

Lebedev, S.V. (2022). Universalism and Pochvennichestvo as the main directions of the philosophy of the 21st century. *Collection of Scientific Articles on History, Philosophy, and Political Sciences. Tuculart Global Review*, 1 (1), 43-50. Ostrava: Tuculart Edition.

Лебедев, С.В. (2022). Универсализм и почвенничество – основные направления философии XXI века. *Collection of Scientific Articles on History, Philosophy, and Political Sciences. Tuculart Global Review*, 1 (1), 43-50. Ostrava: Tuculart Edition. (на англ.)

DOI: 10.47451/phi2022-05-02

The paper will be published in Crossref, ICI Copernicus, J-Gate, International Scientific Indexing (ISI), Academic Resource Index ResearchBib, eLibrary, Ukrainian National Library, and Internet Archive databases.



Sergey V. Lebedev, Professor, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Head of Department, Department of Philosophy, Higher School of Folk Arts, St. Petersburg, Russia. ORCID: 0000-0002-7994-2660.

Universalism and Pochvennichestvo as the main directions of the philosophy of the 21st century

Abstract: At the end of the 20th century, two American thinkers became the “rulers of thoughts”, each of whom expressed his opinion about the modern era - Francis Fukuyama and Samuel Huntington. Francis Fukuyama published the article The End of History. This article immediately became a worldwide sensation. Samuel Huntington published an article on the basis of which he glorified his book The Clash of Civilizations. Among the scientific priorities of Russian philosophy belongs Slavophilism – a philosophical and historical concept of the fundamental dissimilarity (or even hostility) of Russian and Western civilizations. As a result, the old era with its values is ending, and the new one has not yet arrived, which marked a kind of “postmodern”. The aim of the study was to study the main directions of philosophy of the 21st century – universalism and pochvennichestvo, which formed philosophical postmodernism. Historical, comparative, logical and deductive methods were used to achieve the abandoned goal and solve the research problems. The study used materials from the works of such great philosophers of our time as Francis Fukuyama, Samuel Huntington, Theodor Adorno and others. The author comes to the conclusion that the decline of Western civilization does not mean the decline of humanity as such. Today, one can observe the gradual rise not only of new countries that until recently were the periphery of the world, but also expect the rise of new philosophical teachings. They will undoubtedly be based on the philosophical justification of the originality of their civilization. These will be original national versions of “Slavophilism”.

Keywords: postmodernism, Slavophilism, Fukuyama, Huntington, Adorno.



Сергей Викторович Лебедев, профессор, доктор философских наук, заведующий кафедрой, кафедра философии, Высшая школа народных искусств, Санкт-Петербург, Россия.

ORCID: 0000-0002-7994-2660.

Универсализм и почвенничество – основные направления философии XXI века

Аннотация: На исходе XX века «властителями дум» стали два американских мыслителя, каждый из которых высказывал свое мнение о современной эпохе – Френсис Фукуяма и Самуэль Хантингтон. Френсис Фукуяма опубликовал статью «Конец истории». Эта статья сразу стала мировой сенсацией. Самуэль Хантингтон опубликовал статью, на основе которой прославил свою книгу «Столкновение цивилизаций». К числу научных приоритетов русской философии принадлежит славянофильство – философско-историческая концепция о принципиальной

несхожести (или даже враждебности) русской и западной цивилизаций. Как результат, старая эпоха с ее ценностями заканчивается, а новая еще не наступила, что ознаменовала некий «постмодерн». Целью исследования стало изучение основных направлений философии 21-го века – универсализма и почвенничества – которые сформировали философский постмодернизм. Для достижения оставленной цели и решения задач исследования были применены исторический, сравнительный, логический и дедуктивный методы. В ходе исследования были использованы материалы трудов таких великих философов современности как Френсис Фукуяма, Самуэль Хантингтон, Теодор Адорно и других. Автор приходит к заключению, что закат западной цивилизации не означает заката человечества как такового. На сегодняшний день можно наблюдать постепенный подъем не только новых стран, бывших еще недавно мировой периферией, но и ожидать подъема новых философских учений. В основу их будет лежать, несомненно, философское обоснование самобытности своей цивилизации. Это будут своеобразные национальные варианты «славянофильства».

Ключевые слова: постмодернизм, славянофильство, Фукуяма, Хантингтон, Адорно.



What we are probably witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War or another period of post-war history, but the end of history as such, the completion of the ideological evolution of mankind and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of government.

Francis Fukuyama

We are witnessing the “end of the progressive era” dominated by Western ideology, and we are entering an era in which numerous and diverse civilizations will interact, compete, coexist and adapt to each other.

Samuel Huntington

Introduction

At the end of the 20th century, two American thinkers became the “rulers of thoughts”, each of whom expressed his opinion about the modern era – Francis Fukuyama and Samuel Huntington. Francis Fukuyama published the article *The End of History*. This article immediately became a worldwide sensation. Samuel Huntington published an article on the basis of which he glorified his book *The Clash of Civilizations*. Among the scientific priorities of Russian philosophy belongs Slavophilism – a philosophical and historical concept of the fundamental dissimilarity (or even hostility) of Russian and Western civilizations. As a result, the old era with its values is ending, and the new one has not yet arrived, which marked a kind of “postmodern”.

The purpose of this study was to research the main directions of philosophy of the 21st century – universalism and pochvennichestvo, which formed the historical and philosophical postmodernism.

Based on the study’s purpose, the following tasks were earned:

- analyse the leading works of popular philosophers of our time;
- analyse the transformation of philosophical thought, which evolutionarily led to the emergence of postmodernism;
- give the concept of philosophical postmodernism;

- present arguments for the emergence and development of postmodern philosophical thought.

Historical, comparative, logical, and deductive methods were used to achieve the abandoned goal and solve the research problems.

The study used materials from the works of such great philosophers of our time as Francis Fukuyama, Samuel Huntington, Theodor Adorno, etc.

The results of the study

At the end of the 20th century, two American thinkers became “rulers of thoughts”, each of whom expressed his opinion about the modern era. In the summer of 1989, literally on the eve of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the socialist system in Eastern Europe (although it was clear from the developments in the Soviet Union how everything would end), American professor of Japanese origin Francis Fukuyama published an article *The End of History*. This article immediately became a worldwide sensation. F. Fukuyama, on the crest of success, quickly reworked the article into a monograph under almost the same title *The End of History and the Last Man*. The title of the article and book did not mean the end of the world. Let us recall that, according to Hegel, contradiction is the source of development. When contradictions and alternatives to the existing order of things disappear, then history ceases to flow. Now that the end point of being has been reached, i.e., the ideal to which people have striven in the course of their history has been put into practice, continuing being is no longer history in the exact sense of the word. Of course, the world continues to exist and the sequence of events continues, but History as such ceases. As F. Fukuyama himself wrote, “what, in my opinion, has come to an end is not a sequence of events, even serious and great events, but History with a capital letter, i.e., history understood as a single, logically consistent evolutionary process, considered taking into account the experience of all times and peoples. This understanding of History is most of all associated with the great German philosopher Hegel. It was made an ordinary element of the intellectual atmosphere by Karl Marx, who borrowed his concept of History from Hegel; it is implicitly accepted by us when we use words such as “primitive” or “developed”, “traditional” or “modern”, when applied to different types of human society (*Fukuyama, 2015:6*).

According to F. Fukuyama, there are no ideologies and philosophies left in the world that would oppose the Western system (i.e., capitalism in the economy and representative democracy in politics). If almost the entire 20th century, the Western system was challenged by a variety of powerful ideologies – Marxism, Anarchism, Fascism, all kinds of religious and nationalist theories. All of them relied on the developed philosophical teachings, had their own ideas about the world in general and humanity in particular. But by the end of the 80s. the alternative to Western values has practically disappeared. The logical end of human evolution was the complete triumph of liberal democracy. The story is thus ended.

This paradoxical thought, however, would be true only if history were a single ascending line. But the whole world history just showed that the main civilizational centers develop in different ways. This was stated by Samuel Huntington, another well-known American philosopher and sociologist, former adviser to the US Department of Defense on Russian Affairs. He also published an article *The Clash of Civilizations* on the basis of which he made

the book that made him famous. According to S. Huntington, in the world after the Cold War and the Pyrrhic victory of the West, culture and various types of cultural identification (which at the broadest level are the identification of civilization) determine patterns of cohesion, disintegration and conflict (*Huntington, 2003:15*). The struggle of civilizations has taken the place of the struggle of ideologies. According to S. Huntington, civilizations differ from each other in history, language, culture, traditions, and religion. Thus, S. Huntington abandoned the clear opposition “barbarism-civilization”, which comes from the philosophy of the Enlightenment.

According to S. Huntington, at the turn of the millennium, eight local civilizations were formed in the world: Orthodox (Russia and the countries of the former USSR, Serbia, Greece), Western, Islamic, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Latin American, and potential African. The most acute and intractable conflicts in the world pass along the borders of civilizations (the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Indo-Pakistani conflict, the wars in the Balkans, etc.).

However, what is interesting here. S. Huntington, who was familiar with Russian philosophical thought as a consultant on Russian affairs at the Pentagon, actually agreed with the idea of a plurality of civilizations expressed by Russian Slavophiles as early as the middle of the 19th century. So, Western philosophy at the turn of the millennium, through the mouth of its classic, came to the same conclusions as Russian philosophy.

Among the scientific priorities of Russian philosophy is Slavophilism – a philosophical and historical concept of the fundamental dissimilarity (or even hostility) of Russian and Western civilizations. These ideas were formed back in the days of Kievan and especially Muscovite Rus. This concept was embodied in the well-known theory Moscow is the Third Rome. Slavophilism acquired its “classical” form in the 1830s and 1840s. This philosophy is represented by the names of A.S. Khomyakova, I.I. Kireevsky, the Aksakov brothers and other thinkers.

The Slavophiles have that world priority in philosophy that during the period of the triumph of progressive theories, they were the first to express the idea (today it is quite obvious, but not at that time) that there is no single world civilization, the symbol of which are the “advanced” countries Western Europe, and other “underdeveloped” countries must run after the West, importing Western civilization with all its roses and thorns. The Slavophiles pointed to the independence of individual local civilizations.

For half a millennium, the complete economic, military and cultural domination of the West over the world continued. For almost three centuries, the most diverse, but arising from the philosophy of the Enlightenment, universalist theories dominated the spiritual sphere of all mankind. The philosophy of the enlighteners was based on freethinking (that is, there were no authorities for them) and rationalism (the desire to proceed from common sense in everything). The French Enlightenment philosophers further raised the authority of reason and science. Enlighteners developed the concept of a new society based on universal principles, ideals and values: freedom, equality, fraternity. The most important feature of this concept was a radical break with the past and striving for a “bright future” in which these ideals and values should triumph. Of course, traditional culture, from the point of view of the enlighteners, also belonged to the “remnants of the past”.

Enlightenment philosophers sincerely believed that reason would provide a solution to all the problems and tasks facing humanity. Science, the enlighteners believed, is the highest form of reason, and therefore it can give a complete rational explanation of the laws of nature. And

thanks to this, nature will be conquered by man. Science will explain the nature of all relationships between people, which will make it possible to put an end to all social conflicts. In this wonderful new society, all ethnic, estate, class and religious differences between people will disappear. Finally, with the help of science, man will be able to overcome illnesses and finally be able to know himself. The man of the future will be able to put all his thoughts, deeds and actions under the control of his mind.

However, against progress and modernity, the enlighteners believed, there are old prejudices, outdated customs, primitiveness and lack of education. Enlighteners called it tradition. From the point of view of enlightenment philosophy, the very existence of folk traditions testifies to the ignorance and darkness of the people. Progress must sweep away all these traditions. At present, the concept of tradition has changed somewhat. Tradition (Lat. *traditio* – transmission, handing over, tradition) – historically established and transmitted from generation to generation, customs, rituals, social institutions, ideas and values, norms of behavior, etc., elements of socio-cultural heritage that are preserved in society (*Ilyichev et al., 1983:692*).

So, the philosophy of the Enlightenment gave us the basic concepts of our social and cultural life. Only two centuries later, under the influence of world wars, economic crises, and environmental problems, the optimism that remained from the philosophy of the Enlightenment began to dissipate. It is no coincidence that one of the modern British philosophers, John Gray, argues that by the beginning of the 21st century, the universal “Enlightenment project” had been completely exhausted. Therefore, the current provisions of Western philosophical thought are completely inadequate to the challenges of our time.

The 20th century with its world wars, mass genocide, environmental problems led to disillusionment with progress and the very belief that a person is generally capable of changing this world for the better. “After Auschwitz, poetry is impossible,” said Theodor Adorno, one of the greatest philosophers of the last century (*Adorno, 2003:322-333*). “The ecological crisis has devalued the great idea of transforming and conquering nature. The almost achieved victory of man over nature turned out to be in fact imaginary, tantamount to defeat. This crisis paralyzed, killed the former optimism, striving for a bright future, because the latter turned out to be too frightening. In the same way, he devalued the opened possibilities of the consumer society. It seemed to poison the positive and attractive aspects of such a society, creating a situation similar to a feast during the plague. The ecological crisis has made everything fragile, temporary, ephemeral and doomed (*Lebedev, 2013:56*).

Even man as a person in modern times was no longer the crown of creation. If, in the Middle Ages, it was believed that a person was created in the image and likeness of God, if after Descartes a person was considered an animal, but endowed with reason, unlike all other living beings, then after Freud a person became the same animal, living by his instincts. Even the division into men and women after the “sexual revolution” and the rise of feminism became optional. At the beginning of the 21st century, those who were previously considered perverts suddenly became “minorities” representatives who began to demand “rights” for themselves.

And, as a result, the old era with its values is ending, and the new one has not yet arrived. In a word, the “postmodern” has come.

The “postmodern” concept (as a synonym is often used the word “postmodernism”, although this is not the same thing) has turned from a philosophical term into a buzzword used incredibly widely by a wide variety of people under a variety of circumstances. As is often the case with popular words, it becomes difficult to give a concrete and generally accepted definition of what lies behind the concept of postmodernity. Postmodern is understood as both modern philosophy and the latest artistic trends (*Lebedev, 2007*).

Common to various national variants of postmodernism can be considered its identification with the name of the era of “tired”, “entropic” culture, marked by eschatological moods (that is, the mood of waiting for the end of the world), aesthetic mutations, the diffusion of great styles, a mixture of artistic languages. The avant-garde attitude towards novelty is opposed here by the desire to include in contemporary art the entire experience of world artistic culture by ironically quoting it (*Mankovskaya, 2000:347*).

In contrast to the previous era of modernity, when certain artistic styles dominated the field of culture, there is now “multiculturalism”, i.e., a multitude of genres among which (only in theory, of course) there are no dominant hegemonies (*Jencks, 1989:47*).

In philosophy, the postmodern declares that now philosophy “denies in principle the possibility of certainty and objectivity..., such concepts as “fairness” or “rightness” lose their meaning...” (*Bryson, 2003:12*).

The state of loss of value orientations is perceived positively by postmodernist theorists. “Eternal values” are totalitarian ideas, coming from the philosophy of the Enlightenment, which hinder creative realization. The true ideal of postmodernists is chaos. Any semblance of order needs immediate deconstruction – the liberation of meaning by inverting the basic ideological concepts that permeate the entire culture.

Well, postmodern philosophy does not really claim to discover great truths. The philosophy of postmodernists is busy only, using the phrase of G. Hesse, “the glass beads game”, i.e., intellectual games that give nothing to either the mind or the heart. All fashionable postmodern phrases such as “deconstruction”, “simulacrum”, “delegitimation”, etc., cannot hide the fact that such a philosophy cannot explain this world and offer it a new transcendental idea. Accordingly, the postmodern philosopher is not going to offer any alternative to the current state of affairs. But it is precisely in the proposal of an alternative that development is contained. The “removal” of the contradiction means development. If philosophy recognizes that it not only cannot, but is not going to “remove” the contradiction, then this is already only the philosophy of the sophists. And in fact, just as the sophists refused to seek the truth, referring to the subjectivity of the perception of the world (recall Protagoras’ “man is the measure of all things”), postmodernists argue that we can only parse “texts” without drawing any conclusions (*Lebedev, 2007*).

The most characteristic feature for all countries of the world in the era of globalisation is the identity crisis. What is it? This term (Lat. *idem* – “the same one”) appeared in ancient logic and meant a relationship whose members are identical to each other. However, of course, identity is not only a philosophical category. Identity in the human psyche is the ability to express in a concentrated form for him how he imagines his belonging to various social, national, professional, linguistic, political, religious, racial, and other groups or other communities. In other words, what the individual relates himself to is identity.

The era of globalisation, with its imposed patterns of Western mass culture, could not but cause an identity crisis. And it is no coincidence that the struggle in culture (and not at all street demonstrations or voting in parliaments) defines the essence of the era.

Still, it seems that the “post-era” should end soon. The world is dominated by the Western Powers, which, however, are incapable of giving mankind a great idea. Previously, the West for the non-Western (i.e., most) part of humanity caused associations with railways, steamships, newspapers, parliaments, Christianity, universities. Now, Western values are reduced to Big Macs and the rights of sexual minorities. The rise of religious fundamentalism under these conditions is quite understandable. And this only means that the half-thousand-year domination of Western civilization is coming to an end. In the 21st century, countries such as China, India, Brazil, Nigeria, and some other countries of the recent political and economic periphery will play a leading role (*Lebedev, 2007*).

But what about the West itself? He enters the post-Western era. Today, the West is already completely different compared to the 1950s and 1960s, when they started talking about postmodernity. Low birth rates and high life expectancy have led Western nations to become nations of pensioners.

At the same time, Western countries are experiencing a massive invasion of non-Western peoples of the former periphery. So while the West is pursuing a policy of “Westernization” of the world, there is a process of “Westernization” of the West itself. If in the USA there are already more than 50 million Hispanics (15% of the population), in France 45% of the population are non-French, if Germany, in which there are fewer real Germans than it was in 1914, has ceased to be a nation, turning into a “living space” for newcomers from all over the world, and the city of London became the first capital of Europe in which whites became a racial minority, is it possible to talk about the bright future of Western civilization?

What follows from it? What was called Europe no longer exists. We should acknowledge this sad discovery. There is no once great civilization, no great nations that managed world affairs, discovered continents and created the current industrial world. There is only a collection of minorities: racial, ethnic, confessional, sexual. Everything else is nothing more than real estate objects of the former, once great European civilization, its material remnants (*Lebedev, 2007*).

The beginning of the 21st century will go down in history as a time of stagnation. Until recently, great ideologies dominated the world, offering their own alternatives to the existing order of things. Now there are no clear ideological alternatives. Various environmental, feminist and anti-globalist organizations do not claim to create global positive theories. These are not ideas for which you can give your life.

What is happening in the world is sad. Western civilization, for all its innumerable shortcomings, nevertheless ensured the phenomenal rise of mankind. Now the African and Oriental traditions that will dominate the world of the new century, are hardly able to ensure its further development. It seems that the fall of Western civilization will resemble a similar fall of the ancient world, which was replaced by the “dark ages”.

On the other hand, Russia can take a leading place in the post-Western world, unless it forgets that it is a Eurasian country with its own path of development. However, Russia must reassess its cultural heritage and develop its culture with an emphasis on its primordial traditions for this.

In our time, when there are more obese people in the world than the hungry, when completely illiterate people use computers, when standard Western primitive cultural patterns become dominant, it is the national culture, which, precisely because of its nationality, will become understandable and close to all peoples, can become driving force of cultural alternative.

Conclusion

Summarising all of the above, we can state that the Western civilization's decline does not mean the humanity's decline as such. Today, one can observe the gradual rise not only of new countries that until recently were the periphery of the world, but also expect the rise of new philosophical teachings. They will undoubtedly be based on the philosophical justification of the originality of their civilization. These will be original national versions of "Slavophilism". However, since we are not talking about Slavic peoples at all (especially since almost all Slavic peoples consider themselves, however, unreasonably, to be part of Western civilization), it is logical to use another concept of Russian philosophical thought – pochvenichestvo. In other words, as opposed to various universalist theories that try to find the objective laws of the life of all mankind, philosophy comes with an emphasis on the native "pochva", or "soil" in English.



References:

- Adorno, T.V. (2003). *Negative dialectics*. Moscow: Scientific World. (in Russian)
- Bryson, V. (2003). *Feminist political theory: an introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fukuyama, F. (2015). *The end of the story and the last man*. Moscow: AST Publishing House. (in Russian)
- Huntington, S. (2003). *Clash of civilizations*. Moscow: LLC "AST Publishing House". (in Russian)
- Ilyichev, L.F. et al. (Eds.) (1983). *Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia. (in Russian)
- Jencks, Ch. (1989). *What is post-modernism*. NY.
- Lebedev, S.V. (2007, October 7). Postmodern dead ends, or welcome to the desert of the real! Russian Folk Line. Retrieved March 31, 2022, from https://ruskline.ru/analitika/2009/10/07/tupiki_postmoderna_ili_dobro_pozhalovat_v_pustynyu_real_nogo/ (in Russian)
- Lebedev, S.V. (2013). *Philosophy and traditional applied art of Russia. A textbook for students of higher educational institutions studying in the direction of Decorative and Applied Arts and Crafts*. St. Petersburg: Higher School of Folk Arts. (in Russian)
- Mankovskaya, N.B. (2000). *Aesthetics of postmodernism*. St. Petersburg: Alethea. (in Russian)