

**SAM TORRES**

## The Influence of Dugin's Fourth Theory on the Current Socio-Economic Situation in the Russian Federation and Its Impact on Vladimir Putin

**Abstract:** This article provides an in-depth analysis of Alexander Dugin's Fourth Political Theory and its impact on contemporary politics and the socio-economic situation in the Russian Federation, with a particular focus on its influence on President Vladimir Putin's decision-making and policies. Dugin's Fourth Political Theory is an intellectual response to the dominance of Western liberalism and globalization, which Dugin argues lead to cultural homogenization and the loss of national identities. The theory advocates for a multipolar world order where different civilizations and cultural spheres have the right to develop independently without external interference. The article explores how these ideas shape current Russian geopolitical strategy, support the growth of Russian nationalism, and serve as the ideological foundation for policies of expansion and the restoration of Russian influence. Furthermore, the article analyzes the potential risks associated with this ideology, such as the reinforcement of isolationism, authoritarianism, and ethnic nationalism, which may destabilize international relations and threaten global security. The article also considers how Dugin's philosophy resonates with Moscow's historical ambitions and how it is interpreted and implemented in contemporary Russian politics.

**Keywords:** Fourth Political Theory; Eurasianism; Vladimir Putin; Russian nationalism; Multipolarity; Geopolitics; Authoritarianism; Cultural diversity; Liberalism; Globalization

## Introduction

Alexander Dugin is one of the most prominent Russian thinkers of our time, whose theories, particularly the Fourth Political Theory, have gained significant attention and controversy. This article will focus on analyzing Dugin's Fourth Theory, its influence on the current socio-economic situation in the Russian Federation, and its potential impact on the politician Vladimir Putin, often referred to as Gosudar (Ruler).

### 1. Early Clarifications and an Overview

In order to compare the fourth theory to other worldviews and ideologies, it is particularly important to hold a general understanding of their respective beliefs, historical implementations and value systems. This is what will be clarified below.

**Fascism:** Fascism is an ideology that originated in Italy under the leadership of Benito Mussolini in 1919. Fascism is characterized by authoritarianism, militarism, nationalism, and corporatism – a generally left-wing political system under which individuals are separated into government-controlled and/or government-subordinate corporations focused on specific activities (science, manufacture, agriculture, etc.). Emphasis is placed on a strong state and leader who has absolute power over the economy and society. Fascism promotes the unification of the nation under a single ideology and often uses propaganda and violence to achieve its goals. This regime caused significant suffering and destruction in Europe during the first half of the 20th century, especially during World War II.

**Nazism (National Socialism):** Nazism, an ideology associated with Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP), emerged in Germany in 1920. Nazism placed a strong emphasis on racial purity, anti-Semitism, and the superiority of the Aryan race. The totalitarian regime created by the Nazis promoted genocide and expansion to gain Lebensraum (living space) for the German nation. This regime led to the Holocaust, causing the deaths of millions of

Jews and other minorities, and to the devastation of Europe during World War II.

**Communism:** Communism is an ideology derived from the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, which seeks a classless society where the means of production are collectively owned, and private property is abolished. Communism was implemented in various forms, most notably in the Soviet Union after the revolution in 1917. Communist regimes often introduced centralized economic planning and political repression. While communism aimed for social justice and equality, it often led to totalitarian regimes, economic failures, and widespread human rights abuses.

At the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, we witnessed a resurgence of interest in some of these ideologies, which is related to various socio-economic and political crises. In many countries, there is a rise of right-wing populist movements, new forms of nationalism, and authoritarian tendencies (though similar movements form on the left side – with nationalist socialist parties, or groups focused on taking away and/or punishing successful individuals). These movements often criticize liberal democracy and globalization, creating space for alternative ideologies like Dugin's Fourth Political Theory. How are ideologies and cultural and religious values currently being used to justify political and cultural goals?

### **Dugin's Ideology and its Political Use**

Alexander Dugin is a key Russian thinker whose ideology significantly influences contemporary Russian geopolitics. Dugin's philosophy, known as the Fourth Political Theory, serves as a strategic tool to justify Russia's expansionist ambitions. This ideology combines elements of fascism, communism, and liberalism while rejecting modernity and Western liberalism. Dugin's theory focuses on creating a multipolar world where different civilizations can coexist without Western dominance.

Dugin uses his philosophy to support Russian imperialism and justify the invasion of Ukraine. He references the ideas of Ernst Jünger and Carl Schmitt, portraying the West as the Antichrist and calling for “total mobilization”. This mobilization is seen as a fight against Western technological and cultural hegemony. Dugin’s ideology is also evident in his collaboration with American commentator Tucker Carlson, where Dugin presents his vision of a dark future for Western society under the rule of artificial intelligence and technological dystopia. He is also supported and helped strongly, whether intentionally, or by chance and coincidence, by the Russian Orthodox Church, to be discussed below.

### **The Russian Orthodox Church, its Influence on State Politics, and its Relationship with Nationalism**

The Russian Orthodox Church, led by Patriarch Kirill, plays a crucial role in Russian state ideology and nationalism. Organizations like the World Russian People’s Council (WRPC) promote the spiritual and cultural revival of Russia and the strengthening of Orthodoxy as fundamental values. Since its inception in 1993, the WRPC has served as a platform for nationalist and revanchist ideas, including the restoration of the Russian Empire and influence over the “canonical territory” of the Russian Orthodox Church, such as Ukraine and Belarus.

Putin and Kirill jointly propagate the fight against Western values and support Russian nationalism. Putin expresses support for the WRPC and its goals, which include “fighting for sovereignty and justice” against Western neo-Nazism and Russophobia. The Church supports the introduction of Orthodox values into the education system and promotes anti-Western rhetoric, with Dugin being one of the main ideologists calling for a fight against the “satanic civilization of the West” and demanding cultural and scientific “de-occupation”. It isn’t possible to ‘pigeonhole’ the church as the only ‘player’ or involved entity. Although it is by far the strongest, there are several other ideologies and religions with involvement and effect on the political stance of the country.

### **International Religions, Ideologies, and Efforts at Dialogue**

Interactions between different religions and philosophical traditions demonstrate how these ideas can influence cultural and social values. Researchers have examined the interactions between Buddhism and Western philosophy, covering historical contacts, philosophical dialogues, and modern applications (Langone & Ilieva, 2024). Historical interactions include the first contacts between Buddhism and Western ideas, which had an impact on both cultures. Philosophical dialogues focus on the acceptance and rejection of Buddhist concepts in Western philosophy and discussions of their significance.

Modern applications of Buddhist principles in the West show how these religious ideas can be integrated into different cultural frameworks and influence them. Examples of contemporary philosophical and practical uses of Buddhism include its influence on art, psychology, and science. This dialogue between different religious and philosophical traditions, despite its indirect relation to the topic, provides a broader context for understanding how ideologies like Dugin's or Orthodox values are used for political purposes.

The cited articles illustrate how ideologies and religious values can be used to justify and support political and cultural goals. Dugin's philosophy and the support of the Russian Orthodox Church are examples of how religious and ideological ideas can shape geopolitical strategies and national identities. The interaction between Buddhism and Western philosophy provides a broader context for understanding how religious ideas can be integrated into various cultural frameworks and influence them. This dialogue is crucial for understanding contemporary global political and cultural trends.

### **An Analysis of Alexander Dugin's Book "The Fourth Political Theory"**

Alexander Dugin's book "The Fourth Political Theory" represents a comprehensive critique and alternative (while holding, in cases,

similar stances or a combination of the stances) to the three dominant political ideologies of the 20th century: liberalism, communism, and fascism. Dugin argues that these ideologies are exhausted and unable to adequately respond to the challenges of the contemporary world. This theory aims to create a new political philosophy that will address the problems of the postmodern era.

Dugin begins his analysis with a critique of liberalism, which he views as the dominant ideology of the contemporary world. According to him, liberalism is based on individualism and materialism, leading to the atomization of society and the destruction of traditional values. Dugin argues that “liberalism has become the universal measure, and all other ideologies have been marginalized” (Dugin, 2012). This hegemony of liberalism, according to him, leads to the homogenization of cultures and the suppression of ‘diversity’.

Dugin further analyzes communism and fascism, which he considers alternatives to liberalism that have failed. Communism, he argues, failed due to its utopian vision of a classless society and the economic failure of centrally planned economies. Fascism, on the other hand, is associated with totalitarian practices and racism, which led to its historical condemnation. Dugin states that “communism and fascism were reactions to modernity, but they failed to offer a sustainable alternative” (Dugin, 2012).

The Fourth Political Theory, as proposed by Dugin, is based on the concept of multipolarity. This concept rejects the hegemony of a single civilizational model (Western) and aims to create a world where different civilizations and cultural traditions can coexist and develop without one dominating the others. Dugin asserts that “multipolarity means that each civilization must be able to decide its own destiny without external interference” (Dugin, 2012). This approach is intended to preserve cultural diversity and protect national identities from the homogenizing influence of globalization.

One of the main philosophical influences on Dugin's theory is Martin Heidegger. Heidegger's critique of modernity and technology, which he views as destructive to authentic beings and culture, provides a theoretical foundation for Dugin's critique of Western civilization. Dugin writes: "Heidegger's philosophy gives us the key to understanding the deep crisis of modern civilization and shows the way out" (Dugin, 2014). Heidegger's concept of being and authenticity is crucial for Dugin in formulating an alternative to the modern world order.

Dugin's theory also incorporates elements of postcolonial critique, rejecting Western imperialism and globalization. He argues that these processes lead, again, to the homogenization of cultures and the disappearance of national identities. In this context, Dugin's theory is attractive to various nations and cultures that feel threatened by Western dominance and seek alternative ways to preserve their identity and sovereignty. Dugin states: "Globalization is nothing but a new colonialism that destroys diversity and leads to uniformity" (Dugin, 2013).

In practical politics, Dugin's theory translates into support for Russian nationalism and imperialism – which may, by some, be considered somewhat hypocritical, based on his criticisms of similar values from Western groups. Dugin's vision of Russia as a leading power in a multipolar world is closely linked to the policies of Vladimir Putin, who seeks to restore Russian influence and power on the global stage. Putin and Dugin share the belief that Western liberalism is in decline and that Russia has a historical mission to lead the world to a new order that will be fairer and respect various cultural and civilizational traditions. Dugin argues: "Russia must take on the role of leader in the fight against globalization and for the preservation of traditional values" (Dugin, 2014).

Despite its ambitious goals, Dugin's theory faces significant criticism. Some label it as neo-fascist or ultra-nationalist, arguing that its emphasis on cultural and civilizational differences can lead to isolationism and conflicts between nations. Critics also point to internal contradic-

tions in Dugin's theory, particularly its conception of multipolarity, which can be interpreted as a cover for Russian imperialism. "Dugin's multipolarity is not genuine multipolarity but rather an attempt to restore the Russian empire" (Laruelle, 2012). The theory represents an attempt of strong determination to create a new ideological foundation for the 21st century. Its emphasis on multipolarity and cultural diversity offers an alternative to dominant Western models, but it also carries a relatively large risk of reinforcing nationalist and imperialist tendencies. The influence of this theory on contemporary Russian politics and its potential to shape the global political order is the subject of intense debate among political analysts and philosophers.

### **Comparison of Dugin's View of Putin with His Fourth Political Theory**

Alexander Dugin, in his book "Putin vs. Putin: Vladimir Putin Viewed from the Right," creates a portrayal of Vladimir Putin that is deeply rooted in conservative and Eurasianist values. This portrayal of Putin aligns with many aspects of Dugin's Fourth Political Theory, but there are also some differences and inconsistencies.

Dugin's Fourth Political Theory strongly rejects liberalism, which he views as the dominant ideology of the contemporary world. Liberalism emphasizes individual freedoms, democratic institutions, the rule of law, and human rights. Dugin criticizes this approach as decadent and destructive to traditional societies. Similarly, in his book on Putin, Dugin emphasizes that Putin rejects Western liberalism and globalization, which aligns with Dugin's view of the need for a strong leader who stands against these trends.

Another key concept in both Dugin's Fourth Political Theory and his portrayal of Putin is multipolarity. Dugin's concept of multipolarity is based on rejecting the hegemony of a single civilizational model and aiming to create a world where different civilizations and cultural traditions can coexist and develop without one dominating the others. This goal aligns

with Dugin's surprising emphasis on cultural and civilizational diversity. Dugin asserts that multipolarity means that "each civilization must be able to decide its own destiny without external interference." This approach is intended to preserve cultural diversity and protect national identities from the homogenizing influence of globalization. Dugin's Fourth Political Theory additionally includes the idea of Eurasianism, which promotes the creation of a new Eurasian space as a counterbalance to Western hegemony. In his book on Putin, Dugin describes Putin as a leader who is spearheading a Eurasian revolution and seeking to restore Russian influence in the region. This aligns with Dugin's ideas about the need for a sovereign empire capable of resisting global pressures.

Moreover, the Fourth Political Theory advocates for a strong state and authoritarianism as means of protecting traditional values and maintaining stability. Dugin, in his book on Putin, emphasizes that Putin believes in authoritarianism as a way to maintain order and protect the state. This aligns with Dugin's ideal of a strong leader who can uphold traditional values.

However, there are differences and inconsistencies between Dugin's theory and his portrayal of Putin. While Dugin's Fourth Political Theory is deeply ideological and philosophical, Putin is often seen as a pragmatist who makes decisions based on practical needs and circumstances. Dugin acknowledges in his book that Putin sometimes acts pragmatically, which may be at odds with the purely ideological approach of the Fourth Political Theory. Another area of difference is economic policy. Dugin's Fourth Political Theory does not include a detailed economic doctrine, while Putin's policies involve specific economic reforms and measures. Dugin criticizes some aspects of Putin's economic policy, which he views as too liberal or capitalist, and this criticism does not fully align with Dugin's own ideals.

Furthermore, there are varying interpretations of Eurasianism. Although Dugin sees Putin as a leader of the Eurasian revolution, some of Putin's actions can be interpreted as more focused on protecting

Russian national interests rather than a broader Eurasian project. This can lead to discrepancies between Dugin's ideological vision and Putin's practical steps, although it is not possible to state that they do not both believe in a combination of the two.

Lastly, the role of religion differs between Dugin's theory and his portrayal of Putin. Dugin's Fourth Political Theory places a strong emphasis on spiritual renewal and the role of Orthodoxy in Russian society. While Putin supports the Russian Orthodox Church and traditional values, his approach to religion can sometimes be more pragmatic and less ideologically driven than Dugin's perspective.

Alexander Dugin and his Fourth Political Theory is an ideological framework that in many ways resonates with the politics and persona of Vladimir Putin. On the other hand, there are areas where Dugin's theory and Putin's practice diverge, particularly regarding pragmatism (rather than a fixed belief system that is set above situational politics) and economic policy. Nevertheless, it is clear that Dugin views Putin as a key figure for realizing his ideological goals and restoring Russia's greatness on the global stage.

### **The Dangers of Dugin's Concept of Eurasian Civilization for Traditional European and Euro-Atlantic Values**

Alexander Dugin's concept of Eurasian civilization presents a significant challenge to traditional European and Euro-Atlantic values. Dugin's vision of connecting Russia with China and other Asian powers is built on several key principles that directly contradict the values defining the Western world. The following section outlines the potential dangers this vision poses.

Dugin's Fourth Political Theory strongly rejects liberalism, which is the cornerstone of European and Euro-Atlantic values. Liberalism emphasizes individual freedoms, democratic institutions, the rule of law, and human rights. Dugin criticizes this approach as decadent and

destructive to traditional societies. Instead, he advocates for an authoritarian model that places collective identity and state sovereignty above individual rights. This ideology directly opposes the values that Western societies consider fundamental to their functioning.

Dugin's concept of multipolarity is based on rejecting a unipolar world dominated by the United States and its allies. He seeks to create a world where different civilizations, including the Eurasian, can exist as independent powers. This vision can lead to geopolitical tension and conflicts, as different powers strive solely to expand their influence with no consideration or care regarding the expense of others. Dugin's multipolarity is not just about balancing power but also about an ideological battle against Western power. This can undermine international cooperation and stability, which are the foundation of Euro-Atlantic values and security.

### **National Sovereignty vs. Global Cooperation, Cultural and Civilizational Differences**

Dugin emphasizes national sovereignty and resistance to globalization, which he sees as a tool of Western hegemony. This approach conflicts with the concept of global cooperation and integration, which are essential for addressing global issues such as climate change, pandemics, and international terrorism. Euro-Atlantic values support international institutions and legal frameworks that enable coordinated action and cooperation among states. The emphasis on sovereignty brings a relatively high chance of leading to isolationism and fragmentation of the international community.

Dugin's vision of Eurasian civilization emphasizes cultural and civilizational differences, which can lead to the strengthening of nationalism and xenophobia. This approach contradicts Euro-Atlantic values that promote multiculturalism, inclusion, and respect for human rights regardless of cultural or national origin. Dugin's philosophy can lead to the intensification of cultural conflicts and the division of society along ethnic and cultural lines.

## **Authoritarianism and Centralization of Power**

Another important element of Dugin's ideology is the support for authoritarianism and the centralization of power as means of maintaining order and stability. This model is in direct conflict with democratic values that prioritize decentralization of power, participatory democracy, individual freedom, equality of opportunity, and transparency in governance. Authoritarian regimes tend to suppress opposition, restrict freedom of speech, and violate human rights, which is unacceptable for Euro-Atlantic (and generally citizen-friendly) societies.

Dugin's concept of Eurasian civilization presents a significant challenge to traditional European and Euro-Atlantic values. The rejection of liberalism, support for multipolarity and national sovereignty, emphasis on cultural differences, and authoritarianism are in direct opposition to the principles that define Western political and social systems. This ideology can lead to increased geopolitical tension, isolationism, and cultural conflicts, threatening the stability and security of the international community.

## **Dugin's Understanding of the "Great Reset" and Its Comparison to His Fourth Political Theory**

Alexander Dugin's interpretation of the "Great Reset" is a critical analysis of what he perceives as a comprehensive globalist agenda aimed at reshaping the world's socio-economic and political order. This analysis is presented in his book "The Great Awakening vs the Great Reset," where he contrasts this agenda with his own ideological stance, the Fourth Political Theory. Below is a detailed exploration of Dugin's views on the Great Reset, followed by a comparison to his Fourth Political Theory.

In 2020, during the World Economic Forum in Davos, Klaus Schwab and Prince Charles announced the "Great Reset" as a new direction

for humanity. Dugin outlines the main points of this plan as follows:

1. *Capturing the Imagination and Will of Humanity:*

Dugin emphasizes that change will only occur if people genuinely desire it. This involves influencing public consciousness on a global scale, a concept he links to the “cancel culture” and the censorship controlled by globalist networks.

2. *Economic Recovery and Sustainable Growth:*

The economic recovery must focus on sustainable employment, livelihoods, and growth, redesigning incentive structures that have negatively impacted the environment.

3. *Advancing Net-Zero Transitions Globally:*

This includes carbon pricing and the shift to a sustainable market. Dugin interprets this as a move towards the fourth economic order, replacing human labor with cyborgs and implementing advanced artificial intelligence.

4. *Reinvigorating Science, Technology, and Innovation:*

Humanity is on the brink of breakthroughs that will redefine what is possible and profitable within a sustainable framework.

5. *Rebalancing Investment towards Green Initiatives:*

Green investments are expected to create job opportunities in renewable energy, the circular economy, and green infrastructure.

Dugin identifies the Great Reset as a continuation of globalization and the strengthening of globalism, particularly after setbacks such as the conservative presidency of Donald Trump and the rising influence of a multipolar world with nations like China and Russia challenging Western dominance. He argues that the globalist agenda seeks to consolidate power by utilizing new technologies for mind control, internet censorship, and data surveillance under the guise of health and safety during the COVID-19 pandemic.

## Comparison with the Fourth Political Theory

Dugin's Fourth Political Theory is presented as a response to the perceived failures of the three dominant political ideologies of the 20th century: liberalism, communism, and fascism. The theory aims to provide an alternative framework that addresses contemporary global challenges by emphasizing cultural diversity, national sovereignty, and traditional values. There are some key points of comparison:

### 1. *Rejection of Liberalism:*

Both the Great Reset and 4PT reject the current liberal order, but for different reasons. The Great Reset purportedly seeks to reform liberalism into a more sustainable and technologically advanced system. In contrast, 4PT rejects liberalism outright, viewing it as fundamentally flawed due to its emphasis on individualism and materialism.

### 2. *Focus on Multipolarity:*

The Great Reset envisions a world governed by a global elite managing a unified economic and political system. Dugin's 4PT advocates for a multipolar world where various civilizations can coexist independently, preserving their unique cultural and national identities.

### 3. *Role of Technology:*

The Great Reset promotes technological advancements as a means to achieve sustainability and efficiency, including the integration of AI and robotics. Dugin is wary of these technologies, viewing them as tools for globalist control and the dehumanization of society. 4PT emphasizes the importance of maintaining human and cultural elements over technological dominance.

### 4. *Sovereignty and Traditional Values:*

The Great Reset appears to prioritize global governance and economic integration, potentially at the expense of national sovereignty. Dugin's 4PT, on the other hand, places a strong emphasis on the sovereignty of nations and the preservation of traditional values, arguing that these are essential for maintaining social and cultural cohesion.

### *5. Critique of Globalism:*

Both perspectives critique globalism, but their solutions diverge significantly. The Great Reset seeks to reform globalism by addressing its flaws and creating a more equitable system. Dugin's 4PT calls for a complete rejection of globalist principles in favor of a new ideological framework that promotes cultural pluralism and national sovereignty.

Alexander Dugin's interpretation of the Great Reset highlights a globalist agenda that he believes seeks to consolidate power and control through technological and economic reforms. This vision is fundamentally at odds with his Fourth Political Theory, which advocates for a multipolar world rooted in cultural diversity and national sovereignty. While both the Great Reset and 4PT reject the status quo of liberalism, their approaches and end goals are vastly different. The Great Reset aims to reshape and continue the liberal project under a new guise, whereas 4PT seeks to establish a radically different political order based on traditional values and decentralized power structures.

### **War of Continents or Civilizational Circles?**

Alexander Dugin's "Great War of Continents" conceptualizes a geopolitical and ideological conflict that transcends mere territorial disputes, delving into a profound civilizational clash between fundamentally different worldviews and powers. The text reveals Dugin's perspective on an ongoing eschatological battle between two opposing forces: the "Atlantists" and the "Eurasianists."

The editor introduces Dugin's study as a narrative of conspiracies between the "Atlantists" and the defensive "Eurasianists," framing it as an eschatological struggle between two radically opposing worlds. This dichotomy reflects an ideological divide where the "Atlantists" represent globalist, liberal, and materialist values, while the "Eurasianists" embody traditional, authoritarian, and spiritual principles.

## Foundations of Geopolitics

Dugin bases his theory on the principles of geopolitics, a field significantly developed by British geographer Halford Mackinder. He distinguishes between two historical approaches to dominating terrestrial space: the land-based and the sea-based approaches. Mackinder's model posits that terrestrial empires (like Rome and Russia) are inherently opposed to maritime powers (like Carthage, England, and the United States), which reflects deeper ideological and cultural divides.

According to Dugin, Mackinder's ideas highlight the threat posed by Eurasian consolidation to maritime powers, particularly the Anglo-American alliance. This perspective frames the geopolitical strategy of the Atlantists as a long-term effort to prevent alliances between major Eurasian powers like Russia, Germany, and Japan. Dugin argues that this strategy extends to espionage, political lobbying, and cultural infiltration, aiming to maintain Anglo-Saxon dominance. In response, Eurasianists formulated their own geopolitical doctrine, advocating for an alliance between Russia, Germany, and Japan to counter Atlantist policies. Dugin highlights the intellectual contributions of Russian émigré thinkers and German geopoliticians like Karl Haushofer, who developed the idea of a continental alliance against the Atlantic powers.

### “Blood and Soil” – “Blood or Soil”?

Dugin explores the geopolitical implications of choosing between national unity based on race (“blood”) and territorial unity (“soil”). He references Russian philosopher Konstantin Leontiev, who advocated for aligning Russia with Eastern and Asian cultures rather than focusing on Slavic unity. This choice underscores the broader conflict between nationalist and geopolitical priorities.

Dugin critiques Panslavism, particularly its role in World War I, where Russian support for Slavic brothers against the Turks led to disastrous

consequences for Russia itself. He argues that this focus on Slavic unity served the interests of the Atlantists rather than those of Eurasia, drawing parallels with German Pangermanism, which similarly played into Atlantist hands. Furthermore, Dugin asserts that the rise of Pangermanism in Nazi Germany, driven by racist ideologies, ultimately benefited the Atlantists by diverting German attention eastward. He cites Admiral Canaris as an Atlantist agent who manipulated Nazi policies to serve Anglo-American interests.

### **Who is Whose Spy?**

Dugin later delves into the complex ‘interplay’ of espionage and ideological influence, illustrating how geopolitical allegiances transcended national and political boundaries. He describes how figures like Lenin and Trotsky represented different geopolitical schemes, with Lenin’s policies maintaining the Eurasian space and Trotsky advocating for global revolutionary expansion. He contrasts the Soviet military intelligence agency GRU, aligned with Eurasianist principles, with the KGB, which he views as an Atlantist institution. He recounts the historical rivalry between these two agencies and mentions the broader geopolitical context within the Soviet Union.

### **After Victory**

Dugin discusses the aftermath of World War II, where the triumph of Atlantist forces led to a temporary setback for the Eurasian project. He emphasizes the ongoing influence of Eurasianist networks within the Soviet military and intelligence structures, suggesting that the Cold War represented a continuation of this eschatological conflict. The book “Great War of Continents” depicts a profound ideological and civilizational clash between the Atlantists and the Eurasianists. This conflict is not merely about territorial dominance but discusses a deeper struggle between opposing worldviews: the materialist, liberal, and individualistic values of the Atlantists versus the traditional, authoritarian, and collectivist principles of the Eurasianists. In this context,

Dugin's theory highlights the enduring significance of geopolitics in shaping global history and the future of international relations.

### **The Advantages of Eurasianism for the World or Specific Regions**

Alexander Dugin's neo-Eurasianism, as outlined in "Eurasian Mission: An Introduction to Neo-Eurasianism," presents a comprehensive philosophical and political framework. This framework aims to offer an alternative to Western liberalism and globalization by emphasizing the unique civilizational identity of Eurasian countries, with, as in the previous pieces, promotion of multipolarity, and advocacy for a new form of integration based on cultural and civilizational diversity.

### **Philosophical Foundation**

Neo-Eurasianism is rooted in the philosophy of structuralism, emphasizing the multiplicity and synchronicity of structures within different civilizations. Dugin builds on the ideas of Count Nikolai Trubetzkoy, a pioneer in structuralist linguistics, to argue that civilizations possess unique structures that define their cultural, social, and political elements. This holistic approach asserts that each civilization's structure is more than the sum of its parts and should be understood in its own context without imposing external frameworks.

The primary concern of Eurasianist philosophy is civilization. Dugin argues that there are multiple civilizations, each with its own unique structure, time, and space. This perspective challenges the universal applicability of Western values and systems, advocating instead for a multipolar world where different civilizations can coexist and interact on equal terms. This approach promotes cultural diversity and respects the sovereignty of each civilization.

Eurasianism offers several geopolitical advantages, particularly for the countries within the Eurasian continent. Its ideals could, in the-

ory, lead to a more stable and balanced global order, reducing the likelihood of conflicts driven by colonialist or expansive ambitions. Eurasianism advocates for economic integration based on regional cooperation rather than globalist free-market principles. This approach encourages the development of regional economic blocs that can support each other's growth and stability. The Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) is an example of such an initiative, aiming to foster economic collaboration among its member states, which include Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Armenia, and Kyrgyzstan.

One of the core principles of Eurasianism is the protection of national sovereignty and independence. Dugin argues against the imposition of Western political models, advocating instead for governance systems that reflect the unique historical and cultural contexts of Eurasian countries. This respect for sovereignty can help to reduce external interference and promote self-determination among nations.

Eurasianism offers a critical perspective on modernity and postmodernity, which Dugin sees as manifestations of Western liberalism and materialism. Eurasianism has a strong focus on challenging these paradigms and opens the door to alternative ways of understanding and organizing society. This critique aligns with traditionalist and conservative values, appealing to those who seek a return to more stable and spiritually grounded forms of social organization. Critics also consider that such individuals are often fearful of being able to govern themselves, and are therefore quite reliant on governmental decisions to 'pick for them'.

### **Historical Context and Public Skepticism**

Historically, Soviet and later Russian political narratives often diverged significantly from their practical applications. During the Soviet era, lofty promises of equality and prosperity frequently clashed

with the reality of economic hardship, political repression, and a lack of personal freedoms. This legacy has left a deep-seated skepticism among many people, particularly in Eastern Europe and former Soviet states, regarding the authenticity and credibility of Russian political ideologies.

This skepticism is mirrored in contemporary perceptions of Russian political rhetoric. For example, the promises of economic integration and cultural preservation under the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) are often viewed with suspicion. Many people remember the historical instances where political slogans and ideologies served as covers for different agendas, such as consolidating power or suppressing dissent.

### **The Problem of “Inversion of Meaning”**

The phenomenon, where the official rhetoric is perceived to mean the opposite of what is stated, is a significant barrier to trust. In the Czech comedy series “Kosmo,” this is humorously illustrated by the need to translate Russian statements into their real-world implications by reversing/flipping the information that was stated. This “inversion of meaning” is not just a comedic exaggeration but reflects a real issue where political statements are seen as doublespeak.

In Dugin’s case, while his theoretical framework of Eurasianism may emphasize sovereignty, cultural diversity, and multipolarity, critics argue that in practice, it can serve as a guise for Russian expansionism and control. The rhetoric of protecting traditional values and national sovereignty can be viewed as a strategy to extend Russian influence under the pretense of resisting Western hegemony.

### **The Role of Authenticity in Political Ideologies**

For any political ideology to gain widespread acceptance and support, it needs to be seen as authentic and credible. In simple terms, authen-

ticity means that what is promised aligns with what is delivered. For Eurasianism to move beyond being just a theoretical concept, it must show real, tangible benefits that are consistent with its philosophical principles.

First, transparency and accountability are crucial. Political leaders who advocate for Eurasianism must be open about their intentions, policies, and the results of their actions. Without this openness, people will likely suspect hidden agendas and doublespeak, undermining trust.

There has to also be consistency between rhetoric and action. If leaders talk about cultural preservation and economic cooperation, their policies and practices must genuinely reflect these promises. Any inconsistency here can quickly erode trust.

Third, leaders must engage with public concerns. This means recognizing past mistakes and showing a genuine commitment to addressing current issues. Listening to citizens and incorporating their feedback into policy-making is key to building trust and relevance.

It is undeniable that Alexander Dugin's Eurasianism offers a compelling philosophical and geopolitical alternative. However, its success hinges on closing the gap between theory and practice. The historical context of Soviet and Russian political rhetoric, often marked by discrepancies between promises and reality, presents a significant challenge to the authenticity and credibility of Eurasianism. To overcome this, advocates must focus on transparency, consistency, public engagement, and genuine cooperation. Only by addressing these concerns can Eurasianism gain the trust and support it needs to become a viable and respected alternative on the global stage.

### **Moscow's Ambitions in a Contemporary Perspective**

Throughout history, Moscow has had significant ambitions, which have often been perceived as imperialist and expansionist. This per-

ception stems from various historical epochs where Moscow sought to extend its influence and control, often justified by different ideological frameworks. This analysis will explore Moscow's ambitions from the medieval era to the present, focusing on Alexander Dugin's and Vladimir Putin's visions for Russia.

Moscow's ambitions date back to the medieval period, characterized by the doctrine of Moscow as the "Third Rome." This doctrine emerged after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, positioning Moscow as the successor to the Roman and Byzantine empires. This ideological foundation suggested that Moscow had a divine mission to uphold and spread Orthodox Christianity, thereby justifying its expansionist policies. During the Tsarist era, Moscow's ambitions were further reinforced by the notion of "gathering the Russian lands," leading to the annexation of various territories and the establishment of a vast empire. This period also saw the integration of diverse ethnic and cultural groups under Russian rule, often through forceful means.

The Soviet era marked another phase of Moscow's ambitions, though this time driven by the ideology of communism. The Soviet Union sought to spread its influence globally, supporting communist movements and establishing satellite states across Eastern Europe and beyond. This expansionist drive was justified by the belief in the inevitable global triumph of communism.

In contemporary times, Alexander Dugin and Vladimir Putin have articulated visions for Russia that continue to reflect Moscow's historical ambitions, albeit framed in new ideological contexts. Alexander Dugin's neo-Eurasianism presents a vision of Moscow as the heart of a new Eurasian civilization. Dugin envisions a multipolar world where Russia leads a coalition of Eurasian states, countering Western hegemony. This vision is rooted in the belief that Western liberalism is in decline and that Russia has a unique civilizational mission to offer an alternative model based on traditional values and cultural diversity.

Dugin's concept of the "Great War of Continents" frames this struggle as an eschatological battle between the "Atlantists" (representing Western liberalism) and the "Eurasianists" (representing traditional, authoritarian, and spiritual principles). According to Dugin, Russia must lead the charge against Western globalization and create a multipolar world order where different civilizations can coexist and thrive.

Vladimir Putin's vision for Russia aligns with many aspects of Dugin's neo-Eurasianism, emphasizing national sovereignty, traditional values, and a strong, centralized state. Putin has often articulated the idea of a "sovereign democracy," rejecting Western models of governance and promoting a uniquely Russian political system that prioritizes stability and order. Putin's foreign policy also exposes a 'mission' to restore Russia's influence on the global stage. This is evident in Russia's actions in Crimea, Ukraine, and Syria, where Putin has sought to assert Russia's power and challenge Western dominance. Putin's vision is often framed as a response to Western encroachment and a defense of Russian interests and sovereignty.

Moscow's ambitions, from the medieval doctrine of the "Third Rome" to Dugin's neo-Eurasianism and Putin's sovereign democracy show off Russia's strong emphasis on assertiveness and their large interest in influence and control. These ambitions are justified by various ideological frameworks that emphasize Russia's unique civilizational mission and the need to resist Western predominance. The practical implementation of these ambitions poses significant challenges and risks, both for Russia and the broader international community.

## REFERENCES

DUGIN, A., 2012. *The Fourth Political Theory*. London: Arktos.

DUGIN, A., 2013. Eurasian project and its Ukrainian problem. Odnako. Available at: <<http://www.odnako.org/magazine/material/evraziyskiy-proekt-i-ego-ukrainskaya-problema/>> [Accessed 14 May 2013].

DUGIN, A. 2014. Srednyi klass kak ekzistentsia. May 29 Odnako. <http://www.odnako.org/almanac/material/sredniy-klass-i-drugie-ideologiya-semantic-ekzistentsiya/>.

DUGIN, A., 2014. *Eurasian Mission: An Introduction to Neo-Eurasianism*. London: Arktos.

DUGIN, A., 2014. *Putin vs Putin: Vladimir Putin Viewed from the Right*. London: Arktos.

DUGIN, A., 2014. *Velká válka kontinentů*. Transl. Břetislav Dejdar. Prague: Dybbuk.

DUGIN, A., 2021. *The Great Awakening vs the Great Reset*. London: Arktos.

HUNTER, L., 2024. *Tragischer Liberalismus*. Frankfurt / New York : Campus Verlag.

CHESNEY, MARC, 2013. Der Liberalismus und die Logik des Finanzsektors. [In:] NZZ, 149, 1 (July 2013), p.15.

JACOBS, I., and LANDENBERGER, Y., 2024. Kremlguru Dugin. Putin kämpft für Gott und hat die Atomwae, sagt er und grinst. Frankfurter Allgemeine, 22. 05. 2024.

KAUPP, M., 2023. Die politische Utopie der postnationalen Republik Europa. Überlegungen zur Zukunft der europäischen Idee. Februar 2023.

KRPEC, O., 2009. Liberalismus a ekonomický nacionalismus v liberálním obchodním režimu a v problematice hospodářského rozvoje. [Liberalism and Economic Nationalism in International Trade Regime and Process of Economic Development.] Mezinárodní vztahy, 2009, 3, pp. 53–73.

LANGONE, L., and ILIEVA, A.S., eds., 2024. Dynamic Encounters between Buddhism and the West. Introduction. East Asian Journal of Philosophy, vol. 3, nr 1, pp. I–VI.

LARUELLE, M., 2012. *Russian Eurasianism: An Ideology of Empire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

ХОРКХАЙМЕР, М. and МИХАЙЛОВ, И.А., 2008. *Становление Франкфуртской школы социальных исследований Часть 2: 1940–1973 гг.* Москва : Российская Академия Наук.

MILLERMAN, M., Inside “Putin’s Brain”: The Political Philosophy of Alexander Dugin.

MOYN, S., 2024. Der Liberalismus gegen sich selbst und die Rückkehr des Kalten Krieges. [In:] *Der Liberalismus gegen sich selbst*. Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp Verlag.

OELZE, B., 2024. *Der logische Aufbau des Liberalismus. Eine phänomenologische Untersuchung*. Weilerswist : Velbrück Wissenschaft, 2024.

PETROV, N. Triumphant Memory of the Perpetrators: Putin's Politics of History in Hero-Making of Stalin's Agents. *Studia Russica*. (Specific volume and issue details needed for complete citation).

STĘPNIEWSKI, T., 2024. Rosyjska dyskusja postkolonialna w latach 1991–2011. *Studia Russica*.

TSYGANKOV, A. P. External forces and Russian foreign policy. *Journal of International Affairs*. (Specific volume, issue, and page numbers needed for complete citation).

SUDIBYO, L. W., 2018. Perjuangan Mengukuhkan Identitas Nasional: Aneksasi Rusia di Krimea dalam Perspektif Konstruktivisme. *Journal of International Relations*, 4(3), pp.597–606. Available at: <http://ejournal-s1.undip.ac.id/index.php/jihi>. [Accessed 03. 07. 2024].

ZWAHLEN, R., 2024. Des Patriarchen orthodoxe Patrioten. *RGOW*, nr. 1.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sam Torres collaborates with Heritage & Partners LLP, focusing on geopolitical analysis and political science literature. His main interests lie in the post–Cold War world and the formation of new global dynamics in the 21st century. He pays particular attention to political writings originating in various local contexts across the United Kingdom.

Samuel Torres, MSc.

Heritage & Partners

128 City Road

London EC1V 2NX

United Kingdom

[samuel@heritage.partners](mailto:samuel@heritage.partners)

ORCID 0009-0009-0045-8218