

O. Roqueplo¹

D. S. LIKHACHOV'S THOUGHT AND THE FRENCH ELITE CULTURAL CRISIS OF THE 21st CENTURY. INTRODUCTION TO HOMO EURAMERICANUS PROBLEM

The nation should not forget about the reasons why it can value itself.

Albert Camus

The great legacy of the literary critic and thinker D. S. Likhachov still remains little known in France. Only one doctoral dissertation, although very important, was dedicated to him: "D. S. Likhachov. Historical poetics of Russian literature of the 10–20th centuries."² Likhachov, of course, is read and commented on by experts in ancient Russian literature (P. Gonno, A. Lavrov, V. Vodov, J.-P. Arrignon, M.-K. Schaub), which allowed me to discover him for myself. But Likhachov's fame did not go beyond the narrow circle of specialists on Russia.

Meanwhile, the relevance of Likhachov's ideas in modern France can hardly be overestimated. At the beginning of the 21st century, France faced an acute cultural crisis. Likhachov foresaw such crises when he spoke about the need for what he called ecology of culture. Moreover, the academician argued that the problem of conflicts and their resolution directly follows from the problem of cultural ignorance. The deterioration in relations between France (and other European countries) and Russia in 2014 and its aggravation in 2022 is the result of the process described by Likhachov.

This report mainly considers the problem of the French cultural crisis in relation of Likhachov's works and concepts, as well as its consequences for Franco-Russian relations and, in general, for France's relations with the world.

This crisis is tied to the appearance of a new human who I call Homo Euramericanus (or, according to R. Debray, 'Gallo-American'³), and who is no longer French, European, or North American, but represents a transatlantic ersatz culture that has lost its landmarks and even territory. This report will allow us to identify such Homo Euramericanus, to define him in some measure, without going beyond the introduction to the problem of such a significant scale.

The example of France is multifaceted. On the one hand, France and its culture are quite large in Europe, unlike, for example, the Scandinavian countries, and historically they are important landmarks for the whole of Europe and many other countries of the world. On the other hand, French cul-

ture officially seeks to stand against cultural globalization,⁴ which cannot be said about the Netherlands or the Central Europe states. French culture is also clearly and radically different from North America culture, while the common features of the USA, Scandinavia and the Netherlands (North German origin, Protestantism, and early liberalism) explain in some extent the powerful process of cultural integration that made English almost dominant in these countries of Northern Europe.⁵ Finally, unlike Germany, France did not have to go through the injury of a national collapse, so it can stay with open heart to the world and history. Thus, France, along with Italy and Spain (less authoritative countries), is the Roman Empire heiress and largely due to this has a strong, proud and living culture.

Moreover, France (which is logical) plays a special role in international cultural relations. UNESCO is headquartered in Paris, and France is among those countries that have made the greatest contribution to the preservation of world cultural heritage. This, in particular, is due to the cultural exclusion policy, which the writer and statesman Andre Malraux insisted on and which France has pursued since 1959. According to this concept, works of art, including dramaturgical, cinematographic and television ones, cannot be sold and bought like other goods, therefore the common market rules should not apply to them. The first international campaign for the preservation of cultural masterpieces began with Malraux's famous speech in UNESCO in 1960. The approach of the Russian scientist Dmitry Likhachov and his Declaration of Cultural Rights dated 2001 are largely in tune with the ideas of the Frenchman Malraux.

To investigate the cultural crisis in France means to study it in the country where it is least destructive, and to predict the consequences for the rest of the EU countries, adding that the Balkans seem to follow a different logic for their radical differences, similar to those of Russia itself.

Let's consider Homo Euramericanus problem by historical, anthropological and geopolitical aspects.

The cultural crisis of the French elites: from 1940 and May 1968 to vocism and new types of barbarism of the 2010s

French culture is undoubtedly one of the brightest in Europe. Our richest literary heritage has been created for several centuries, starting from the Middle Ages. In the 20th century, thanks to technological progress, other types of art also started to develop exponentially. So, by the early 1940s, France was experiencing the golden age of cinema, but at that time an acute moral crisis began in the country. This crisis was caused by the military defeat and the German oc-

¹ Former advisor of the Special Envoy of France in Russia, political analyst and consultant for the Analysis Center "Conflits" (Paris) and SongYun Forum (Shanghai), Dr. Sc. (History), Dr. Sc. (Political Sciences) from Sorbonne University (Paris). Author of 28 publications on geopolitics, history, international relations and color revolutions, including: "The Mythical Carnation Revolution in Portugal (1974–1976): How to Turn Colonizers into Colonized within Two Years", "The Flavor of Color Revolutions" (co-authored), "Kaliningrad: The Prussian Epicenter of Tension in the Baltic Region?", "Russia and its Far-Western Mirror: the Geopolitical Identity of Russia through the Lens of Kaliningrad Oblast", and others. Winner of several awards from the Herder-Institut in Marburg (Germany).

² *Lesourd F.* D. S. Likhatchev. Poétique historique de la littérature russe du Xe au XXe siècle. Lausanne : L'Age d'Homme, 1988.

³ *Debray R.* Comment nous sommes devenus "gallo-ricains" // *Conflits : Revue de Géopolitique*. URL: <https://www.revueconflits.com/americanisation-influence-culturelle-regis-debray/> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

⁴ See The J. Toubon Law dated August 4, 1994; documents on providing support to the international Francophonie.

⁵ Interview given to the author by Dutch Professor V. Mamadakh, June 5, 2018.

cupation. The consequence was the society splintering into three antagonistic groups:

- a large centrist (conservative and socialist) collaborationist bloc, which accepted defeat and stopped believing in the reasonableness of the French model of development, including cultural one;

- Gaullist nationalists (right and left) who did not accept defeat;

- Communists inspired by the USSR example, who fought against the Reich in the name of the French working class.

This splintering is of fundamental importance for understanding the French culture of the 20th century and its modern trends. The liberation of Paris in 1944 ensured the temporary superiority of the Gaullist and Communist Resistance forces, but in 1946 the centrists who had collaborated with the Reich during the war and did not believe in the success of the Paris Uprising, effectively returned to power. Because of the centrists' policy, a cultural crisis began, since they were still ready to become satellites of stronger powers. This crisis made possible a massive Anglo-Saxon cultural intervention. Since the late 1940s, this policy has led, for example, to the creation of the Graduate School of Social Sciences, the cradle of the 'American left', to counterbalance the influence of the National Center for Scientific Research, which was considered too pro-communist. It was during this period that Homo Euramericanus was born, this cultural hybrid without roots, which is neither European nor North American.

Regis Debray says that modern Frenchmen are Gallo-Americans. "There is something of Johnny Hallyday in each of us," President Macron says. But what is the Johnny Hallyday phenomenon if not the American dream? When he passed away, a million Frenchmen came to the Champs-Élysées to take part in the funeral procession, and Macron gave a speech in his honor. Holliday is a French-Belgian rock singer who throughout his career tried to copy Elvis Presley, very popular among the petty bourgeoisie and partially among the working class.

However, it is necessary to describe in more detail the appearance of Homo Euramericanus. English has become the language of globalization and increasingly widespread electronic technologies. This implies a certain acculturation of the whole world, especially elites and youth, through *globish* subculture. However, this is not enough for Homo Euramericanus emergence – it is still necessary to erase cultural and historical memory and abandon their heritage, as Yuri Lotman wrote.¹

Of course, this process in France is not all-around. Everywhere there are local scientists, people who are rooted in their culture and history. However, some categories of the country's population have already become real Homo Euramericanus. These are the political and economic elite, advertisers and journalists, some teachers and scientists, but in the first place – not very educated, representatives of the petty bourgeoisie aimed exclusively at consumption. It was they who were 'the people who wept for Holliday.' These four social groups are opposed by a huge and very diverse part of the French citizens who resist: scientists, clergy, cultural figures, defenders of cultural heritage, especially local ones, bearers of a truly cultural consciousness regardless of

¹ *Лотман Ю. М. Культура и информация // Лотман Ю. М. Статьи по типологии культуры. Тарту : Тартуский ун-т, 1970. С. 11.*

their social origin, as well as a very large proportion of the working class – successors of political culture of communist and Gaullist resistance.

At the same time, it should be remembered that outside of Europe, patriotism, nationalism, and the memory of colonial threats act as a defense against Homo Euramericanus, and in Turkey and Mexico, the gap in development compared to the United States also contributes to such a protection. Although individual cases can be observed all over the world, Homo Euramericanus phenomenon on the scale of the entire country's leadership can still be found only in the EU (although it is possible that this may also happen, for example, in South Korea, which will give rise to the formation of Homo Amerasiaticus). In some EU countries, this phenomenon is more widespread, in others less, but at the elite level it seems self-evident, including because nationalism was suppressed everywhere back in 1968, and there was no colonial threat capable of scaring and warning them.

Homo Euramericanus does not lose its language in France. The French language is strongly influenced by English, but is not in danger. However, French culture is seriously threatened.

D. S. Likhachov argued that literature is the primordial basis of culture, the moral and spiritual values of society, and that it can always serve to restore them: "literature... is an inexhaustible source of moral strength" and "moral self-purification."² He was right. But with the appearance of television and Internet, a new sociocultural factor seems to have changed the situation. As Regis Debray wrote in 2017, "we have moved from the graphosphere to the videosphere. So the videosphere is America. As soon as you turn on your computer, your language and thinking are formed under the influence of ideals, standards and words that came from across the Atlantic."³ In practice, this means that the 21st century made the image and the written word to compete, and that the 'picture' and video, more primitive and understandable to an uneducated audience, almost prevailed over the text. This is evidenced at least by the fact that PowerPoint presentations are attached to even serious scientific papers. The text becomes insufficient, which indicates a reversal and a decrease in the word role.

The United States influence is visible all over the world, and to a large extent the Americanization of France and other countries is simply an effect of globalization. But Homo Euramericanus clearly differs from other 'Americanized' people in the degree of cultural dependence. In his case, it is complete, and he consciously strives to become an American, abandoning his native culture. This was not possible in the 1950s or 1960s.

The color anti-cultural revolution occurring in France in May 1968 was largely the result of the influence of the German-Jewish philosopher Herbert Marcuse's views, the Frankfurt School representative, one of the CIA heads in Germany, who was responsible for the 'denazification' policy. It was in this context that he gradually became the founder of *The New Left* political direction. Its supporters believed that since all issues of material existence were resolved by capitalism, then moral obligations and prohibitions are no longer relevant, so it is possible to start im-

² *Лихачев Д. С. Русская культура в современном мире // Лихачев Д. С. Избранные труды по русской и мировой культуре. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2022. С. 65.*

³ *Debray R. Op. cit.*

plementing human sexual instincts by releasing them. He supported the free expression of left-wing ideas, pseudo-Maoism (having advocated Maoism in 1968¹) and minority rights because they represent the ‘party of tolerance,’ as well as a ban on the activities of right-wing (nationalist) forces because they are the ‘party of intolerance.’ Marcuse opposed any control and censorship, which, in his opinion, are sources of oppression.²

This is what the May 1968 movement is, supported by the situationists Guy Debord and Cohn-Bendit, as well as Trotskyists and pseudo-Maoists. This is the libertarian movement Rock and all that it represents: anti-patriotism, anti-hierarchy, anti-society and anti-culture; it condemns the theaters of Paris, Lyon, Avignon, because they are centers of classical culture, Rock and New Left rivals.

At the same time, the movement is not anti-capitalist, and its ideology is rather weak. The main slogan put forward by Cohn-Bendit is ‘prohibition is prohibited.’ But in essence, it was a movement aimed at the destruction of culture in the form in which it existed before 1968, since it did not provide for the renewal of social, moral and cultural values according to the ‘mock-deconstruction-destruction’ scenario.³ No student slogan in May 1968 was positive. It was a battle against the roots and foundations of order, whatever that order might be. Predictably, the desire for cultural devastation opened the door to the Americanization of society.

Thus, May 1968 became the cataclysm that literally disoriented the whole society and, first of all, the youth themselves. *Pencée 68* (The Thinking of 1968) reflects nihilism, which is clearly manifested in the moral and artistic crisis of the 1970s, when cinema shows emptiness. *Pencée 68* begins as ‘youthful barbarism’ and constant adolescence. It is logical that after May 1968, any actions against up to riots were allowed and possible. The degree of wandering generated by this revolution can be judged by the leader profiles. Thus, Cohn-Bendit lived in a world that was neither European nor American, and was torn between high bourgeoisie, Sartre salons, drugs, pedophilia, the extreme left terrorism of Hans-Joachim Klein and Pierre Goldman’s banditry.

All intellectuals, mainly of left-wing views, and ultimately almost the entire French elite, in fact, came from the same school – the Parisian Sciences Po, adopted *Pencée 68* that continues to dominate directly or indirectly the media and in the ruling elite minds. Since May 1968, everything that reminded of the authorities or the legacy of the past was ridiculed, especially the concept of national allegiances under the influence of Marcuse’s denazification. Meanwhile, *Pencée 68* received the support of influential theorists – J. Lacan, M. Foucault, J. Derrida, J. Deleuze (a group of ‘French theory’) and pedophiles⁴ who seek to protect exclusively ‘oppressed’ minorities, like Marcuse. They delegitimize the majority rule and deconstruct all social institutions: family, church, state, trade unions, and school...

Then they began to deconstruct all forms of identity – social, cultural, sexual, and biological. These philosophers

¹ Giroud F. L’Express va plus loin avec Herbert Marcuse // L’Express. 1968, 23 sept. URL: https://www.lexpress.fr/politique/1968-l-express-va-plus-loin-avec-herbert-marcuse_2013310.html (accessed: 16.03.2023).

² Marcuse H. *Eros & Civilization* (1955, 1966) ; *Idem*. *Tolerance repressive* (1964).

³ Zemmour E. *Le Suicide français*. P. : Éditions Albin Michel, 2014.

⁴ Pédophilie et inceste : comment le passé rattrape ceux qui ont défendu l’indéfendable // Le Parisien. URL: <https://www.leparisien.fr/culture-loisirs/pedophilie-et-inceste-qui-sont-ces-intellectuels-qui-ont-longtemps-defendu-l-indefendable-05-02-2021-8423257.php> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

changed the dominant way of thinking and public values of French society and still define them in public discussions.

Finally, since 1981, when supporters of *Pencée 68* came to power, a simplified scheme ‘patriotism = nationalism = fascism = absolute evil’ was imposed on all media, which, as it is supposed, should be opposed by the formula ‘cosmopolitanism = libertarian left = anti-fascist resistance = democracy = absolute good.’

Since then, all public debates have systematically revolved around this false polarization of the internal and external political life of France. Examples are easy to find among the many publications in the media. The debate on the fundamental issues of the 21st century is thus gradually narrowing down to a ‘single thought’ (*pensée unique*). Such a drastic impoverishment of the debate became possible only upon condition of the preliminary erasure of cultural and historical memory.

The bourgeois youth revolt in May 1968 led, among other things, to the deformation of education. Everyone who attended school after 1968 faced a general decline in the quality and volume of education. In outward appearance, it became more democratic and accessible, but in fact it gradually deteriorated. According to the estimates of Régis Debray, in 2015 the manager’s son made five times more mistakes in French than the worker’s son in 1930.⁵ The main consequence of this is the loss of centuries-old cultural and historical memory, only the memory of the period after 1945 remains. We will return to this in the second part of this report.

Having won the first victory, *Pencée 68* provoked a second wave of ideological and cultural invasion of France, starting in the 2010s, with gender theory on the one hand and vocism on the other. Here I will focus only on the second topic.

The vocism ideology⁶, like many others, is not a cultural phenomenon. Initially, it was intended to awake and liberate the Black Americans consciousness from Anglo-Saxon cultural domination. But it quickly turned into a weapon of mass cultural destruction: its purpose was to delegitimize, condemn and then erase cultural memory, which, according to vocists, restricts freedom, and replace it with another one specially invented for this purpose. This is how Likhachov defines the destruction of culture in his theory of cultural ecology.

North American vocism is imported into France by liberal libertarian organizations, in particular, by some communities of black residents in the Caribbean countries. It is increasingly challenging the foundations of French culture. Here is one example illustrating the extreme danger of vocism.⁷ In February 2023, a young activist vocalist accused Jean de La Fontaine that his fables were allegedly plagiarism of Aesop’s texts. The latter, allegedly, was a black African. The pretext is ridiculous – it is enough to read Aesop in Greek and La Fontaine in French. But the damage has been done: young people begin to doubt Lafontaine – one of the pillars of European literature and the founders of the classical French language. Vocists are trying to undermine La Fontaine’s authority, and then ‘cancel’ him. By erasing

⁵ Debray R. *Civilisation. Comment nous sommes devenus américains*. P. : Gallimard, 2017. Chapitre III.

⁶ Valentin P. *L’idéologie woke*. Vol. 1 : Anatomie du wokisme ; Vol. 2 : Face au wokisme. P. : Fondapol, 2021.

⁷ <https://www.tiktok.com/@guerriersilencieux/video/7204917759312956677> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

La Fontaine from the minds of thousands of young people,¹ vocalists create a situation where in the near future it will be possible to erase all classical French culture. The danger is enormous, especially when you consider that vocists receive not only money for seducing young people, but also direct power over them, since vocist Pape Ndiaye has been the Minister of National Education in Macron's government since 2022.

Likhachov wrote that the role of schools and universities is vital for maintaining culture.² This is where the power of vocism lies, with its pervasive political and social tentacles.

It should be emphasized that it is no coincidence that vocism is so destructive to such an extent: it was born in a community that at one time experienced a cultural collapse. The peculiarity of the black population of North America and the Caribbean countries is that they are descendants of slaves who were forced to abandon their language of culture, mixing them so that they cannot understand each other, and turn them into submissive slaves. It is this cultural devastation that has become a disease spreading across all continents.

Finally, the decisive year in the history of the cultural crisis in France was 2012, when it was decided to cancel finally the teaching of Ancient Greek and Latin in secondary schools. But this is the deepest foundation of French culture – fundamental works in science and art, literary classics; sacred texts, philosophical treatises were written in these languages, the French language was formed on the basis of Latin... This is undoubtedly the most acute crisis, because it lays axe to cultural roots. This is exactly what Likhachov pointed out when he said: "After the revolution, the prohibition of the Religious Education and teaching the Church Slavonic language was a colossal blow to the Russian language and, consequently, to the Russian conceptual world. Many expressions from psalms, services, Sacred Scripture (especially from the Old Testament), etc. have become incomprehensible. This enormous damage to Russian culture will still have to be studied and comprehended."³

Likhachov noted that when at least one essential element of a particular culture is disappeared or disintegrated, and then ultimately the whole culture is under threat.⁴

The Greeks and Romans considered barbarians those who did not speak their beautiful languages. Thus, the French people entered the era of barbarism in 2012, and they become victims of the war against their culture. Can it be considered an accident that same-sex marriages were legalized in the same year? Then in 1968, attacks on theaters occurred at the same time with the propaganda of unbridled sexuality and pedophilia. Morality, as Likhachov notes, is inseparable from culture.

Homo Euramericanus: a man by the Lethe River and a pedocrat

The diplomatic, ideological and even military confrontation between the countries of Western Europe (including France) and Russia, which began in 2014 and escalated in 2022, re-

minds us of the importance of Likhachov's thinking about peace. Today's Euro-Russian confrontation, of which we will mention only the Franco-Russian dimension here, is indeed a war of postmodern obscurantism. Likhachov wrote:

"And a lasting civil peace is possible only on the basis of culture. Many of our tragic conflicts largely stem from lack of culture, from intemperance in expressions, from inability to listen to an opponent, to convince him."⁵

Modern France has been implementing to some extent the idea of banning Russian art, literature, and classical music since 2022 as part of 'political sanctions' that invade even the cultural field, at the request of the Ukrainian⁶ and British⁷ governments, who claim that culture is the third front of the war, which they are leading against Russia, along with the military-political and economic fronts. This is, of course, outrageous, but it really is an obscurantism war, a crime against culture and ethnic hatred (which also directly or indirectly affects the majority of Ukrainians who share this culture). And, as Academician Likhachov perfectly understood, this obscurantism makes peace impossible and war inevitable. But this third front is natural, because, as the scientist recognized, culture is a matter of spiritual security of a particular people,⁸ in a total war, the enemy attacks cultural security too.

Likhachov insisted on the concept of 'lack of culture', and one can only agree with him. Geopolitical conflicts are inevitable, tensions arise often, but their resolution is always possible provided that cultural ties with the other party are preserved. These ties include not only diplomatic efforts, but also the knowledge of the other, the desire to understand him, if only to control or 'win'. The rupture of cultural and even scientific cooperation between the French and Russians – an unheard phenomenon during the Cold War – is extremely dangerous, since these two peoples represent the most important historical poles of culture in the European space.

This is not the source of the conflict itself, but the inability to control it, which was possible even in the conditions of tension during the Cold War. Today's French leaders no longer know Russia – neither its language, nor its history, nor its culture. In the 1990s, the Russian language gradually disappeared from schools and is not taught today, which has a decisive influence on the level of knowledge about Russia in French society, including in the academic environment. The same can be said about other foreign languages. Meanwhile, Likhachov argued that education is the basis of all human contacts with national and world culture.⁹

Russian history is also almost unknown in France, especially the history of relations between our countries. It is not

⁵ Лихачев Д. С. Великая культура примирительна по своей сути // Дни науки в Университете. Избранное. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2007. С. 55.

⁶ Oleksandr Tkachenko: "As Ukraine's culture minister, I'm asking you to boycott Tchaikovsky until this war is over" // The Guardian. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/dec/07/ukraine-culture-minister-boycott-tchaikovsky-war-russia-kremlin> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

⁷ Scott G. Cultural sanctions are third front in Ukrainian war – Dorries // Evening Standard. 2022. March 3. URL: <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/uk/vladimir-putin-russian-international-paralympic-committee-nadine-dorries-culture-secretary-b985751.html> (accessed: 16.03.2023) ; Sanctionner la Russie sans bannir sa culture // La République des livres. 2022. 2 août. URL: <https://larepubliquedeslivres.com/sanctionner-la-russie-sans-bannir-sa-culture/> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

⁸ Декларация прав культуры, § 14.

⁹ Декларация прав культуры, § 14г.

¹ <https://www.tiktok.com/@guerriersilencieux/video/7204917759312956677>.

² Декларация прав культуры, § 1б, § 14в, г.

³ Лихачев Д. С. Культура как целостная среда // Лихачев Д. С. Избранные труды по русской и мировой культуре. 4-е изд. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2022. С. 28.

⁴ Декларация прав культуры, § 14л.

present in the consciousness of generations born after 1950. This gap is very noticeable. Recall the debate between Jacques Chirac and Lionel Jospin in 2002, when Jospin effortlessly quoted Lermontov.¹ That said, Jospin was an anti-Soviet, a Trotskyist and a protester in May 1968, but he was born in 1937, so he got a good classical education. I should also mention Jean-Pierre Chevenne (born in 1939), who I supported myself in 2017–2019. A left-wing politician and statesman, but he was able to establish contact with Russia, including during a period of high tension after 2014, because he remembers from history both the alliance of Russia and France in 1894–1917, and the wars – Crimean, Napoleonic, Seven Years.’ He knows that Russia is a European country that is part of a common European (including French) memory. In 2014, he participated in a Franco-Russian event in memory of 1914.

But these leaders represent the outgoing generation. The generation of today’s leaders, regardless of their level of education, does not have this historical memory, because, as Yu. Lotman wrote, their memory has been erased and re-written by the powers that want to destroy both French and Russian culture, and they have been doing it very skillfully since 1968. Nicolas Sarkozy (born in 1955), Francois Hollande (born in 1954), Emmanuel Macron (born in 1977) are united by the fact that they were decisively influenced by the events of 1968 that occurred either in their school years or long before them. Unlike people born before 1950 (who can be considered the last generation of long memory, since in 1968 the youngest of them was already 18 years old), the leaders who were born later belong to the generation of oblivion: they do not know and do not remember in cultural terms the world before 1945, which in their view is like ‘year 0’². Their speeches and addresses never go beyond this date. The result is obvious: since 1947, the USSR has been an adversary, and Russia has been an ‘eternal adversary,’ because there is no longer any memory of Stalingrad, the battle of Gumbinnen in September 1914 that saved Paris, the Congress of Vienna, Peter the Great and Catherine II.

Moreover, for these generations, the United States is almost the only winner in World War II and the only liberator of Europe. In 1945, the question: “Which country contributed the most to defeating Germany?” 55% of the French answered ‘the USSR’ and only 15% – ‘the USA’, and after seventy years of propaganda (especially through cinema) and the destruction of historical memory – exactly the opposite.³

Let me give you an example: neither Francois Hollande nor Emmanuel Macron in 2014–2018 ever mentioned the Franco-Russian Alliance in any of their speeches,⁴ although the celebration of the centenary of the end of the First World

War (1914–1918) in France lasted five years. Moreover, all speeches devoted to this history period, as a rule, contained a reference to the events of 1945, and Armistice Day on November 11, 1918 (the day of the signing of the Compiègne Truce, which ended hostilities in the First World War) is now Remembrance Day for the Fallen without any further clarification. The events of that period no longer matter.⁵ R. Debray gave a more precise explanation: “The farther the dead, the closer the distant (= USA).”⁶

Today, the ignorance by political, economic, media and cultural leaders of a new generation about the rather long common French-Russian past could lead to disastrous consequences. Modern leaders are in thrall to the ideology and ideas of the Cold War and their recent historical and cultural dependence on the United States and Great Britain. They are unable to imagine another world, which would allow them to make a comparison with the world in 1914, 1814 or 1714.

But let’s return to the events of May 1968. In the period from 1958 to 1968, Ch. de Gaulle tried to restore French power in the form in which it existed before 1914. He could do this because he kept the memory of that period, after all – culture is a direct source of power, as D. S. Likhachov said. After the overthrow of de Gaulle, the participants of the May 1968 events began to erase the memory of the time before 1945, when France was great, which did not allow a new de Gaulle to appear and start all over again with the same ambitions.

Young leaders do not remember the glorious time, so they believe that France should be content with the memory of the events of 1945, which they know. They can’t imagine anything else. In this case, the memory of the Franco-Russian Alliance goes beyond the relationship to Russia, since in 1914 this military-political alliance was one of the foundations of French power. The new leaders do not know their interlocutor, the ‘enemy’; they do not want to understand him, which prevents not only achieving peace, but also the promotion of the interests of their own countries, including economic and commercial ones.

The role of scientists, whose importance in culture was emphasized by D. S. Likhachov, is particularly important in this case.⁷ The leaders of the countries do not listen to the opinion of real scientists and French experts on Russia (B. Drventski, P. Gonno, A. Lavrov, J. Sapir, A. Groppo, J.-P. Arrignon et al.), instead they are guided by the opinion of false experts, even such influential ones as M. Yelchani-nov, the researcher of creativity F. M. Dostoevsky. In 2015, in his book “Dans la tête de Vladimir Poutine”, he, acting a bit like a charlatan, wrote that there is an eternal Russian threat to Europe: pan-slavism in the 19th century, communism in the 20th, and Putin’s neo-pan-slavism (!) in the 21st.⁸ His book, despite the unconvincing nature of some

¹ <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA419269524&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=03017257&p=AQNE&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7E6dc369a0> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

² The only notable exception is Prime Minister D. de Villepin (born in 1953), who was in power at the end of Chirac’s term. But de Villepin is a professional diplomat-historian, which means a special case. It is no coincidence that the end of Chirac’s mandate is also the fall of Villepin, the only ‘young leader’ having a historical memory.

³ *Narochnickaja N.* Que reste-t-il de notre victoire? P. : Editions des Syrtes, 2008.

⁴ Déclaration de M. François Hollande, Président de la République, en hommage aux anciens combattants de la Première Guerre mondiale, à la nécropole nationale de Notre-Dame de Lorette le 11 novembre 2014 // Vie publique. URL: <https://www.vie-publique.fr/discours/192935-declaration-de-m-francois-hollande-president-de-la-republique-en-homm> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

⁵ Similar indifference of French leaders has already been observed during the celebration of the Napoleonic bicentennial (1998–2021). While the population and mayors organize very popular events, Parisian leaders forget or refuse to celebrate even the Battle of Austerlitz in 2005 (when the prime minister Villepin is on a business trip), some way under the influence of black-Caribbean ideologues (Claude Ribb). This causes indignation of only two deputies, one of whom is a Corsican. See: *Boudon J.-O.* Les commémorations de Napoléon. URL: <https://www.revueconflits.com/jacques-olivier-boudon-commemorations-napoleon-sartene/> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

⁶ *Debray R.* Civilisation. Comment nous sommes devenus américains. P. 80.

⁷ Декларация прав культуры и ее международное значение.

⁸ *Eltschaninoff V.* Dans la tête de Vladimir Poutine. Arles : Actes Sud, 2014. This book, unfortunately, is the only ‘about Russia’ that French government advisers read when I worked with them in 2017–2019.

conclusions, was translated into all the languages of NATO countries and hastily republished in March 2022. Such pseudo-scientific works are dangerous for culture and all mankind. Let us recall in this connection Auguste Comte's formula: "From science comes foresight, from foresight action." If we have imperfect "scientific combinations," then "[E]verything yet done is inadequate to the object."

Therefore, Russia is perceived by young leaders who have no memory as a foreign, barbaric, new country, as if it has never been neighboring Europe and no important issue has been discussed with it for the last 300 years. This is where a lack of culture as a cornerstone in the foundation of peace and war manifests itself.

French leaders in 2022 have gone too far in their desire to 'cancel' Russian culture and Russian cultural symbols. A reasonable question arose: what can they hope for in negotiations with Russia if they do not know this country? Isn't that why, already in February 2022, NATO strategists, who are simultaneously waging a cultural and media war against Russia, wrote that there would be no peace with the Russian Federation until its (unlikely) defeat?

This problem is far from French-Russian, it is also French-Arab, French-African, French-Vietnamese, French-Brazilian and even French-Polish, French-Hungarian, etc. This is especially true of those countries that do not compete with France and do not feel hostility towards the French.

Thus, since 2007, we have witnessed many French diplomatic crises (sometimes acute) that have no political basis, the cause of which lies in culture. History and culture were almost completely removed from French leaders' view. Such incompetence of ignorant leaders is regularly condemned by many diplomats and the military, which assess the grave consequences of this decision.¹

Here's an example. On July 26, 2007, Nicolas Sarkozy delivered a speech to Africans at the French-speaking University of Dakar, one of the best in Africa, and he, in particular, stated: "The tragedy of Africa is that the African has not fully gone down in history... There is no place for adventure or the idea of progress in the African imaginary world. In an African universe where nature controls everything, a human escapes the torments of history that modern human suffers from; the African remains unchanged amid a constant order where everything seems to be written in advance."

This speech was composed by the brilliant logographer Henri Guaino, but it was booed by the Africans² and Jacques Chirac (born 1932) laughed at it: "The African has gone down in history; moreover, he is the first to go down!" How did such speech become possible in a State that acts as a political and cultural landmark for half of the African States and which preserves on its territory the best part

of the cultural heritage of these countries (masterpieces of art, recorded oral texts, literature, cinema, African studies, etc.)? Also how did it become possible that five years later the new President Francois Hollande (born in 1954) repeated essentially the same ideas (showing the same profound ignorance)?³ And how did it become possible that in 2017 Emmanuel Macron (born in 1977) turned not even to a little-known history, but this time to the only events known to his generation (we are talking about N. Mandela)? All this can be compared with the words and actions of Jacques Chirac, who skillfully completed his last presidential term with the opening of the Museum bearing his name on the Branly Embankment (or the Museum of Art and Civilizations of Africa, Asia, Oceania and the Americas (non-European civilizations)). The restoration of the French-African Museum allowed Chirac to build bridges and create a basis for dialogue with Africa.

The answer to the question of how this became possible is related to the erasure of historical and cultural memory: Sarkozy, Hollande, Macron and French advisers have no memory of the Franco-African relations of the 19th–20th centuries, it is replaced by a narrow Euro-American memory that 'does not know' what Africa is and how strong the French, French-speaking component is in it (see African onomastics), it is both Francophile and Franco-phobic, a real 'daughter of France' in grief and joy.

The generation of French leaders born after 1950 does not know that nowhere in the world is the public more receptive to French discourse than in French-speaking Africa. The modern French elite no longer knows that the President of the Central African Republic Bokassa took part in the liberation of France and that for two years French Equatorial Africa was the only territory of Free France (1940–1942) with an independent French army (the 2nd armored Division of General F. Leclerc de Otklock), whose epic journey across Africa led to the liberation of France in August 1944, combining the entire Franco-African history in one event. This epic is central because it answers a vital question about French memory: did France liberate itself by its African army or was it liberated by the Anglo-Saxons? And therefore, should she live independently or depending on the 'liberators'?

In his speech, Hollande expressed a desire to visit the House of Slaves (Maison des Esclaves) on the Senegalese island of Goree – a museum and memorial to the victims of the Atlantic slave trade. But he does not know that it was the inhabitants of this island, who sold slaves captured in African interior to Europeans!

The lack of culture makes the French leaders powerless even before their African spiritual and cultural brothers. Not surprisingly, after fifteen years of cultural and historical incompetence, French leaders have lost their influence in Africa, both in the Central African Republic and in Mali, Burkina Faso, perhaps even in Nigeria. I would like to note that it is not so much French power that is collapsing, as French incompetence and cultural ignorance that make Africans turn to other partners, more intelligent and cultured. Such weakness of the French leaders in the short term may lead to disaster, because the Democratic Republic

¹ *Malbrunot G.* Le déclassement français. Élysée, Quai d'Orsay, DGSE: les secrets d'une guerre d'influence stratégique. P.: Michel Lafon, 2022; *Idem.* Le déclassement de la diplomatie française // *Conflits*: Revue de Géopolitique. URL: <https://www.revueconflits.com/georges-malbrunot-declassement-francais/> (accessed: 16.03.2023); *Scheer F., Dufourcq B., Hennekinne L.* Le Quai, outil vital d'une diplomatie efficace // *Le Monde*. 2010. 24 août. URL: https://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2010/08/24/le-quai-outil-vital-d-une-diplomatie-efficace-par-francois-scheer-bertrand-dufourcq-et-loic-hennekinne_1402148_3232.html (accessed: 16.03.2023).

² See: *Mbembe A.* L'Afrique de Nicolas Sarkozy // *Africultures*. 2007. 31 juil. URL: <https://africultures.com/lafrique-de-nicolas-sarkozy-6784/> (accessed: 16.03.2023); *Idem.* France-Afrique: ces sottises qui divisent // *Africultures*. 2007. 8 août. URL: <http://africultures.com/france-afrique-ces-sottises-qui-divisent-6819/> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

³ France – Afrique: le texte du discours de Dakar prononcé par François Hollande // *Jeune Afrique*. 2012. 15 oct. URL: <https://www.jeuneafrique.com/173903/politique/france-afrique-le-texte-du-discours-de-dakar-prononce-par-fran-ois-hollande/> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

lic of the Congo has now become the first French-speaking country in the world, and only French-speaking Africa still seems to be a large zone of influence for France and French-speaking culture.

Thus, France is becoming provincial and more isolated than it has ever been for millennia. France no longer understands Africa, because French leaders have lost an essential part of the classical French culture that connected them with African countries. Today, for edification, it is Africa that preserves the classic French onomastics of the 1900s, while Homo Euramericanus already uses Euro-American lexemes.

D. S. Likhachov argued that culture is a source of strength: “Russia is a great country. Great not for its territories, not for military glory, not even for industry and raw materials, but above all for its thousand-year-old culture, which gave the world immortal works of literature, architecture, music, and fine art.”¹ Lack of culture, in turn, is a source of strengthlessness.

I need to say a few words about the people who embody French culture abroad – diplomats. In fact, the French cultural crisis of leaders was followed by the crisis of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Quai d’Orsay) and diplomacy. Since 2007, when Bernard Kouchner, a participant in the May 1968 events, took the post of Foreign Minister, diplomats have lost all ability to influence French diplomacy, which was henceforth determined by the president and a narrow circle of people chosen by him.²

This marginalizing of diplomats gave rise to ignorance, lack of restraint and rigidity of diplomatic policy after 2007 (see examples in Libya and Syria). In 2022, this policy was brought to its logical conclusion by the diplomatic corps abolition. This is lack of culture triumph. Thus, 2007 should be considered the year of a break point: generational, cultural and personnel. It is appropriate here to quote the words of Academician Likhachov that “cultural differences of peoples and the inability to cultural understanding and mutually enriching dialogue of cultures became one of the causes of interethnic and international conflicts of the 20th century.”³

Lack of culture, memory and knowledge is, according to the scholar Bashlar, an epistemological obstacle that impedes the progress and the search for problem solving.

Therefore, today the young members of the French political elite, theoretically educated but actually ignorant, who drank water from the Lethe river, returned to a clean slate, like teenagers who discover new things without knowing anything.

Since 1968, we have seen the establishment of neocracy (or even pedocracy) – a regime where those who were born yesterday, a kind of eternally young teenagers who do not know history and culture, rule. Is it possible to measure the danger of this trend, which affects almost the entire society?

Here we can mention Auguste Comte, who is the author of the concept of three states: theological (when a human perceives the world as he imagines it, the ‘childhood’ of humanity), metaphysical (when he considers it as it should be, the ‘adolescence’ of humanity) and positive (when a person perceives it as such, what he is, and the ‘maturity’ of hu-

manity). The rulers’ ignorance of scientific theories shows that we are obviously not in a ‘positive’ state, but have regressed to a neocratic ‘metaphysical’ or even pedocratic ‘theological’ state.

This is an extreme form of inability to understand the other (= autism), to listen to his arguments, whatever they may be. Such a state is not far from savagery, which is a distinctive feature of the backward and uneducated ‘childhood’ of humanity. Diplomacy becomes impossible in this case, and people may find themselves in on the battlefield only to kill each other. When a culture dies, a human also soon dies – this is the law that D. S. Likhachov deduced from his ecology of culture.

“If nature is indispensable to human biological life, then the cultural environment is equally indispensable to his spiritual, moral life, for his ‘spiritual settled lifestyle,’ for his attachment to native places, moral self-discipline and sociality. <...> Non-compliance with the laws of biological ecology can kill a human in biological terms; non-compliance with the laws of cultural ecology can kill a human in moral terms. And there is no gap between them, just as there is no clearly defined boundary between nature and culture.”⁴

Europe in 2022–2023 clearly demonstrates this tragic trend: it is moving towards the abyss due to the lack of culture.

Homo Euramericanus geopoliticus:

The EU is like a hegemonic empire without culture and therefore destructive

According to D. S. Likhachov, “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.”⁵

This characteristic, prophetically formulated by Likhachov, exactly corresponds to the EU portrait that we have observed since 2020. The real Europe obviously has a rich and ancient culture (including Greek, Roman, Christian and Indo-European). As Friedrich Nietzsche wrote, “Europe exists only in a number of very old books,” in such treasures as *The Iliad*, *The Odyssey*, *The Aeneid*, the works of Plato, *The Gospel*, in the general legendary heritage collected by Perrault, Lafontaine, Grimm, Andersen, Rybnikov, Afanasyev, etc.

Despite ephemeral attempts to unite most of Europe (the Frankish Empire, the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, 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 such entity had a cultural past, traditional landmarks and spiritual shrines. Attempts to create a united Europe were based on national traditions, but above all on the Roman Empire, the true basis for two parts of Europe: Latin Catholic and Greek Orthodox. Following the thought of Academician Likhachov, it can be argued that the power

¹ Лихачев Д. С. Великая культура примирительна по своей сути // Дни науки в Университете. Избранное. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2007. С. 10.

² Malbrunot G. Le déclassement français ; *Idem*. Le déclassement de la diplomatie française ; Scheer F., Dufourcq B., Hennekinne L. Op. cit.

³ Декларация прав культуры, преамбула.

⁴ Лихачев Д. С. Экология культуры // Лихачев Д. С. Избранные труды по русской и мировой культуре. 4-е изд. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2022. С. 486–487.

⁵ Лихачев Д. С. Многомерное и целостное видение культуры // *Ibid*. С. 22.

and cultural antiquity, and hence the legitimacy of these imperial structures, ensured both the level of violence limited by culture level and the uselessness of violence as a source of power.

The Napoleonic Empire is a pan-European construction, much more rigid than its predecessors, for the reasons indicated by D. S. Likhachov: this empire did not have a stable cultural foundation and did not know what it really was (the French, Franco-Italian, Neo-Carolingian, neo-Roman Empire or an ideological empire embodying the ideals of the French Revolution and Enlightenment).

After a period of stability under Bismarck (*Klein-deutsche Lösung*, the little German way of German unification) the Second Reich in 1891 entered a cultural crisis, which gradually led to pan-Germanism (*Großdeutsche Lösung*, the Great German way of German unification). Since 1915, the Second Reich completely lost German cultural landmarks and became a conquering empire that absorbed Austria-Hungary, annexed Poland, the Baltic States, made Romania, Ukraine, Finland satellites and no longer had borders. Therefore, the level of violence here was higher than in the French Empire.

The Third Reich had a particularly high level of violence for the same reason. Since 1941, it no longer had a cultural basis; it was no longer the Great Germany, because it moved towards the distant East, which it wanted to annex. At that moment it was a pan-Germanic, that is, ideological, military empire that did not know where its cultural center was located: is it still Berlin and Prussia, or Aryan Scandinavia, or the mythical Gothic Ukrainian-Polish empire of the ancient king Germanarikh, or a neo-pagan empire? No cultural tradition allowed it to become stable, and this explains its destructive and self-destructive influence.

Finally, the last of the pan-European constructions is the European Union. After a period of formation, as part of interstate cooperation (*European Economic Community* in 1957–1993), it became a new hegemonic and expansionist union, but less hard. However, first of all, it should be said that the European Union is not based on any element of culture.

The following evidences can be given. Symbols that are culture vectors are irrelevant in the case of the EU. The flag of Europe with twelve stars is the only used and recognized symbol that officially does not refer to anything other than the idea of abstract and indeterminate unity (at that any religious reference is 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 symbols, unrelated to reality, are model ones.

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 the name Europa belonged to a nymph (according to legend, Zeus appeared to Europe, playing on the seashore, in the shape of a white bull and ran away with her). Then for 18–19th centuries, Europe was depicted as a crowned nymph with a sword and a globe (according to the iconographic tradition established by Ch. Ripa), associating with the throne, crown, temple, book, artistic and scientific instruments, that is, with the instruments of culture.

EU ideologues explain: “Antiquated, extremely hermetic today, extremely Christian, imperial or even imperialist, extremely armed and therefore militant allegory seems to have been intentionally left without images and doomed to

oblivion.”¹ They might add that it is also ‘extremely European, cultural and truthful.

Such perceptions for the European Union are a real denial of culture. The further the EU develops, the fewer cultural landmarks it has. It was the Europeanist Francois Hollande who prohibited the teaching of Ancient Greek and Latin in a school in 2012. However, is there anything more European than these languages, which united all the peoples of Europe for 2.5 thousand years?

But that’s not all. I have met several times with Philippe Perchoc, an extremely socially and politically influential ideologue in the European Union, now a member of the European Parliament, who is considered the main leader of the Eurocentric movement in France, primarily among the Parisian elite. My discussion with him in 2010 was devoted to the EU symbols and cultural and historical landmarks. Perchoc 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 European Union 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 drawn up and applied by lawyers who rely on a narrowly professional technocratic lexicon. This ideology, according to its chief ideologue, should be regularly replenished with the ideas and political aspirations of the elites of the new countries joining the EU, since the elites are still under the charm of (futuristic one for them) the project, but not under its application: “The EU behaves like a screwed-up teenager who does not know what to do with his changing body.”² However, it is the search for new ideas and the desire to get them from countries, which could join the EU, that will ensure its growth and help to realize 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, African countries) to reassert its ideology through victory: electoral, military, mixed (= color revolution). As the European media has repeatedly noted and as is often repeated in Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova and other countries, “democracy has won, so the EU and the West have won.” This is the meaning of the existence and legitimacy of the EU. Such expansionism cannot be called peaceful, and when it is not a winner (for example, in Turkey, Belarus, Serbia, Russia, Ukraine), then another country is immediately labeled as an enemy,³ even if this is not true.

Moreover, the image of the EU ‘teenager’ confirms the idea of neocracy that was mentioned earlier, and can help to understand Homo Euramericanus’ unhealthy passion for gender theory and LGBT. This indicates a general cultural regression of French leaders to adolescence (and even childhood) and involution.

¹ Gosselet S.-K. Représentation de l’Europe // Encyclopédie d’histoire numérique de l’Europe. URL: <https://ehne.fr/fr/encyclopedie/thematiques/les-arts-en-europe/representation-de-l-europe/representation-de-l-europe> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

² Perchoc P. L’utopie est à nos portes // Voxeurop. 2010. 28 déc. URL: <https://voxeurop.eu/fr/lutopie-est-a-nos-portes/> (accessed: 16.03.2023).

³ Patten C. Russia’s hell-hole enclave. There is a centre of organised crime in the middle of Europe // The Guardian. 2001. Apr. 7 ; Roqueplo O. La Russie et son miroir d’Extrême-Occident : l’identité géopolitique de la Russie ultra-périphérique sous le prisme de l’Oblast’ de Kaliningrad. Étude géographique et géopolitique. Histoire. Université Sorbonne, Paris Cité, 2018. Chapitre IV.

Following D. S. Likhachov's logic, we can conclude that the European Union is potentially worse and more dangerous than the Third Reich, because it even has no cultural fantasy.

In 2021, the book by the historian G.-H. Soutou "Europa! Les projets européens de l'Allemagne nazie et de l'Italie fasciste" was published, where he describes a hidden side of the EU history.¹ In particular, the author says that for the first time the European Union idea was embodied during the Third Reich and that it was not only a German project, but the Italian fascists, who were then a real driving force, took an active part in it. The reason for this lies again in the connection between culture, legitimacy and violence, identified by Academician Likhachov. Like the Second Reich, the united Italy had blurred cultural foundations, so the ideas of Italian fascism alternated between the creation of the Italian nation and the new Roman Empire. It was the second concept, as Soutou shows that formed the basis of the European Union first version of the 1940s.

However, the first European Union included a large number of Western European Roman Catholics, centrists and socialists who acted independently. It was they who imposed on everyone the idea of a specifically European (anti-Soviet and anti-Anglo-Saxon) education, whereas the Third Reich was initially much smaller (Nordic) and at the same time much larger (worldwide) than the Pan-European Union.

It should also be noted the continuity of ideas (as well as people) of the political structure of 1942 and the EU of 1992, which is demonstrated by the archetypal example of Francois Mitterrand (born in 1916).² This story has been forgotten and erased from the memory of the generation of people who were born after 1950, but its potential development seems to repeat itself before our eyes.

Today, the EU chimera turned into a hydra with countless heads, seems to be gradually turning into an empire with totalitarian tendencies. The unelected European Commission at the head of this political entity, which since 2020 has become autonomous and independent from the EU member states and devoid of any cultural basis, began to turn into a dictatorial and militant technocracy: first by libertarian governance, then by the suppression of mass demonstrations against such policies and, finally, by militant attacks 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, calls NATO (with headquarters in Brussels) its defense system, although the Anglo-Saxon 'pillars' of this organization are not included in the EU. We are dealing with a culturally 'wandering' empire: neither European nor truly Anglo-Saxon, reminiscent of the three attempts of tough hegemony that preceded it.

In reality, the EU is just a geopolitical mirror of Homo Euramericanus, a human without culture, homeland, and

borders. It has no geographical reference point. Who in the EU can consider Brussels a real capital and center? Brussels is a city divided in two parts between the Walloon and Flemish districts. The USA, the city of New York and the state of California, not to mention London, are more of a cultural center for EU leaders than any other place in the European Union. Thus, the EU becomes Euroamerica, which is in danger of joining the dominant cultural pole.

In general, the European Union is an entity that avoids the cultural dimension. Therefore, it returns to the form of ultra-archaic political construction, potentially close to barbarism for of its anti-cultural basis and anti-historical neocratic elites. This is not Europe, but anti-Europe, because there is no Europe other than culture, history and memory. The ideology of the Europeanists is liberal-libertarian technodemocracy. They have a policy of Europeanization of their members. In other words, they condemn everything that does not match this ideology, that is, European values. But who will believe that the ideology, which conceived in the 1970s, has anything to do with Europe, its three thousand years of history and culture?

In fact, every true scientist and cultured person in Europe is a true European. It is such people who are lacking today; they are being pushed aside and replaced by Homo Euramericanus. Nicolas Sarkozy said in 2007 that "the African has not fully gone down in history," but it seems that the elites of France and the EU, that is, Homo Euramericanus, have left it forever.

Conclusion

D. S. Likhachov believed that in the 21st century the main threat to culture comes from mass culture. He was not mistaken, but today we see another, deeper and initially less noticeable threat, which is the result of a frightening anti-cultural revolution.

Likhachov's ideas allow us to understand correctly the problem of Homo Euramericanus that has become fundamental one. The latter is not just a cultural hybrid, but a real new human, whose peculiarity is that he has lost his memory, forgot his history, and therefore an essential part of his culture and can no longer understand the world where he lives. Hence his complete dependence on foreigners.

Academician Likhachov believed that culture cannot exist for a long time if any part of it is missing. All of Likhachov's fears about the loss of culture not only have come to pass, but were also have been implemented by the nihilistic, barbaric and now openly militant 'new human' who has been in power in France since 2007. The fact that he was able to enter the midst of French leaders who were traditionally committed to the defense of high culture, who were guided by Malraux's recommendations, is an ominous sign for all European culture, thoughts and actions.

Europe today is divided on the war issue, this is mainly because its western part, however paradoxical it seems, is no longer European, in cultural terms it is already Euro-American one and is waiting for its political and economic annexation by the Anglo-Saxon world, which is a logical consequence. Indeed, as D. S. Likhachov rightly believed, the only real basis of society is not the economy, but culture.

¹ Soutou H.-G. Europa! Les projets européens de l'Allemagne nazie et de l'Italie fasciste. P.: Tallandier, 2021.

² Mitterrand was a right-wing French Catholic lawyer and a high-ranking civil servant who faithfully served the Vichy regime during the Franco-Nazi cooperation, then became an anti-communist socialist, supported May 1968, surrounded himself with Pénécée 68 participants and supporters when he became president in 1981, and resolutely devoted himself to building the EU by signing the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. His seemingly contradictory career is quite consistent in terms of Europeanism.

Literature

Ferry, L. La pensée 68 / L. Ferry, A. Renaut. – Paris : Gallimard, 1988. – Текст : непосредственный.

Kamouh, C. UE, une impasse politique et sociale / C. Kamouh. – Текст : электронный // La Pensée libre. – 2021, juin. – URL: <http://la-pensee-libre.over-blog.com/2021/06/n-231-ue-une-impasse-politique-et-sociale.html> (accessed: 09.05.2023).

Lesourd, F. D. S. Likhatchev, Destin d'une histoire des mentalités en Russie / F. Lesourd. – Текст : непосредственный // Revue russe. – 1998. – № 14. – P. 13–21.

Рокplo, O. Привкус «цветных революций»: французский май 1968-го. Дважды розовая / O. Рокplo. – URL: <https://www.sb.by/articles/dvazhdy-rozovaya-chast-1-ya.html> ; <https://www.sb.by/articles/dvazhdy-rozovaya-chast-2-ya.html> (accessed: 09.05.2023). – Текст : электронный.