and 1932 would be formed "on the basis of ideology, personal fitness and merit". P. N. Savitsky tracked following gradation of "ruling teams" in Russia: the Varangians – the Moscow princes – the nobility - the Communist Party – the "Eurasian ruling team," which he called "the sociological views of the Eurasianism". L. P. Karsavin suggested that no multi-party system would be allowed, and the "Eurasian team" would be "the only ruling party". According to him Russia under the USSR was in state of transition "from the Communist Party to the Eurasian team." N. N. Alekseev justified the creation of Eurasian Party as a tactic, not as a philosophy. It was believed that in that respect the Eurasians should learn from the experience of the

---
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masons. He did not agree with an official ban on political parties, in the Eurasian state their creation simply would not be allowed. In 1927, P. M. Bitsilli welcomed the idea of a unified Eurasian party, but did not agree that it should be the only one.

The formation of the Eurasian ideology as totalitarian or at least as undemocratic one, during the second and the third internal stages, was parallel with the increasing sympathy of the Eurasians with the USSR.

It was already stated in the 1927 Eurasian formulation that the "Soviet society is the only possible system in Russia-Eurasia", which would be "a basis for development", to which to the "religiosity, sociality, personal stewardship", would be added. The slogans: "All power to the Soviets", "For the Bolsheviks against communism", "Russia and the Soviets, but without communism", were raised.

Out of the ideas of N. S. Trubetskoy only the claims of lineage from the Golden Horde, the first "all- Eurasian state", were left. N. S. Trubetskoy himself did not remain indifferent to the USSR. The old Eurasian had found the foreign policy of the USSR as positive with its "rejection of the false Slavophile and Panslavist ideologies [...] With regard to the attitude towards the East for the first time the correct tone, corresponding to the historical substance of Russia-Eurasia, has been taken: Russia for the first time recognized herself as a natural ally of the Asian countries in their struggle against the imperialism of the countries of the European (Romano-Germanic) civilization". N. S. Trubetskoy fully supported Soviet foreign policy because it was the successor to the imperial one, but following the tradition of the Eurasian replacement concepts, he did not use the term "colonization", and instead uses the term "fraternization", and instead the Slavophile he offered the "Eurasian" ideology.

With regard to the internal policy of the USSR N. S. Trubetskoy agreed with the abandonment of the Russification, on the one hand, and the "desire to eliminate the cultural gap between the upper and lower strata of society", on the other. The overall conclusion of N. S. Trubetskoy about the Soviet power, however, unlike most of the Eurasians was negative - the USSR remained the successor of Europeanizing mission of Peter I, "as it was before, the authorities see Russia as material for the construction of the building [...] communist country today [...] is the offspring of Romano-Germanic civilization".123

Ya. A. Bromberg was the only one strongly opposed to the Soviet power, for whom the Soviet Russia decided the Jewish question "externally", the USSR retained the Provisional Government’s measures eliminating the passport and
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institutional restrictions. The power in the USSR was "godless", and could not solve the "religious and eschatological question," like the Jewish one.¹²⁴

The Eurasianism’s anti-Europeanism was intensified in the mid-1920s. The modern European culture "in all its parts, except for the empirical science and technology", was declared decadent. To distinguish themselves from the West, the Eurasians contrasted the Soviet federative model with European ones, without specifying exactly which features were "Western" and which "Eurasian". It was about another external, formal replacement of terms: "The Eurasians vindicate the principles of federation and autonomy in their Soviet rather than in their European meaning". For the Eurasians the "federation" replaced the "empire".

N. N. Alekseev elaborated the thesis of the Soviet democracy as a realization of the Cossack ideal of state: the "state of the Soviets" became "a special form of the Russian Eastern democratism", and 1917 was a "Pugachev’s victory". The combination of Soviet democracy with autocracy was successful and should be maintained in the Russia-Eurasia.¹²⁵ That was the conclusion of the programme and Eurasianism in 1926: "The Soviet system, combined with a strong central power, multi-level elections and local professional associations".

The "Soviet democracy", as the Eurasians called the system of the Soviets in their programmes, was opposed to the European democracy. The "Western democracy is the work of professional politicians", in future Eurasia there would no need of such, a so called "Eurasian team" would be enough. The lack of any clear mechanism for the selection and control of that "team", the rejection of the separation of powers, and of pluralism, would allow the turning of that "Eurasian team" in virtual oligarchy.

The internal borders of the future Eurasian federation did not differ from those in the USSR. The Bolshevik "zoning" according to the Eurasians had solved the national separatism, and a "frenzied Russification". There was a hint in the programme of 1926 about a "revision" of the borders, but without specifying whether external or internal borders were meant. "Painless correction here and there, of the damaged borders of Eurasia."

Soviet borders, however, raise a number of issues today in the Russian Federation, and in the post-Soviet space. A typical example is Ossetia, which in the Russian Empire had common borders, while the USSR it was divided into Northern and Southern, and this now gives the Georgians the right to lay claim to the Ossetians.

¹²⁴ Бромберг, Я. А. Запад, Россия и еврейство. – В: Евреи и Евразия, с. 19.
¹²⁵ Алексеев, Н. Н. Русский народ и государство..., с. 107; На путях к будущей России (советский строй и его политические возможности). Пак там, с. 365.
Only the rejection of internationalism distinguished the Eurasian from the Soviet ideology. The Eurasians upheld the principle: "National system on a national basis".¹²⁶

Due to the similarity of the Eurasian programme of 1926 with the Communist Party one, L. P. Karsavin entered into a dispute with its principal author - P. N. Savitsky. The minutes of his questioning by a Cheka functionaries of 8 August 1949 recorded L. P. Karsavin’s statement: "I thought that the project of organization of the Eurasianism proposed Savitsky was not feasible since the Eurasian movement had not been yet formed, and his project of its constitution was copying of the constitution of the Communist Party of Russia, with which I absolutely did not agree. Later I thought my participation in the active anti-Soviet work of the Eurasianism was impossible, because I could not reckon the movement as serious one. I thought the task of the Eurasianism should be confined only in carrying out ideological work among Russian immigrants".¹²⁷

The tendency in the Eurasianism in the second half of the 1920s to oppose Bolshevism to Communism, developed in the 1930s into the opposition "Lenin-Stalin": "Soviet democracy is experiencing an acute crisis [...] everything that was original "Leninist" broken down. [...] it is inadmissible to be carried away with the "formal-democratic" facade of the new "Stalinist" state [...] the Eurasianism should give the Russian people's its "imperial idea".¹²⁸

The Eurasians thus preceded Khrushchev’s logic at Twentieth Congress of CPSU, when all the blame was cast on Joseph Vissarionovich, and the bright future remained behind the image of Vladimir Ilyich.

There was a new trend in the convergence of the Eurasianism with the Communist ideology, which indirectly shows the influence of Lubyanka on the movement. It was proved in the programme "Eurasianism and Communism", published anonymously and undated, with a Marxist approach and lexis, that "Eurasia added to the European communism its own, Eurasian features", that "Russian communism is the Eastern, Eurasian issue of "Western Marxism".¹²⁹


¹²⁷ Из протокола допроса Л. П. Карсавина. 8 августа 1949 г. – В: Политическая история русской эмиграции…, с. 299.

¹²⁸ Андрей Эфрон. От советской демократии к имперской идее. – Евразийская хроника, 1937, № 12, ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 16, л. 35.

¹²⁹ Евразийство и коммунизм. Б. а., б. г. ГАРФ, ф. 5783, оп. 2, д. 24, л. 2, л. 6 об.
The European Communism was the "final capitalism", which was decaying, and the Eurasian brand of Communism would become the future not only of Eurasia, but also of entire Europe. The Eurasian Communism was followed in the pamphlet by an extensive critique of capitalism by all the laws of dialectical materialism. The philosophy of "early" Eurasianism, which distinguished from Marxism and materialism, was forgotten. The Eurasian idea of the second half of the 1920s was already living without its authors.

The interest of Lubyanka to the Eurasianism was not limited to circumstantial evidence. In a memorandum to the Assistant Chief of KRO (Counterintelligence Department) of the OGPU, W. A. Styrne, of 5 February 1925, a concrete picture of the work of the organs with the Eurasians regarding Operation "Trust", was given.

The Operation "Trust" was one of provocations of the Cheka against the white emigration. In 1922, the Russian emigration learned about the existence of the "Union of the Monarchists of Central Russia" in the USSR, disguised under the name "Association of Moscow Municipal Credit", whence its name "Trust". In 1923, General P. N. Wrangel formed the "Russian All-Army Union", with a fight group, whose task was, together with "Trust", to penetrate into the USSR, in order to carry out espionage and sabotage. In 1924-1926, the "Trust" actually monopolizing the illegal contacts with White emigrants’ military organizations.

In 1925 the Eurasians also established contact with agents of the "Trust". The report of Cheka superior W. A. Styrne included the text of a resolution of the Eurasian Congress in Berlin of January 1925, where from the Eurasian fraction of the "Trust" were sent two Eurasians, one - "real monarchist" and the other - "our operative".

Information about the spreading of the Eurasianism among the emigration was also enclosed: "The Eurasianism is most widespread in Czechoslovakia and the Balkans, and at that the Eurasian agitation is met with sympathy in the Vrangel’s Army units, working in the mines, (by the way we should point out that in the spring of 1925 several members of the Eurasian Council, together with a representative of ours, had to make agitation trip in the Balkans). The Eurasians have several dozen agitators and propagandists in Prague itself, and several hundred neophite Eurasians, and up to 1,000 (out of 3,000 emigrants involved in politics) sympathizers".

The report concluded that the "Trust" is coalesced with the Eurasianism and our influence in the Eurasianism is definite, through it we can push through any
question, and the individual members of the Eurasian Council obey all our orders, and they will render us any assistance".130

The connections of the Eurasians with the "Trust" is also evident from the correspondence with P. N. Savitsky with P. S. Arapov. In a letter dated July 31, 1924 P. S. Arapov tried to convince the Eurasian leader of the necessity of such contacts: "It seems to me that you should not be alarmed by the combination of work along the line of oil* and along the line of the Trust [...] The whole problem lies in that it is the Trust to make oil organization that fosters the achievement of targets oil [...] I think we should move on to the tactics of the Masons, ie, no independent commercial enterprise and groups whose members gradually penetrate into all sorts of businesses".131

In early 1926 the Eurasian organization "Council of Five" differentiated itself from the "Trust" by a decree: "Unlike manufactury firms*, which in our opinion are ugly bodies living artificial and ghost-like life, the Trust is alive and healthy body born of the real conditions of Argentine reality [...] Unfortunately, the first year of our partnership with the Trust showed that our credit work among the people of this Trust did not achieve our main practical problem [...] we are deeply convinced that that oil credit for its further development and refinement over time will be the only credit to Argentina, that this credit is precisely the one which alone is able to replace the rival one. However, we know that today the oil more credit seem unacceptable for many, too many people".

Despite the refusal of direct involvement in the "Trust", "Council of Five" kept its intention to cooperate with the organization: "The termination of our credit work within the Trust, we are far from considering break with the Trust [...] we envisage our work in Argentina only in the form of cooperation with the Trust".132 In 1927, the "Trust" had been exposed as a representative of the GPU.

In 1937, when the scandal of the connections of the Russian emigration with the "Trust" had subsided, P. Savitsky distinguished himself from his role in the involvement of Eurasianism with the Cheka organization and condemned those

---

130 Из докладной записи помощника начальника КРО ОГПУ В. А. Стырне начальнику КРО ОГПУ А. Х. Артузову о контрразведывательных операциях "Ярославец" и "Трест". 5 февраля 1925 г. – В: Политическая история русской эмиграции..., 249 – 251.

131 Из письма П. С. Арапова П. Н. Савицкому. 31 июля 1924. – В: Политическая история русской эмиграции..., 248–249.

* In the jargon of the Eurasian " manufactury firm" meant immigrant organization, "Argentine reality" - Russian reality "credit work" - ideological work, "Argentina" – Russia, "competitors" – communists, and "oil credit" - Eurasian ideology.

contacts: "The talks and work "with everybody" in the emigration are fairly typical of the Trust [...] Anyway the Eurasians had nothing to do in this "immigrant-Trust mess" [...] Then I felt strongly that to save Eurasianism should once and for all to cut off the relations of the Eurasian organization with the entire "White Guard" of Zaytsov and K. [K = Kutepov].". 133

In 1953, the emmigrant magazine "Vozrozhdenie" has published an outline of a witness of the cooperation the Eurasians with the GPU. The editors specified at the outset that it was an account of September 1928, and that during his second going to the USSR its author died. As a precaution or not to use it as compromising material, all the names of emigrants were removed, except those of the Eurasians.

The outline was of the nature of operational investigation of the Eurasians ... And the editors admitted that the author had been to Russia, which without the knowledge of the GPU could not pass unpunished. The portraits of the Eurasians were far impartial. P. P. Suvchinsky was labeled as "a spoiled souteneur", "self enamoured", an "esthete from head to toe", P. N. Savitsky, as "hysterical person", well educated, "whose ideal was Lenin", and so on. According to the author, all negotiations with agents from Russia were led P. N. Savitsky (head of the Prague group), and P. P. Suvchinsky (head of the Paris group).

Only N. S. Trubetskoy was mentioned as the most respectable of the Eurasian leaders, or as their "moral regulator". The author did not have close contacts with the old Eurasian. The profile of the mass of the Eurasians was unsparing: "Most of them are nice people, their attitudes are sectarian, military discipline is fully introduced into the group. They are accustomed not to think [...] Besides, they are always silent, and won’t hiss even the most unpleasant meeting, but then they will report to the superiors. [...] In their own circle they are all geniuses, outside that circle – a flock and idiots [...] the overwhelming majority of participants are involved with the White movement". 134

Another connection of the Eurasianism with the GPU, besides the Operation "Trust", was the publication of the newspaper "Eurasia", which began in November 1928, i. e. immediately after the "Trust" was exposed. Editors of the "Eurasia" was Sergei Efron, an NKVD agent among the emmigration and the musicologist P. S. Suvchinsky. The Eurasians V. N. Ilyin and V. P. Nikitin were contributors to the "Eurasian". P. N. Savitsky and N. S. Trubetskoy did not recognize the paper as a representative of the Eurasian organization, but as "an apologia for Marxism" unacceptable to the religious consciousness. P. N.

133 Заметки П. Н. Савицкого о "Тресте". – В: Политическая история русской эмиграции..., с. 254.

134 А. Б. Евразийцы и трест. – Возрождение, 1953, № 30, с. 126, 123, 125.
Savitsky called the policies of "Eurasia", "salon communism"\textsuperscript{135}, which not only undermines the Eurasian idea, but took a position of "liquidator" of Eurasianism. N. S. Trubetskoy accused the newspaper of propaganda of ideas of Nikolay Fyodorov, or "fyodorovstvo", which was close to chiliasm. The newspaper was not popular, but it managed to set the emigration further against the Eurasianism. The effect of the fallacy was reminiscent of the time of Nicholas I, when in the eyes of the Russian society the magazine "Moskvityanin" of Mikhail Pogodin was a platform and voice of Slavophilism, erroneously associated with the official propaganda.

The connection of part of the Eurasianism with GPU not only complicate the attitude of the Russian emigration to the movement, but also contributed to its political collapse.

\textit{Typology of Eurasianism}

The Eurasian ideology is eclectic and it does not allow a single definition.

Eurasianism is \textit{conservative} with its three main elements: metahistoricism (cult of the past and historical providencialism), religious nationalism (Orthodoxy as a national identification), and sacralisation the state.

Eurasianism is a \textit{radical} with its far-left its political and economic agenda.

Eurasianism is \textit{imperial} with its geopolitical projection of the future of Russia - Russia for all the Eurasians, not just for the Great Russians, and with its Russian messianism.

Eurasianism is \textit{Russian} with its insisting on the leading role of the Russian people in an Eurasian state.

Eurasianism is \textit{provincial} or belonging to the \textit{Pochvenniches}tvo (Return to the Soil) with its anti-Europeanism (a result of unfinished process of nation building), with its isolationism (a result of the real condition of the emigration, which was one of enforced isolation), and negative identity (resulting from the psychology of vanquished - with N. Ya. Danilevsky after the Crimean war, with the Eurasians - after World War I and the revolution).

\textsuperscript{135} Савицкий, П. Н. “Газета “Евразия” не есть евразийский орган”. – В: Политическая история русской эмиграции…, 274–279.
Eurasianism is *universal* – its ultimate goal was the inheritance of Europe and geopolitical and cultural-philosophical terms. Eurasianism was a premonition of globalization!

Eurasianism is *original* – it had created a new mythology (it rejected completely the myth of entirely Slavic origin of the Russian people and Russian culture, on the one hand, and the leading role of the Slavic question in the Russian idea, combining the ideologeme "Moscow - the Third Rome" with "Russia-Eurasia"- the second Golden Horde, on the other), and proposing a new periodization of Russian history (outside the Eurocentric frameworks).

Eurasianism is *not original* – it had replaced the terminology without investing new meaning (instead of "colonization" - "fraternization", instead of "universal human" - "all-human", instead of "empire" - "federation", instead of "monarchy" - "autocracy", instead of "president" - "posadnik", instead of "ethnicity" - "face", instead of "super ethnos" - "multiethnic person", instead of "party" - "ruling team").

Eurasian philosophy is *European*! The rejection of rationalism, of positivism, and the theory of progress, or the theory of earthly paradise, situated the Eurasianism in the philosophical scheme of European idealism. In that respect, it was part of European philosophy and, paradoxically to its goals, it had integrated, and not sever Russia from Europe.

Eurasian culture is *European*! There is no Eurasian culture, there is Russian one, and Russian culture became European with the adoption of Christianity!

*Archetypes*. The Russian archetypes of Eurasianism are the Russian Romanticism of the early Slavophilism, the Russian messianism of P. Ya. Chaadaev and V. S. Solovyov, the Russian seeking for national self-determination through cultural and religious self-identification of Fyodor Dostoyevsky and K. Leontiev and through cultural self-determination N. Ya. Danilevsky. The European archetype is the German objective idealism of Schelling, that the "early" Eurasians turned into "historical" idealism.

*Genesis*. The genesis of Eurasianism started far before the official birth of the movement in 1921 – in the period between the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907 and the February and the October Revolution in 1917.

If the "old" Eurasian is to be briefly defined, he, like every Russian immigrant was like the "wandering Russian" of Fyodor Dostoevsky, whose
troubled spirit be soothed only after achieving "universal happiness." The Eurasian remained "subject to the idea".

The seeking for the Russian idea was the "pilgrimage to the holy places in history", according to the fine definition of Russian emigre G. P. Fedotov. The Eurasians were the generation of Russian emmigrants, which was formed as a religious-philosophical alternative to the politicization of the Russian idea since 1905, and can be called the "generation of God seekers".

Notwithstanding the external resentment against the cultural monism of Europe, which is nothing more than a combination of the values of antiquity with those of Christianity, the "generation of God seekers" remained a part of European culture, and the Eurasianism - part of the Russian Europeanization of Asia, Europeanization towards the sun.

Translated by ROUMEN GENOV
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