

“HOMO BRICS” AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF “HOMO EURAMERICANUS”

Sergey Musienko, the head of the Analytical center EcooM,
Board member of the Writers Union of Belarus

Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachev argued that: “Without the ability to address each other, we lose ourselves as a people. How to live without the ability to name? In general, to notice a phenomenon is to give it a name, to create a term, so in the Middle Ages, science was mainly engaged in naming, creating terminology. The name was knowledge. When the island was discovered, it was given a name, and only then it was a geographical discovery. There was no opening name” [1].

Therefore, the theme of today's Likhachev readings: “BRICS as the New Space for Dialogue Among Cultures and Civilizations” seems to me very relevant and timely.

Olivier Roqueplo, Doctor of Sciences in History and Politics, Sorbonne University (Paris) at the 2023 Likhachev Conference, in his article [2] made a request for a very interesting theme, in my opinion: Introduction to Homo Euramericanus Problem, in which the author says that the European crisis is caused by the appearance of the so-called Homo Euramericanus. “Who is no longer French, European, or North American, but represents a transatlantic ersatz culture.”

It seems that consideration of problems and prospects of the formation of a new global platform of cultural cooperation within BRICS (science, culture, art, education, economy, law) should begin with definitions and terminologies according to D.S. Likhachev.

What are you made of, “Homo BRICS?”

According to Likhachev, “if people inhabiting some geographical territory do not have their own integral cultural and historical past, traditional cultural life, their cultural shrines, then they (or their rulers) inevitably have a temptation to

justify their state integrity with all kinds of totalitarian concepts, which are all the harsher and more inhumane, the less the state integrity is determined by cultural criteria” [3].

This portrait, prophetically given by Likhachev, exactly corresponds to the EU portrait, in particular, the one we have observed since 2020. It is important for us to avoid illusions about the EU as a partner at the beginning of the journey of building the new space for dialogue among cultures and civilizations of the BRICS.

Therefore, it is important to learn more deeply the assessments of the European reality, through understanding and the French thinker O. Roqueplo, in order not to fall into the trap of not having a common cultural Code for the BRICS. Understand what the EU is all about.

Even the least ephemeral attempts of the hegemony to unite most of Europe (the Frankish Empire, the Holy German Empire, the Papal theocracy of the 13–14th centuries, the Austro-Spanish, and then the Austro-Hungarian-German-Italian Habsburg monarchy, the Bourbon family pact), each of them had its own cultural past, traditional landmarks and spiritual shrines. All these attempts to create Europe were based on national traditions, but also and above all on the Roman Empire, the true matrix of the two parts of Europe: Latin Catholic and Greek Orthodox. Following the thought of Likhachev, it can be argued with good reason that the power and cultural depth, and hence the strong legitimacy of these imperial structures, ensured both the level of violence limited by the culture level itself and the uselessness of raw violence as a source of power.

The Napoleonic Empire is a pan European construction, which is much more rigid than its predecessors, exactly for the reasons indicated by Likhachev: it is an empire that has no stable cultural foundation and does not know exactly what it is (the French Empire, Franco-Italian Empire, Neo-Carolingian Empire, the Neo-Roman Empire? An ideological empire embodying the French Revolution and the Enlightenment?)

After a period of true Prussian stability under Bismarck (Kleindeutsche Loesung) the Second Reich in 1891 entered a cultural crisis, which gradually led it to pan-Germanism (Grossdeutsche Loesung). Since 1915, the Second Reich completely lost German cultural landmarks and became a conquering hegemonistic empire that began to absorb Austria-Hungary, annexed Poland, the Baltic States, made Romania, Ukraine, Finland satellites and no longer had borders. Therefore, the level of violence was higher than in the French Empire.

The Third Reich has a particularly high level of violence for the same reason, but even more acute. From 1941 onwards, it no longer had a cultural base, it was no longer a Great Germany because it was moving towards an increasingly distant East that it wanted to colonize, it was simply a pan-Germanist, that is, ideological, military empire that did not know where its cultural center of gravity was: was it still Berlin and Prussia? Aryan Scandinavia? The mythical Gothic Ukrainian-Polish Empire of the ancient king Germanarich? Or even a neo-pagan empire? No cultural tradition allows it to become stable, and this explains its destructive and self-destructive vocation.

Finally, the last of these pan-European constructions is the EU. After a period of formation, as part of interstate cooperation (EEC, 1957–92), it turns out to be a new hegemonic and expansionist union, but clearly less assertive. But above all, it is not based on any one element of culture. The evidence for this is very clear. Symbols that are themselves culture vectors are irrelevant in the case of the EU. The famous flag with twelve stars is one of the only symbols used and recognized, and it doesn't even officially refer to anything but the idea of abstract and vague unity (any God-like religious reference is explicitly rejected). The symbol '€' is just the designation of the Eurodollar. As for the euro banknotes, they depict architectural models that are not in reality. These uprooted symbols are exemplary. The EU has never claimed to belong to the Roman Empire, nor to its cultural or historical heritage. It is surprising that in ancient times Europa was a nymph with the bull-Zeus, and that for 17–19th centuries, Europe was

everywhere depicted as a crowned nymph with a sword and a globe, associating with the throne, crowns, noble horse, temple, book, artistic and scientific instruments, that is, with the instruments of culture (according to the iconographic tradition established by Cesare Ripa). But the EU ideologues explain: “Antiquated, extremely hermetic today, extremely Christian, too imperial or even imperialist, extremely armed and therefore militant allegory seems to have been intentionally left outside images and doomed to certain oblivion” [4]. They might add that it is also ‘extremely European, too cultural and too truthful.’ Thus, these symbols are unknown to the EU, a true denial of culture. The more the EU develops, the fewer cultural landmarks it has. It was a fan of the European studies, François Hollande, who in 2012 forced the removal of Ancient Greek and Latin from schools, and is there anything more European than these languages, which have united all the European peoples for 2,500 years?

But that's not all. I had the opportunity to meet with Philippe Pershock several times, an extremely socially and politically influential ideologue at the EU level, now a member of the European Parliament, who is considered the main leader of the Europeanist movement in France, primarily among the Parisian elite. O. Roqueplo's discussion with him in 2010 was devoted to the EU symbols and cultural and historical landmarks. Pershok clearly expressed the thought that the EU is an innovative project that is self-sufficient and therefore has no cultural and historical landmarks. According to him, the EU has no past, it exists only in the present and the future. The EU is based on ideology (liberalism, human rights, federalism, the ideology of peace, that is, not pacifism, but Atlanticism) and international treaties that are applied by a bureaucracy of lawyers who specialize in technocratic jargon that is intentionally abstruse. This ideology, according to the ideologue, should be regularly replenished with the political aspirations of the elites of the new joining countries, since these elites are still under the charm of (futuristic one for them) the project, but not under its application [5]: “The EU behaves like a screwed-up teenager who does not know what to do with his

changing body. However, it is in search of new dreams from the countries that might join it that it will grow and embrace its role in the world.”

Hence the constant and dangerous expansionism that allows the EU to measure forces with others (Russia, Turkey, the Arab world, Africa) to reassert its ideology through victory: be it electoral, be it military, be it mixed (= color revolution) [6]. As it was written in Euro-media and constantly repeated about Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova and other countries, “democracy won, therefore the West and the EU won.” This is the meaning of the existence and legitimacy of the EU. This expansionism is not peaceful, and when it does not win (in Turkey, Belarus, Serbia, Ukraine, and the Russian Federation), it immediately labels another country as an enemy [7][8] even if reciprocity on the part of these countries is not true.

Moreover, the idea of an “adolescent EU” curiously confirms the idea of a neocracy from the previous chapter. It may even help to understand Homo Euramericanus' unhealthy interest in gender theory and LGBTism. It is a general cultural regression to adolescence and childhood on the part of French leaders, an involution.

In this respect, following Likhachev’s logic, we can conclude that the EU potentially can be even worse and more dangerous than the Third Reich, because it even has no cultural fantasy. In 2021, a book by historian H.-G. Soutou reveals a hidden part of the EU history [9]. He shows that the first real application of the idea of the European Union took place during the domination of the Third Reich, and that it was not just a German project, but a construct in which the Italian Fascists, who were the real driving force, took a very active part. The reason for this lies again in the connection between culture, legitimacy and violence, identified by Academician Likhachev. Like the Second Reich, the newly unified Italy had a culturally blurred foundation, so Italian fascism oscillated between the Italian nation and the new Roman Empire. It was this second concept, as Soutou shows that formed the basis of the first European Union of the 1940s. However,

this first European Union was also a vast network of Western European Catholics, centrists and socialists who acted on their own will, and it was they who enforced the idea of a specifically Europeanist anti-Soviet and anti-Anglo-Saxon entity, whereas the Third Reich was originally much smaller (Nordic) and much larger (worldwide) than their pan-European union. We can also note the continuity of people and ideas between this political structure of 1942 and the EU of 1992, as the archetypal example of François Mitterrand shows [10].

This story has been forgotten and erased from the memory of the generation after 1950, but its potential development seems to repeat itself before our eyes.

Today, the EU chimera turned into a hydra with countless suckers, seems to be on its way to becoming an empire with totalitarian tendencies. The unelected European Commission at the head of the political entity, which since 2020 has become autonomous from the EU member states and devoid of any cultural basis, began to turn into a dictatorial and militant technocracy: first by libertarian governance of the virus, then by the suppression of mass demonstrations against its policies and, finally, by its very militant impulses together with ultranationalist and culturally invertebrate Ukraine against Russia, still relying on its culture and deep history.

This pan-European empire, which has no cultural basis and is therefore unstable, is also obscure: it calls NATO its defense system, the Anglo-Saxon ‘pillars’ of which are not included to the EU with the same headquarters in Brussels. We are dealing with a culturally ‘wandering’ empire: neither European nor truly Anglo-Saxon, this time reminiscent of the three brutal attempts of the hegemony that preceded it.

In reality, the EU is just a geopolitical mirror of Homo Euramericanus, a human without culture, homeland, and borders. It doesn't even have a geographic center of reference. Who in the EU can consider Brussels a real capital and center? Brussels is a city cut in two parts, where Belgians struggle between the Walloon and Flemish districts. The USA, New York and California, not to mention

London, are actually more of a cultural center for EU leaders than any other place in the EU. Thus, the EU is already a true Euromerica, threatened with direct annexation by its dominant cultural pole.

In general, the EU is an entity that avoids the cultural dimension in every sense of the word. Therefore, it returns to the form of ultra-archaic political construction, potentially close to barbarism, both from its own anti-cultural basis and from its anti-historical neocratic elites. The EU is not Europe, but anti-Europe, because there is no Europe other than in culture, history and memory of the ages. The ideology of the Europeanists is liberal-libertarian technodemocracy. It has a policy of Europeanization of their members. In other words, it condemns anything that is not of this ideology, “not European.” But who can believe that an ideology born in the 1970s has anything to do with Europe, its three thousand years of memory and culture? In fact, every true scientist and every truly cultured person in Europe is a real European. It is such people who are lacking today; they are being pushed aside and replaced by Homo Euramericanus.

While Nicolas Sarkozy, the 23rd president of the French Republic argued that the African person had not made enough history, it seems that the elites of France and the EU, that is Homo Euramericanus, have already left it for good, while the “Homo BRICS” have yet to emerge?

Based on the imperfect experience of integration structures of post-Soviet countries: CIS, the Union State of Belarus and Russia, the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), the issue of at least discussing the space of dialogue among cultures and civilizations within the BRICS is urgently on the agenda. Not to be likened to the EU, with its amazing metamorphosis of culture.

In this connection, the case of 1996 comes to mind, when the parties, having failed to agree on a common system of values, tried to agree on the cooperation between Belarus and Russia, the newspapers had already written that: “April 2, 1996 will go down in history as the day of establishment of the Community of Sovereign Republics.” [11].

Then there was the scale of publications in the various press: “Once again we are in the SSR!” [12], “There are only three letters left of the USSR” [13], complete incomprehension — “SSR? CIS? Community?” [14] and other incisive articles. Only then the entity became — the Union State of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus. We should be more attentive to the Symbols.

The great thinker D.S. Likhachev said: “Anyway, culture is a huge integral phenomenon that makes humans, who inhabit a certain space, a people, a nation out of just a population. The concept of culture should include and has always included religion, science, education, moral and ethical standards of behavior of people and the state” [15].

БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ СПИСОК

1. См. Лихачев Д.С. Я живу с ощущением расставания... // Комсомольская правда 1996. 5 марта URL.: https://www.lihachev.ru/pic/site/files/fulltext/izbrannoe_misli_o_jizni/0022.pdf. (дата обращения: 30.03.2024).
2. О. Рокпло. Мысль Д. С. Лихачева и культурный кризис французской элиты XXI века. введение в проблему Homo Euramericanus Диалоги и конфликты культур в меняющемся мире: XXI Международные Лихачевские научные чтения, 25-26 мая 2023 г. – Санкт-Петербург: СПбГУП, 2024. – С. 112-122.
3. Лихачев ДС: Многомерное и целостное видение культуры// Избранные труды по русской и мировой культуре, 2022г, с.22
4. <https://ehne.fr/fr/encyclopedie/th%C3%A9matiques/les-arts-en-europe/repr%C3%A9sentation-de-l%E2%80%99europe/repr%C3%A9sentation-de-l%E2%80%99europe> (дата обращения: 30.03.2024).

5. <https://voxeurop.eu/fr/lutopie-est-a-nos-portes/>(дата обращения: 30.03.2024).

6. Мусиенко С. Г., Осипов М. В. "Привкус цветных революций". М.: Беларусь, 2023. С. 400.

7. Patten C : « Russia's hell-hole enclave. There is a centre of organised crime in the middle of Europe »//The Guardian, 7/04/2001/(дата обращения: 30.03.2024).

8. Roqueplo O: La Russie et son miroir d'Extreme-Occident, 2018, chapitre IV./ (дата обращения: 30.03.2024).

9. Soutou H-G: Europa! Les projets européens de l'Allemagne nazie et de l'Italie fasciste, 2020/ (дата обращения: 30.03.2024).

10. Миттеран был правым французским адвокатом-католиком и высокопоставленным государственным служащим, который верно служил вишистскому режиму во времена франко-нацистского европейского сотрудничества, затем стал антикоммунистическим социалистом, поддержал «май 68-го», окружил себя 68-щиками, когда стал президентом в 1981 году, и решительно посвятил себя строительству ЕС, подписав Маастрихтский договор в 1992 году. Его, казалось бы, противоречивая карьера вполне последовательна с точки зрения европеизма.

11. «Обращение Президента Республики Беларусь А.Г.Лукашенко к белорусскому народу» // СовБеларуссия, 1996-02.04.

12. “Вновь мы в ССР!” // Комсомольская правда, 1996, 3.03.

13. «От СССР остались только три буквы» // Коммерсантъ- DAILY, 03.03.1996

14. ССР? СНГ? Сообщество?// Свободные новости плюс, №14, 1996. 5.4-12.4.

15. Лихачев ДС: Культура как целостная среда// Избранные труды по русской и мировой культуре, 2022г, с 28.