PROBLEMS ON SOME THEORETICAL BASES OF EURASIAN INTEGRATION

This article focuses on the study of the theoretical works of representatives of the Eurasian movement and its understanding at the present stage. Eurasianism is a philosophical and political-ideological movement that emerged among the Russian émigrés of the 20s and 30s. XX century, interpreting Russia as Eurasia that is a special middle continent between Europe and Asia. During this period, the Eurasian movement spread to the territory of Europe. Eurasian circles originated in Prague, Berlin, Paris, Brussels and other European cities. In the 20s of the twentieth century, the political organization of Eurasians took shape. In the future, the Eurasian concept received a new sound with the ideas and writings of L. Gumilev. In the XXI century, it received a new sound due to the initiatives of the President of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev in 1994 and became the basis for the creation of the Eurasian Economic Union.
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Introduction

The term ‘Eurasia’ is rooted in the classical theories and concepts of ‘Geo-politics’ particularly the concepts of ‘pivot’ and later ‘heartland’ defined and developed by British Geographer Sir Hartford Mackinder in 1904, where he identified the huge landmass of the east of Urals as the ‘pivot’ and claimed that whoever will control this vast territory control global politics. In addition, the further the definition Eurasianism considered as the philosophical and political movement that determined the uniqueness of the Eurasian continent.

President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev introduced and developed his own vision, policies, perceptions and values of Eurasianism, which he has been propagating and practicing on a continuous and consistent basis. In fact, the concept of Eurasianism and Eurasian policies have turned into state ideologies which are reflected in domestic, regional and foreign policies as well as in the foundation of the recent regional integration process. Kazakhstan’s vision of Eurasianism and creation of the Eurasian Union based on Eurasian solidarity is an official policy (ideology) developed, launched and being implemented by Nursultan Nazarbayev, the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan that fundamentally differs from those of Russian, Turkish and others in terms of underlying goals, objectives, methods, directions and mechanisms of implementation (Cutler, 2010).

Since that time, domestic researchers began to pay attention to the study of the topic.

In Kazakhstan science, there are publications on the theoretical and practical identity of the ‘classical’ Eurasianism, its transformation into a modern form of ‘neo-Eurasianism’, as well as the possibilities and prospects of the Eurasian project in the form of integration processes. This issue became actively investigated after the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbayev had stated the Project «On creation of the Eurasian Union» in 1994. His book «Eurasian Union: Ideas, Practice and Prospects» became a strategic document of the Eurasian concept of the leadership of Kazakhstan (Danilevsky, 1991). A complex work «Nazarbayev’s Eurasian Doctrine», in which all the speeches of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbayev on Eurasianism and experts’ opinions can be found, was useful for considering the evolution of the Eurasian concept of N.A. Nazarbayev and its implementation in the cultural, economic cooperation (Evraziyskaya Doctrina Nursultana Nazarbayeva 2010).

The origins of Eurasianism, the role of the Eurasian idea of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbayev in the modern integration processes became a hot topic for Kazakhstani researchers and politicians. Experts as Tokaev (Tokaev 1997), Mansurov (Mansurov 2011), Laumulin (Laumulin 2009), Zhumagulov (Zhumagulov 2008), Nyssanbaev (Nyssanbayev 2009) generally consider the concept of Eurasianism and its realization by Kazakhstani leadership.

In the content of this article, the methods of analysis and synthesis, logic, and systematic method were used. Research methods are based on empirical data as works of theorists of Eurasian Movement and President of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev. Taking into account that the future of Eurasian continent is determined by the tendencies of the world development, the study was conducted with the use of the methods of a particular branch of knowledge, namely the internationally forecasting. For example, in the analysis of the present stage of evolution of eurasianism concept, objective and time analogy methods, the collective expert assessment and scenario, the method of possible or desirable model have also proved themselves useful. In the study, special attention will be paid to descriptive and prescriptive (normative) prognoses.

Classical eurasianism

Classical Eurasianism is a social and philosophical teaching of ideological and political movement of the Russian émigré community that manifested itself the most actively in the 1920s and 1930s of the last century. It determines the uniqueness of the Eurasian continent.
According to Russian geo-politicians, it is important to distinguish two stages in the development of the Eurasian movement.

The first one is the appearance of the Eurasian idea in the environment of post-revolutionary immigration in the early 20’s. The representatives of the various sciences are considered the founders of the Eurasian movement; they are linguist and philologist Prince N.S. Trubetsky (1890-1938), geographer and economist P.N. Savitsky (1895-1968), an Orthodox theologian, later a priest and historian of culture G.V. Florovsky (1893-1979), fine art expert P.P. Suvchinsky (1892-1985), historian G. Vernadsky, jurisprudent and political scientist N.N. Alekseev, historian of culture, literary critic and theologian V.N. Ilyin, historian Erenzhen Khara-Davan.

Eurasian movement emerged in the conditions of reforming the political system of Russia. Russian emigrants, who were expelled from Soviet Russia in the 20s of the last century, tried to understand the reasons, which led to the October Revolution of 1917. Their opinions were divided. Their findings were inconsistent too. Some of them regarded the revolution as a logic process and hoped that Russia would take the path of capitalism. They believed that it was going to become a parliamentary republic, copying the model of the Anglo-French democracy. Others rated the event as an unfortunate mistake in the historical development of the country. And more enlightened people tried to ground a model cultural and political development of Russia, which was entirely new for the world community and based on the Eurasian concept put forward by them (Sadykova 2013, p. 378). It was the N.S. Trubetsky, P.N. Savitsky, G. Vernadsky, N. Toll, and E. Khara Davan.

In their writings, Eurasianists paid great attention to the role of Russia on the Eurasian continent. They continued the tradition of the Slavophiles, such as K. Leontiev, N. Danilevsky who emphasized the uniqueness of the Russian Empire through the prism the world history of existing empires.

According to K. Leontiev’s work «Byzantinism and the Slavism», he considered the resolution of Eastern question and occupation of Constantinople to be one of the ways of salvation of Russia. It was the city, with which cherished, ‘crazy dreams of that part of Russian society, which thought Russia to be the heiress of Byzantium, were associated. The pan-Slavist Konstantin Leontiev (1831-1891) was one of the first authors to introduce naturalist elements in his philosophy of history: according to him, there was one unique law that determined the development of plant, animal, and human worlds, and therefore of history. Convinced of historical fatalism, he denounced European anthropocentrism, the biological weakening of the West caused by Democratization. He called Russia to react and claim an autocracy, to refuse social leveling in the name of material well-being (Leontyev, 1996: 6-8).

The ideas of N. Danilevsky had the most significant influence on the formation of the Eurasian concept. He formulated the theory of cultural-historical types as the antithesis of universalistic conceptions of history, which were of clearly Eurocentric character. The Eurocentrism based on the rationalist theory of progress with its interpretation of history as a one-dimensional linear process.

In his writings, Danilevsky contrasted Russia and Europe from a geopolitical point of view and in a historical context, wondering, «Why is Europe hostile to Russia?»: «The fact is that Europe does not acknowledge our being its part. It reckons Russia and the Slavs in general as something foreign to it, and at the same time, as it derives them from China, India, Africa, most of America, etc. Therefore, Europe sees Russia in Rus’ and reckons the Slavs as not only alien, but hostile nature» (Danilevsky, 1991: 50-51). Thus, in the major works, the Slavophiles bound up the future of Russia with the fortunes of the Orthodoxy, thereby emphasizing the uniqueness and peculiarity of Russian culture. In addition, they were opponents of Eurocentrism, considering that Eurocentric approach did not provide objective scientific explanation of the history of Russia.

The beginning of the Eurasian movement is considered to be the publication of Trubetskoy’s book ‘Europe and Mankind’ in Sofia in 1920. In this book, he, following Danilevsky’s tradition, opposes the uniqueness of the Roman-German European culture: «The revolution in the minds of the intellectuals of the non-Roman-Germanic peoples will inevitably be fatal to universal Europeanization .... Now, if they understand and are deeply aware that Europeanization is absolute evil, and cosmopolitanism is brazen deception, then they will stop helping the Roman-Germans.... We must always keep firmly in mind that the opposition of the Slavs to Germans or the Turans to Aryans has not given a true solution to the problem and that there is only one true opposition: the Roman-Germans – and all the other nations of the world, Europe and humanity» (Danilevsky, 1991: 50-51).

Unlike the Slavophiles, Trubetskoy’s main objection lay in the fact that he noted the presence of the Asian element in the Russian blood, «Uniting
itself of almost the entire territory of modern Russia under the rule of one state was first made not by the Russian Slavs, but the Turanians-Mongols. Russians’ moving to the East was the result of Russification of a number of Turanian tribes; the cohabitation Russians with Turanians has threaded Russian history. If the coupling the Eastern Slavs with Turanians is the basic fact of Russian history, if it is difficult to find a Great Russian, who has not got any Turan blood, and much of the blood flows in the veins of the Little Russians, it is clear that we, Russians, need to study our brothers Turan for the right national self-knowledge» (Istoki evraziistya 2012: 76-77).

Geographer and economist P.N. Savitsky should be considered as one of those ardent theorists of the Eurasian Movement and the chief founder of the Eurasian movement. As a person interested in geopolitics, P. Savitsky reflected his views in his writings: «Turn to the East», «The assertion of the Eurasians», «Steppe and the settled way of life», «The geographical and geopolitical foundations of Eurasianism», etc. After reviewing his main work, it is possible to define the following theses:

First, «Russia itself is neither Asia nor Europe – this is the main geopolitical thesis of Eurasians. Therefore, there is no ‘European’ and ‘Asian’ Russia, but there are its parts that lie to the west and east of the Yenisei River, etc... Russia ... is a specific geographic world».

Secondly, Russia is the median state, which is a special form of civilization. «Russia has much more reasons to be called the ‘Middle Kingdom’ than China has... The force of fatal facts called the Russian world to play a unifying role within the Old World. All the totality of the diverse cultures of the Old Continent can become and is becoming an organic whole only to the extent in which Russia-Eurasia fulfills the vocation of it» (Savitsky, 2012: 114-116).

Third, Russia-Eurasia is a synthesis of world culture and history of the world, deployed in space and time. Being a special type of civilization, it has developed based on several cultures and traditions, such as the Aryan-Slavic, Turkic nomadic and Orthodox.

Fourth, P. Savitsky considers Turan as a part of the Russia-Eurasia and justifies the Mongol overlordship. He notes, «Russia is the successor of Great Khans, the successor of Genghis and Timur’s deeds, the unifier of Asia .... It combines both historical «settled» and «steppe» elements». Thus, he shows Russia-Eurasia as a synthesis of the European Forest and Asian Steppe.

Fifth, P. Savitsky offers the principle of ideocracy, regarding it as a term that integrates all forms of non-democratic, non-liberal government based on non-materialistic and non-utilitarian motivations. It should be noted that Savitsky pays attention to the fact that ideocracy is inherent to the Land, while the Sea is characterized by a liberal democracy.

The Eurasian movement, which gained its actual features on the base of P. Savitskys works, began to spread in Europe. It was the second period of the Eurasian movement. Paris became its main center in Europe. Even in the 1920s, Eurasianism did not have a real common ideological platform; it was an atmosphere, an outlook on the world. The acceptance of the Soviet regime accelerated the division of the Eurasian movements into two factions. The first faction is based in Prague (Savitsky, Alekseev, Trubetskoy), kept its distance from the USSR; while the second faction (Karsavin, Suvchinsky) based in Paris, was close to the new regime. The latter published the Marxist weekly Evraziia (Eurasia) in 1928-29, and a Belgian version, Evraziets (The Eurasian) – which often limited itself to republishing articles from Pravda – from 1929 until 1934. From 1924, the Stated Political Directorate infiltrated the Eurasians movement. In 1938, with Prince N.S. Trubetskoy death, the stage of classical Eurasianism ended.

However, the clerisy of Russia did not lose interest in the Eurasian idea. It was revived in the 60s, when Eurasianism assumed a new meaning due to Lev Gumilev, a great scientist and a versatile personality, who is often cited as the founder of the Neo-Eurasianism.

In his writings, L. Gumilev combined several sciences, including natural and human sciences such as geography and history. It is his main merit. He gives an appraisal of world historical development of various ethnoses in terms of geographic terms. L.N. Gumilev advocated rapprochement between the humanities and natural sciences. He considered it necessary to take into consideration the natural and geographical factor (that is what we call habitat) in the ethnic history. He introduced the key concepts of modern ethnology into science. They are ‘passionarity’, ‘passionary waves’, ‘phases of ethnogenesis’, and many others. The ideas in regard to the terms were developed by him in ‘Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere’, ‘Millennium around the Caspian Sea’ and ‘From Rus’ to Russia’, ‘Rhythms of Eurasia’, etc. ‘Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere’ is the most important of them.
Thus, the great scientist L. Gumilev, with the use of a systematic approach, carried out an in-depth analysis of the development of the global history of ethnoses. His object of study includes Alexander the Great and Napoleon as passionaries. He is the author of the deep, innovative research on the history and culture of the nomads of the Middle and Central Asia from III B.C. to AC, historical geography, he is the founder of the theory of Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere, orientalist. His work has contributed greatly to the development of world science and laid the foundations for the formation of new ideas aimed at the unification of the Eurasian peoples. The ideas of the representatives of classical Eurasianism and Gumilev have acquired a new meaning. Kazakhstan’s President Nursultan Nazarbayev has paid particularly great attention to the Eurasian concept.

Kazakhstan’s Eurasianism: its formation and realization

In 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, new sovereign states, among which was Kazakhstan, appeared. The very first initiatives of independent Kazakhstan showed the world the peaceful nature of the foreign policy of our country. Initially, the leadership of the state that did not have access to the open sea, but had sufficient energy and mineral resources, recognized that it was irrational to close itself in the certain regional framework, on the contrary, it was crucial to actively develop relations with all countries of the world, especially with neighboring countries. As early as December 2, 1991, at a press conference on the results of the presidential elections, N.A. Nazarbayev paid an attention to the central position of Kazakhstan in the region as a bridge between Europe and Asia.

The President in his speeches at the Royal Institute of International Affairs Chatham House officially stated the Eurasian idea on March 22, 1994. He noted, «The prevailing conditions dictate the need to abandon the desire to keep all the states within the CIS. In our view, it is advisable to build a real working alliance of states based on the ‘core’, which can be named ‘Euro-Asian Union». Other states could join it if they would fulfill certain conditions: cessation of hostilities, strict observance of international agreements, territorial integrity and inviolability of borders, refusal of any form of economic pressure (Nazarbayev, 1997: 23-24)

The idea to create a Eurasian Union was later developed by President of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev at the Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov on March 29, 1994. The President drew attention to “the need for a transition to a qualitatively new level of relations between our countries on the basis of intergovernmental association formed on the principles of voluntary participation and equality. The Eurasian Union (EEU) could become such an association. It should be based on the principles other than those of the CIS, for the basis of the new association should include supranational bodies to address two key issues: the formation of a single economic space and ensuring joint defense policy (Nazarbayev, 1997: 32-33).

As the real project the Eurasian concept was officially formulated by the Kazakh leadership on June 3, 1994. This document became the basis of integration, oriented for cooperation with the regional actors and world community in general.

According to the project of June 3, 1994, the following important points were:

1) Development of international relations necessitates the strengthening of intergovernmental integration processes. Taking into consideration the differences in the levels of development of the market economy, the democratization of the political process, it is proposed the formation of an additional integration structure – the Eurasian Union.

2) The Eurasian Union will be a union of equal independent states, aimed at implementing national interests of each member country and their collective integration potential.

3) The Eurasian Union is seen as a form of integration of sovereign states to strengthen stability and security, social and economic modernization in the post-Soviet space.

4) The implementation of this objective requires the creation of supra-national bodies such as the Council of Heads of State and Heads of Government of the Eurasian Union – the supreme body of the political leadership; the parliament, which shall coordinate the legislative activities of the countries included in the Eurasian Union; the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, which shall coordinate foreign policy; the Council of Ministers of Defense to create a real military complex; the Interstate Executive Committee of the Eurasian Union as a permanent executive and supervisory authority.

5) A common document or citizenship for all the countries of the Eurasian Union and mandatory development of agreed programs of economic reforms are expected (Evraziyskaya Doctrina Nursultan Nazarbayeva, 2010: 5-6).

Suggesting the idea of a Eurasian Union is one of the greatest merits of N.A. Nazarbayev, who is a deeply thinking leader of our time. For
the precedent years, the President of Kazakhstan has been developing the conceptual framework of the Eurasian doctrine in his theoretical works and emphatically promoted the formation of a real and an effective structure of the Eurasian Union at all its levels and in all respects. Thus, the project of President Nazarbayev proposed in 1994 to create the Eurasian Union became the basis for the convergence of the Eurasian states through integration.

The President Nazarbayev described the principles of his vision of Eurasianism in an article in the Russian Newspaper Izvestiya published on October 25, 2011. According to him, the Eurasian Union should be based on and follow four basic principles; (1) it must be built on economic pragmatism, (2) it must be based on voluntary participation of member countries who must decide independently whether they want to be locked in within their own boundaries or join the globalized world; (3) it should be created on the principles of equality, mutual respect for sovereignty and not interference into domestic affairs of others; (4) each member country should create its own national institutions on the principles of consensus of all participants without giving up national sovereignty. The President also reiterated that the creation of the Eurasian Union will be, in no way, restoration or recreation of the former USSR (Nazarbayev, 2012: 37-38).

The project of Kazakhstan’s Eurasianism is more realizing now in the regional economic organizations in the post-Soviet space.

The first real practical step towards the formation of the Eurasian Union was the creation of the Customs Union within Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia in 2010. Being a form of exclusively economic integration, the Customs Union was aimed at the economic cooperation the states.

Concordance of the positions of the Member States of the Customs Union resulted in their further interaction. The three countries signed an agreement on the Common Economic Space, which entered into force in 2012. On November 18, 2011, the heads of member states of the Customs Union signed the Treaty on the Eurasian Economic Commission. The Common Economic Space (1 January 2012) launched a new supranational body – the Eurasian Economic Commission (EEC), which replaced the Commission of the Customs Union.

In accordance with Article 4 of the Treaty on EEC, the Committee consists of the Board of the Commission and the College of the Commission. The Board of the Commission provides overall control of the integration processes in the Customs Union and the Common Economic Space, as well as the general management of the Commission. The Board of the Commission shall be composed of one representative from each Party, who is the deputy head of government, vested with the necessary authority under the laws of that Party. Since the establishment of the Board, a number of important issues have been discussed.

The signing of Declaration on the establishment of the Eurasian Union by the leaders of Russia, Kazakhstan and Belarus on November 18, 2011 was considered as the main achievement of the realization of the Eurasian idea in the economic area. At meetings of the Eurasian Economic Commission, the Heads of State discuss the signing of the document on the establishment of the Eurasian Union.

Nowadays it is continuing the discussion about the perspective of the activity of the Eurasian Economic Union. For example, Regis Gente believes that the term of Eurasianism came to Kazakhstan as a response to a primordial preoccupation with Russian influence in the region. In addition, internationally it shows the attempts of Kazakhstan to form the new republic’s geopolitical ambitions, foreign policy objectives and its official posture on the world scene. The young Kazakh republic has adopted a «multi-dimensional» foreign policy to protect its independence, a self-defense mechanism that counterbalances Russian influence with that of other powers. The Eurasian paradigm justifies ties with China, the West (the US, the EU and other European countries), Asia (Singapore, South Korea, and Malaysia) and the Middle East. Kazakhstan wants to be seen as a bridge between Asia and Europe. It also pursues multilateral ambitions via the OSCE, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and so on. By such means, it demonstrates a real opening up to the world (Gente 2010). According to the view of M. Olcott, through an active Eurasian policy of engagement, Kazakhstan intends to turn the ‘curse’ of geography into strength and advantage by maintaining and balancing relations with all major actors in the world (Olcott, 2002: 78).

Conclusion

Thus, we can conclude that Eurasianism is a philosophical and political movement that determines the uniqueness of the Eurasian continent. The founders of the Eurasian movement are
considered such authors as linguist and philologist N.S. Trubetskoy (1890-1938), geographer and economist P.N. Savitsky (1895-1968), an Orthodox theologian, later priest G.V. Florovsky (1893-1979) and art historian P.P. Suvchinsky (1892-1985). In their writings, they paid great attention to projects for the reorganization of the existing social system in Russia. They continued the tradition of the Slavophiles, whose origins lie in the works of such scholars as K. Leontyev, N. Strakhov and N. Danilevsky, who focused on the central role of Russia in the Eurasian space. Further, Eurasianism acquires a new meaning with the ideas of Lev Gumilyov, whose ideas were widely spread by the beginning of the 21st century. The name Gumilev in the scientific community began to associate neo-eurasism.

The modern Kazakhstan’s Eurasianism has significantly expanded its context. Thanks to the efforts of the President, sovereign Kazakhstan has become an active subject, equal and important member of the international Eurasian dialogue. It nowadays became the basis of Eurasian Economic Union.
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