Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 4 (2009 2) 595-600
~ ~ ~

УДК 130.2

Features of Eurasian Traditions in System of Western Traditionalism of the First Half of Twentieth Century

Julia T. Chanchikova*
Krasnoyarsk Administration,
93 Marx st., Krasnoyarsk, 660049 Russia [1]

Received 6.11.2009, received in revised form 13.11.2009, accepted 20.11.2009

In the article author suggests version about presence of own set of traditions in classical Eurasian project. Notions of «traditionalism» and «conservatism» are considered in it. Short review of western traditionalism of the first half of the century and also comparative analysis of features of Eurasianism and western traditionalism are presented. In result of it conclusion about singularity of Eurasian traditionalism and its falling out from general context is made. In the article author is based on works of Eurasianists of classical period and Neo- Eurasianists and also on investigations of European and Russian scientists in area of traditionalism.

Keywords: Eurasianism, Neo-Eurasianism, tradition, traditionalism, conservatism, «conservative revolution», symphonic person, Eurasia, place-development, geopolitics, conciliarism, Eastern Orthodox Church, church, sacral, patriotism, religion, ideology, culture, neo-traditionalism, neo-conservatism, truth, primordial true, Idea-Ruler.

Recently interest to classical Eurasian project from scientists, politicians, writers and philologists is observed. At the same time system explanation of Eurasian phenomena is absent. Eurasian project which has caused wide polemic since the moment of its appearance is still «inconvenient» for scientists who want to include works of Eurasianists into certain limits. Eurasianism is not confined in limits of liberalism, national patriotism, Marxism and any models social development.

Nevertheless possibility of Eurasianism considering in limits of traditionalistic contour exists so far as traditionalism is enough wide philosophical notion included large range of ideas.

In generally accepted interpretation the traditionalism is world outlook and social and philosophical direction which upholds keeping of cultural, social, historical and religious traditions. In the turn Eurasianism has been considered philosophical current. Eurasianists considered themselves «intellectual movement».

Traditionalism as religious and philosophical current had appeared in France. In its sources members of Roman Catholic theology of nineteenth century – J. de Maistre, L. de Bonald, F. de Olivier, F. de Chateaubriand had stood. This generation of traditionalists had influenced on establishment of European culture and mattered for Russian thought very much. Undoubtedly Eurasianism occupies smaller place in the history

* Corresponding author E-mail address: Julia@admkrsk.ru

by time and has numbered about century since beginning of its appearance. As for classical Eurasian project its activity lasted ten years.

Ideas of traditionalists in nineteenth century had had wide social perception due to conservative romantics. Romanticism had not been completely traditionalistic oriented ideology. However according to E. Troeltsch «turn to idea of organism and tradition» (Averyanov, 2003:123) had become prevailing tendency inside romanticism especially German one. Namely conservative romantics had created classical European conservatism which had influenced on formation of Russian one of nineteenth century. As Russian conservatism of nineteenth century had found reflection in classical Eurasian project the connection between European traditionalistic world outlook base and Russian Eurasian thought are traced.

Traditionalism and conservatism are close notions. Nevertheless there is set of efficiently separating differences. Conservatism as opposed to traditionalism, which is system of philosophical and world outlook ideas, is difficult and multifaceted social phenomena. It can be considered in few dimensions: as the whole set of physical qualities of individual, as political ideology and finally as social and political movement.

While Mannheim wrote «traditionalism is general physiological position which expresses of different individuals as tendency to hold the past and avoid innovations» (Mannheim, 1994:597). Traditionalism is usually considers like wider notions and that Mannheim called «conservatism» is understood one of variety of traditionalism.

According to A. Dasnoy typology it should be distinguished integral and ideological traditionalism. Integral traditionalism reproduces initial paradigms of activity as a rule they are given by initializing way through initiation and sacral rites. It is peculiar to traditional society and closely connects with lifestyle of traditional society. As Dasnoy considers the ideological traditionalism as opposed to integral one is «world outlook of post-revolutionary epoch and appears only in society which cannot already be called traditional» (Kara-Murza et al., 1995:97). It is conscious traditionalism, ideology which defends certain spiritual, political and social principles. Such dual reading of traditionalism as on the one hand «before responsive» social self-organization and on the other hand ideological reaction of society on invasion of allogenic, heterogeneous or radically changing world order factor has established among majority of modern thinkers. Following Dasnoy typology the classical Eurasian project can be referred to variety of ideological traditionalism because Eurasianism is not in limits of traditional society. On the contrary the project developed in conditions of geographical remoteness from country which became impulse for creative thought of philosophers. Eurasianists glorified Eurasia and consciously cultivated traditional lifestyle of mythical state-continent.

The second stage of scientific interest to problem of «tradition» on West was in the first half of twentieth century and became well-known as social and philosophical direction neo-traditionalism. Neo-traditionalism in twentieth century developed under the sign of deep studying of non-European sacral traditions. It often led scientists to the most radical conclusions. Present state of human civilization was imagined by neo-traditionalists wittingly distorted and depraved, without sacral traditional base. The feature of neo-traditionalists of twentieth century was uncompromising stand in respect to modern world. It dramatically distinguished from traditionalists of previous century who had expected to a large extent on success of their ideology through conservative politics of «restoration» and «reconstruction». If line of restoration had been characteristic for traditionalists-classics then in situation of triumphing modernism of twentieth century neo-traditionalism could mean only

complete rupture with prevalent ideological tendency – uncompromising «conservative revolution». In some part it can be found features of neo-traditionalism in Eurasianism. Philisophers-Eurasianists also deeply penetrated into century layers in search of answered on modern urgent questions and easily found parallel between Eastern Orthodox Church, Hinduism and Islam, between Moscow state and steppe imperia of Genghis Khan. Meanwhile revolutionary character of Eurasianism has been less radical. Eurasianism has been full of amazing, unusual for neo-traditionalism, optimistic belief in spiritual renewal both of the whole society and each separate individual. In Eurasianists opinion their idea was endowed with strong constructive power which transformed internal and external worlds. In the same time Eurasianists has not already been satisfied by conservative course of «restoration» and «reconstruction» and craved for renewal through conversion to Eurasian truths.

As ideas of neo-traditionalists and neo-conservatives which proclaimed «conservative revolution» the doctrine of philosophers-eurasianists in USSR was closed for mass studying for a long time. Eurasianism was not mentioned even in polemic articles which condemned alien world outlook ideas. One of the reasons of such blind isolation was reflection of «conservative revolution» on Eurasian project.

Actually superficial comparison can direct on some community of German neo-traditionalists and Eurasian scientists. First of all it is interest to East. However if neo-conservatives searched superpower on Tibet then Eurasiantists searched corroboration of generality of Asian and Russian. It gave reason for formation of state-continent Eurasia. In that point neo-traditionalists were much closer to French philosopher-mystic René Guénon then to Eurasianists who has never searched secrets of sacral practices and created their doctrine as open for all bliss.

Philosophical direction of traditionalism connected with activity of Rene Guenon and his followers is not accepted to distinguish into some separate stage of development of understanding of «tradition» problem. However ideas of the philosopher influenced much on traditionalists' discourse of both western scientists and Russian ones. So his school can be considered the third, special stage of development of traditionalism ideas in twentieth century.

Premordial tradition namely sacred knowledge the source of which was the Creator became special interest of philosopher-esoterist Rene Guenon. The author said «all 'esoteric traditions have one origin and essentially can not contradict each other» (Guenon, 2000:240).

Thus it is possible to talk that numbered two centuries of existence traditionalism developed within three principal stages and always was stimulus for research thought and also for appearance new ideological and political currents. A lot of variants and wide outline of limits of traditionalism allowed joining different and at times discrepant members of philosophical schools and currents.

In spite of tradition and traditionalism have been studied by both Russian and foreign scientists enough we do not find examples of examination of Eurasianism within European traditionalism. It can be supposed that the reason of it became some isolation of Eurasianism of the first half of twentieth century in general traditionalists' line, its brightly expressed individuality and Eurasianism which based on key notion «place-development». However referring of Eurasianism to traditional brunch is possible in connection with that the theme of tradition takes special place in Eurasian project. Eurasianists based on Slavonic ideas in lots of points considered Eastern Orthodox traditions the point of meeting of Eurasian community. In their opinion ideas of Russian Orthodox Church unlike Catholicism

and especially Protestantism were not abstract and ascetic in the sense of negation of world and activity. And the most important was that bases of true ideology which held life examine came from true Russian Orthodox faith. According to Eurasianists way from idea to life completely coincided with way from faith to life.

Postulating Eastern Orthodox Church as supreme and singe in its rightness confessing of Christianity Eurasianists also did not follow orthodoxies and reject wholly other Christian directions and other confessions. One of the important methodological statements of Eurasianists was conclusion that different religious positions could be differently realized by different nations. Here Eurasians reached thought about primitivity of different nations in taking one or another bases. Latter must correspond to culture, mentality and historical fate of the nations.

The main principle of Eurasianists was conciliarism and simphonism. In their opinion the way to Eastern Orthodox Church opened for all people. Return in lap of Eastern Orthodox Church happened through free self-opening of individuals in Christ. Thus they did not deny even individualism which characterized Catholicism and Protestantism since it was put into all-embracing scheme of simphonism. According to Eurasian version individualism of bright participants of general symphony was leveled by generality of action. If for Eurasians chatholics and protestants were capable through sufferings of Christ to come to Eastern Orthodox Church then Buddhism and Islam were closer in their interpretation to Orthodox Christianity. They were similar in world outlook approaches. Eurasianists considered that Islam and Buddhism as well as Orthodox Church had idea of world transfiguration but not change one world by another (pagan world by Christian one). They found the similarity between Orthodox ideas of self-sacrifice, humility, submissiveness to god's will and Asian teaching about karma and fate.

Only with one Eurasianists did not agree sharply and raised an objection to; it was proclaiming certain kind of religion as single true, as some ecumenical religion which pretended on the role of base for building all-human culture.

Eurasianists were far from reading of Primordial tradition by traditionalists. They did not consider that any world initial Truth, united for all nations, lay in the base of their teaching. Moreover Eurasianists tried to formulate own original initial Truth, personal Primordial tradition. It was Eurasian postulate about Idea-Ruler. It consisted in special role of Russia which was enough for to live and sacrifice for good of Russia-Eurasia. The notion of «Russia-Eurasia» became for Eurasianists their initial, authentic traditions, point of development and its final purpose. It became Eurasian Universe. On base of their view of initial tradition Eurasianists succeeded in formation of own set of traditions. They got the name «Eurasian traditions». Elements of it varied both in the time and of different its followers. At the same time following statements were its components: explanation of identity of Russia-Eurasia as special cultural, historical, geographical world; renunciation of Europocentrism and express interest to cults of East as closer to spirit of Russian civilization, but not identical to it; inclusion into Russian civilization side by side with Slavonic nations «Turanid» ones as rightful and active element of its historical establishment and development; idea of particular historical way and mission of Russia; proclaiming of Eastern Orthodox Church by pivot of Russian identity and base of its revival; ideocratical conception of state which included idea about state of «social justice and truth» subordinate to supreme idea-ruler, idea of conciliarism and symphonic person; studying of geopolitical Russian features as Eurasia and

imposition of new category «place-development». Whether does the set of «Eurasian traditions» contradict to Eastern Orthodox tradition? But its proclaiming as pivot of Russian identity could turn out extremely declarative or Eastern Orthodox tradition could transform in the course of formation of original Eurasian model of traditions.

Eastern religious tradition united all areas of Eurasian project. About the half of article in collection «Outcome to East» covered religious questions. The same proportion was in following collections. Eurasianists emphasized more than once that it was not true to accent geographical aspect connected with introduced by them notions «Eurasia» and «place-development» in their teaching.

Following to Eastern Orthodox tradition was clearly emphasized by Eurasianists in collection «Russia and Latinism» (1923). It became reaction on Vatican ingratiating with Soviet Russia. Considering burning questions of relations of two Christian Churches Eurasianists polemicized with V. Solovyev and set of his ideas against their «Outcome to East».

In Eurasian conception Russian Orthodox Church was recognized dominate and connecting origin of Russian culture. And namely it had to become base of building of new Russia which Eurasianists considered rightly to name Eurasia. From these thoughts the third feature of Eurasians understanding of Eastern Orthodox tradition followed. It was idea about special nearness of Eastern Orthodox Church to Eastern religions. The main argument of this point was that Eurasiansts referred Eastern regions to pagan. N. Trubetskoy wrote: «Since the paganism is not deliberate and stubborn renunciation of Eastern Orthodox Church and haughty staying in its separatism; the paganism yields to Orthodox call sooner and easier then Western Christian world and does not treat to Orthodox Church with same hostility» (Pashyenko, 2003:69). That is the paganism was considered as «potential» Orthodox Church by Eurasianists. Eurasians traditions can be built in certain closed structure. Initial point is Russia-Eurasia. There is further consideration of Russia-Eurasia from the point of view of Eurasian teaching about individual, symphonic and conciliar persons, according of which Russia-Eurasia was considered as symphonic person. For Eurasians clear hierarchy determined by functional completeness and specificity of activity one or another person existed in system of symphonic persons. Christian culture as symphonic person realized itself in line of the lowest symphonic persons – in different cultures. In its turn the culture realized itself in nations. The nations actualized in the culture, Christianity, moved to highest point of conciliarism existence and perfected on good of Russia-Eurasia. The conciliarism united social persons and helped them to rush to common spiritual center which was Eurasian primordial tradition, Russia-Eurasia. Common purposes and ways of their achievement, solidarity and serving to neighbor, priority of conciliar whole of higher order and finally sacrificiality became the main principle of unity of social persons. According to Eurasianists common spiritual center was Eastern Orthodox Church. But it was the same as Russia-Eurasia because of both identification and actualization of Russia-Eurasia happened with Eastern Orthodox Church and following to Orthodox traditions. Except conversion to Orthodox traditions and reading them in own original context Eurasianists became successors of Russian geopolitical traditions. After many Russian rulers, travelers, scientists, commanders, state officials Eurasianists admitted special role of Siberia in Russian development. Moreover namely geography, national and cultural features of Siberia became for Eurasianists one of confirmation of truth of their basic statements.

Worked out historical conception of Eurasianism G. V. Vernadskiy considered that «all history of Eurasia is consecutive set of attempts of creation of common all-Eurasian state» (Sonicheva, 1991:49).

In developing of Siberia Eurasianists saw national and cultural regularity. N. S. Trubetskoy noted some whole of Eurasia in anthropological, national and psychological aspects. He wrote: «Population of this part of the world is dissimilar and belong to different races. Difference between Russians from one side and Buryats or Samoyeds from other one is very big. But it is typical that uninterrupted chain of intermediate and transitional links exists between these extreme points» (Trubetskoy, 1995:219). Trubetskoy distinguished general for Eurasian nations elements Turanid psychology for which inability to detach the faith from way of life, soul clarity and calm were characteristic. Moreover Eurasianists saw in consolidation of Siberia in Russia one of stages of «gathering of separated parts of Eurasian ulus of Empire of Genghis Khan» (Lavrov, 1999:51).

Thus it is possible to talk about formation of own original set of Eurasian traditions which formally integrated into West European model of traditionalism and in fact was isolated «product» of philosophical thought based on Eastern Orthodox tradition and tradition of Russian philosophical thought. Impulses of Eurasianism we find in woks of K. Leontyev, philosophers of Slavophil group, regionalists, in Russian literature of nineteenth and beginning of twentieth centuries. Developed and intelligent by Eurasianists Russian political traditions connecting with geopolitical rush of the country and ideas of Russian statehood were part of the set of Eurasian traditions.

References

Averyanov V. Nature of Russian expansion/ V. Averyanov. – M.: Lepta-Press, 2003.

Averyanov V. Tradition and traditionalism in scientific and social thought of Russia// Magic mountain. – 2005. – N.4.

Bernstein B. Tradition and social and cultural strucrures// Soviet ethnography. – 1981. – N 2.

Chistov K. Folklore. Text. Tradition. – M., 2005.

Conservative idea – purifying from illusions. Ideal platform of conservative analytics club// Gold lion. – 2000. – N 11-12.

Dugin A. Sacral patriotism/ A. Dugin. – M., 2000.

Guenon R. Essays about tradition and metaphysics/ R. Guenon. – SPb.: Azbuka-klassika, 2000.

Kara-Murza A., Panarin A., Pantin I. Spiritual and ideological situation in modern Russia// Political investigations. – 1995. – N 4.

Karsavin L. Religious and philosophical compositions/ L. Karsavin. – M., 1992.

Lavrov S. Eurasianism: modernity of conception// Conciliar Moscow. – 1999. – N.10.

Limonov E. Holy monsters. – M.: Marginerm, 2003.

Livshits M. Crisis of outrageous/ M. Livshits. – M., 1968.

Mannheim K. Diagnosis of our time/ K. Mannheim. – M., 1994.

Pashyenko V. Social nature of Eurasianism/ V. Pashyenko. – M., 2003.

Sonicheva N. Philosophy of Eurasianists in conception of G. Vernadsky// Phenomena of Eurasianism. – M., 1991.

Trubetskoy N. History. Culture. Language// N. Trubetskoy. – M., 1995.

Trubetskoy N. View on Russia not from West but from East// Elements. – 2000. – N 1-2.