

support both cultural and vigorous trade relations with these non-Eurasian, purely Asiatic countries. From bitter experience Russia knows more about Europe than they do; she should unite them in opposition to European civilization, forewarn them against the invasive spirit of Europeanism in its diverse manifestations, and help them to create and develop their own national cultures.

Domestically, the future Russia should never forget the past. This does not mean the past should be resurrected; that is impossible and unnecessary. But certain principles that organized life in the time of Genghis Khan and in pre-Petrine Muscovite Rus' can be placed at the foundation of future development. The most important is a close connection between the *mores* of private life, the state system, and religion. The godless, antireligious state is a European invention that depends on the spirit of European civilization. It is true that Europeans take great pride in this invention and consider it a sign of progress. But this is how Europeans evaluate all the products of their civilization. They reason in the following way: Everything invented by Europeans that conforms to the general spirit of their culture is good and "progressive," while everything not invented by Europeans is good only to the extent that it resembles some European invention. But when one reasons objectively, resists European self-adulation, and remembers that the antireligious state has never existed in the history of any non-European people, one is led to the conclusion that this state system is unnatural and freakish, contrary to normal human nature; and if it does not contradict the human nature of Europeans, then this is so because their natures are abnormal and degenerate. A healthy human being is always religious. And it is untrue that religion is a private, individual matter. In reality religion always has been, is now, and always will be the concern of the whole nation. The peoples of Eurasia have always been religious. The fact that some have fallen away from religion can be attributed to the crippling influence of European civilization and ideas. Russia-Eurasia can recover her true nature and

become her true self only after returning to religion and strengthening the religious dimension of her life.

This does not mean that it is necessary to recreate the union between the state and the official church that existed in Russia before the revolution. Quite the opposite is true. This union stifled Orthodoxy, it deprived the Russian Church of its capacity to develop, and it aimed to transform the Church into a branch of the police—a pattern that is antithetical to the spirit of a genuinely religious state system. This union, which led to the subordination of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to the state and to the imposition of state censorship on free expressions of the religious spirit, does not conform to the principle of a close relationship between the state and religion that lies at the foundation of every genuine Eurasian state structure. But other ideas about the relationship between religion and the state familiar from European practice are equally unsatisfactory (e.g., separation of church and state, subordination of the state to an ecclesiastical hierarchy, a pact between the state and an international ecclesiastical hierarchy).

All of these schemes are permeated with the spirit of European civilization, a spirit that is crippled in the realm of religion. They are based on an abstract conception of church and state as two separate organizations with different personnel, while in real life church and state are made up of living people, and what is more, of the same people. The people in the church and in the state are not two separate entities but one. Free will and conscience exist in every human being; they are not different entities, but different qualities, different capacities of the same person. In a normal, rational, decent person there is no discord between will and conscience, but rather a certain harmony. The same should be true of the state system and religion. Lifeless, official religiosity is analogous to the subordination of conscience to the will; struggle between church and state is analogous to the struggle between conscience and will. But the subordination of the state to the ecclesiastical hierarchy is not analogous to subordination of the will to

conscience. In this case the state and the ecclesiastical hierarchy can be thought of as two separate entities; the result is the subordination of the will of one entity to the conscience (and, consequently, the will) of another.

The problem of the mutual relations between the state system and religion is of fundamental importance to Russia-Eurasia, since, as I have argued, Russia-Eurasia can become herself only after she has become religious. The solution to this problem is to be found not in legislation but in the warp and woof of everyday life. There was no official religion in the empire of Genghis Khan, nor was there subordination of the state to any ecclesiastical hierarchy; but the state system of Genghis Khan was nevertheless deeply religious. Similarly, in pre-Petrine Rus' the faith was not official and subservient, nor was the government subordinate to the power of the Church. Nevertheless, the old Muscovite state system was religious.

In both systems this problem was resolved not in the realm of politics and legislation, but in the realm of life style and psychology. Every one of Genghis Khan's warriors swore allegiance not only to his superior (and through him, to his superior's superior, and so on, up to the Supreme Khan), but also, and above all else, to a higher religious principle. And every warrior knew that his superior swore allegiance to that same religious principle, and his superior's superior, and so on, up to Genghis Khan himself. This allegiance to religious principle on the part of the warrior, his superior, and of Genghis Khan himself was not merely *pro forma*, it was not merely an aspect of their service; it also existed beyond the boundaries of their service, at the center of their everyday lives. The life of nature, human destiny, and the customs that guided human life were understood as elements in the orderly movement of things preestablished by a transcendent, Supreme Being. The state system was understood as part of this natural order. The same attitude toward these matters can be seen in pre-Petrine Rus', despite the enormous differences between it and the nomad state of Genghis Khan. If Russia-Eurasia wants

to become her true self once again and not a misshapen image of European civilization, she must recreate these same conditions. Externally these conditions need not resemble either pre-Petrine Rus' or the empire of Genghis Khan, but the principle underlying the structure must be the same. For this is the true, underlying principle of every genuine Eurasian state system.

Thus, the path along which Russia-Eurasia must pass to reach what is genuinely her own, the path to her own true nature, has been traced by her past. This is not a path into the past, but forward, toward something genuinely new, toward something extraordinary. Russia's task is to create a completely new culture, her own culture, which will not resemble European civilization. What is happening in Russia at present only appears to be new and unprecedented. In actual fact, it represents destruction and not creation; and this destruction is permeated with the same old spirit, the spirit of Peter I, of Catherine II, and of the nineteenth-century intelligentsia, which was seduced by the superficial allure of European civilization and ideas. Genuine, constructive creation remains in the future. It will be possible only when the attractions of European civilization and of ideologies invented in Europe have been exhausted once and for all, when Russia ceases to be a distorted reflection of European civilization and finds her own unique historical nature, when she becomes once again herself: Russia-Eurasia, the purposeful heir to and bearer of the great legacy of Genghis Khan.