

CONCEPTS RELATED TO CULTURAL-HISTORICAL TYPES AND "TURKIC CIVILIZATIONS" IN LITERATURE

Jafarov T.*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Baku Slavic University*

ORCID: 0000-0002-4429-654X

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12746138>**Abstract**

The article analyzes the cultural-historical types presented in the book "Russia and Europe" by the Russian philosopher N. Danilevsky, published in 1869, and the concept of civilizations put forward by him. The concepts of O. Spengler and A. Toynbee, discussed in the later periods, as a whole, discussions on this level, ideas related to the concepts of "culture", "civilization", "historical-cultural type", as well as literary addresses and texts, and F.M. Dostoyevsky are referred to. As the main reason why the Turkish historical-cultural type cannot take a proper place in these concepts, the rise of the Slavic historical-cultural type against the background of the Russo-Turkish wars are emphasized.

It is obvious that the Turkish cultural-historical type is not included in the first and subsequent classifications based on the laws and regularities of movement defined by the Russian scientist who had the first role in defining cultural-historical types. Historical facts and various types of evidence are listed to prove this. Although the indicated error was eliminated by the authors of the Eurasian concept of Russian history in the 20s and 30s of the 20th century, it is noted that there is a need for scientific-theoretical confirmation of the existence of the Turkish cultural-historical type and Turkish civilization as an ideological landmark in the historical conditions of the formation of the Union of Turkic States.

Keywords: N. Danilevsky, "Russia and Europe", cultural-historical type, crusades, Slavs.

INTRODUCTION

The term "cultural-historical type" belongs to Nikolai Danilevsky, a Russian philosopher, and natural scientist who lived in the nineteenth century. In the book "Russia and Europe" (1869), he proposed the theory of cultural-historical types [8]. As a philosopher of history, N. Danilevsky was the founder of the theory of civilizations (synonym: the theory of "local civilizations") and the author of its first version – the theory of cultural-historical types" [8, 6]. Based on this characteristic, S. I. Bazhov, the author of the preface to the latest edition of the previously mentioned book, calls history a "biography" of original and independent cultural-historical types (civilizations), and also lists the ten "full-fledged" cultural-historical types indicated in Danilevsky's book: 1) Egyptian; 2) Chinese; 3) Assyrian-Babylonian-Phoenician, Chaldean or Ancient Semitic; 4) Indian; 5) Iranian; 6) Jewish; 7) Greek; 8) Roman; 9) New Semitic or Arabian; 10) German-Roman or European, and two American types: Mexican and Peruvian, who went extinct by "violent death" before the end of the development cycle. N. Danilevsky also thinks about the future of the Russian-Slavic cultural-historical type [8, 8].

This book by N. Danilevsky attracts our attention from the point of view of: 1) recent changes in ideas about cultural and historical types; 2) the need for a new reading of the theory of civilizations; 3) to identify the significance of the book "Russia and Europe" for a rational understanding and completion of discussions about the nature of today's world order, and its prospects; 4) the probable vulnerability of this theory, which undoubtedly influenced the subsequent concepts of the development of civilizations.

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

To substantiate and motivate the answers to these questions, let us first turn to chapter V of the book [8,125-150], where five laws of movement and development of cultural-historical types are presented and commented on. According to N. Danilevsky's *first law*, "every tribe or family of peoples characterized by a separate language or group of languages possesses an original cultural-historical type." According to his *second law*, any original cultural-historical type can originate and develop with political independence. Depending on N. Danilevsky's *third law*, each cultural and historical type is original, unique, but it "develops" its own civilization "with greater or lesser influence of external, preceding, or modern civilizations. *The fourth law* of cultural-historical types, according to the Russian scientist, assumes that the ethnographic elements inherent in each type "achieve completeness, diversity, and richness" with the existence of a federation or a political system of state. The author builds his *fifth law* on the fact that after indefinitely prolonged growth, cultural-historical types achieve rapid development and prosperity, but in a short time their depletion and extinction occur.

Commenting on the first two laws, N. Danilevsky does not doubt their correctness. At the same time, the statement of the Russian scientist that by the time he put forward the theory of cultural-historical types, in other words, by the second half of the nineteenth century, "all other significant tribes had not formed original civilizations" is questionable. Such civilizations include Turkic tribes, who, according to the scientist, "live in countries that are not suitable for culture, have not emerged from a state of savagery or nomadism."

Seemingly, "these tribes remained at the level of ethnographic material, this means they did not participate in historical life at all or rose only to the degree of destructive historical elements" [8, 127]. This statement was put forward in that historical period when the whole of Europe and the Christian world were united by the struggle against the centuries-old presence of the Turkic Ottoman Empire in three parts of the world, and there was also opposition not only to the political, but also to the cultural and religious influence of the Turkic state. At the same time, Russia continued the process of ousting the Ottoman Empire from the Slavic lands, and the Russian-Turkish wars were in progress. Russia fought for the right to leadership in these territories. Simultaneously, Europe feared a significant strengthening of the Russian Empire in the Balkans and the Middle East. It was a time when Russia actively joined the struggle for the implementation of the political theory of "Moscow—III Rome", and the transformation of the country into an Eurasian state. Russia intervened in the confrontation between the Romano-German and Turkic-Islamic civilizations in Europe, and wanted to create a Slavic Union and an All-Slavic Federation in the lands cleared from the Turkish presence. Therefore, it was important for N. Danilevsky not only to show that Russia did not belong to Europe, the Romano-German world, but also to substantiate the process of maturation and prosperity of the Slavic civilization on the basis of the Byzantine, the emergence of a new cultural-historical type-Slavic. At the same time, Russia intended to bring the matter to an end: by supporting the liberation wars of the Eastern and Western Slavs. By all means, it wanted to win their hearts, and prevent any of the Slavs from entering into an alliance with the countries of the Romano-Germanic world. But the intervention of European states in the Crimean campaign (1853-1856) prevented the implementation of Russian plans. It was the "course of the Eastern question about the Crimean War" that gave N. Danilevsky an excuse to "disclose the hostility of Europe to Russia and the Slavs." According to the scientist, "this hostility lies in the deep enmity that exists between the Slavic and Germanic-Roman worlds, a discord that penetrates to the very foundations of the general plan of development of world history." [8, 565]. N. Danilevsky considered the cure of Russian society from the "disease" of Westernism, as well as the complete political liberation of all Slavic peoples, the formation of the All-Slavic Union under the patronage of Russia to be an important factor for the establishment of the Slavic cultural and historical type and the identification of the main differences with the Germanic-Roman type [8, 566]. In the XV and XVII chapters of his book, under the titles "All-Slavic Union" and "Slavic cultural-historical type (instead of conclusion)," the author establishes categories indicating various discoveries of the historical life of the Slavic peoples, about their inherent culture [8]. The general sections of cultural life are designated and commented on under the following definitions: *religious, cultural, political, and socio-economic activities*. Slavs are presented as a four-basic cultural-historical type [8, 568-569].

The question of the essence of world civilizations and the role of European cultures and countries in the representation and transformation of accumulated experience and values has long been discussed in the philosophy and literature of Western Europe, while the term "cultural-historical types" was established in the late 1960s of the XIX century. The epoch of classicism assimilated, revised, and remade samples of ancient and medieval cultures. And all this happened at the same time as the European bourgeois revolutions. The era of classicism mixed with the age of Enlightenment, the rapid development of philosophical and didactic ideas. There was a dilemma about educating a new human being—a person of the era of awakenings and shocks, a person who is thinking and free internally. Almost simultaneously, the era of sentimentalism and romanticism began. Europe was engulfed by philosophical ideas, on the one hand, and the romantic spirit of the poetry of Byron, Goethe, and Schiller, on the other. The Great French Revolution, which shattered established orders and ideas, was followed by the creation of the empire of Napoleon Bonaparte. The era of Napoleonic victories was replaced by a period of awakening Russian minds in the aftermath of the liberation of Europe from Napoleonic violence. But Russia was not able to take advantage of the historical opportunity that appeared after the creation of the Holy Alliance in Europe. For Russia, the era of the gendarmerie of Europe began with years of internal confrontation. Instead of liberating the common people from serfdom, implementing serious reforms, and supporting the spirit, ideological and creative aspirations, and inspiration of the young Russian nobility, after the Decembrist uprising, persecution of liberals began. As a result, they found themselves in Siberia and the Caucasus. For the second time in its history, Russia failed to take advantage of the opportunity presented to it for socio-economic and cultural elevation. Let us recall the first years of Catherine II's coming to power, her decree on the drafting and establishment of a new code in Russia with the involvement of all layers of Russian society, the Empress's decision to publish liberal magazines, the introduction of a European-style educational system in the country, and other achievements of the era of European classicism. However, soon, under the pretext of the outbreak of war with Turkey, everything came to an end.

Having gotten rid of the apprenticeship of Western European literature and philosophers, Russian philosophical and literary thought tried to interpret the course of civilizational processes in its own way. Along with Westerners, who perfectly understood and affirmed the role of Europe in the formation of philosophical and cultural thought in Russia at that time, Slavophile views appeared, who saw the path of development and the mission of their motherland in the Slavic world. The concept of N. Danilevsky became the cornerstone of the ideological platform of the Slavophiles. The ideas of Westernism and Slavophilism penetrated into the Russian literature of the XIX century; which was strongly ideologized. In the context of the debate about the Russian idea, in the sources of many outstanding texts of Russian literature like the novel "The Brothers Karamazov", in their philosophical backgrounds, as

well as in the widespread overlap of these works with the ideas of Rousseau, Kant, Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and other European thinkers, there is a deep search for Russian identity, religiosity, conciliarity, and other qualities.

According to our observations, subsequent concepts and views about cultural-historical types came from the original theory about them; their authors were strongly influenced by the Russian philosopher. Oswald Spengler's concept of the collapse of Western civilization [21] appeared immediately after the First World War. Arnold Toynbee put forward the theory of the emergence and development of civilizations before the outbreak of World War II as a *response* to the global challenges of the time [17]. Each new version of this concept had its own socio-political, economic, and ideological basis and was created by scientists with completely different professional and ideological platforms. Each of them presented the history of the development of civilizations and cultures in different ways.

But it would be logical to refer to the origins of the question, to the historical moment when it became necessary to define the concepts of "culture" and "civilization", and N. Danilevsky's theory of cultural-historical types has not yet been established. This will help us understand the essence of the definition of these types. In our opinion, one of those who seriously studied the history of European civilization and stood at the origins of the problem is the French historian, philosopher, theorist of language and literature, statesman, and diplomat Francois Guizot. He had an unequivocally firm belief about the development of civilization in Europe: "Civilization cannot be searched in any one European state, and its history cannot be studied from the history of only one country. It endlessly changes nuances; has never fully developed in any one single state. The elements of its history should be searched in France, at the same time in England, or in Germany, then in Italy and Spain" [6].

Conceptually, it would be necessary to take as a basis precisely this position of the theorist of civilizational development, which made it possible to come to a completely acceptable conclusion: "One can ask oneself the question: Is there a worldwide civilization of the human race? Does humanity strive for a certain goal? Do people pass on to each other from century to century something that does not disappear, something that grows, is stored as a precious treasure, and is thus something imperishable and eternal? As for me, I am deeply convinced that humanity really has a common purpose; that there is a transmission of the treasures of civilization from generation to generation and, consequently, there is a universal history of civilization." [6].

O. Spengler and A. Toynbee, in turn, became the authors of the subsequent most systematic and well-known classifications of cultural-historical types. The first of them rejected the idea of a universal world history, claimed the existence of many stories of individual original cultures functioning as an integral, autonomous organism. The German scientist identified eight great cultures: *Egyptian, Babylonian, Indian, Chinese, Greco-Roman (ancient), Arab-Byzantine (magical), Maya (Mexican), and Western European (Faustian)*. In

addition, he suggested the possibility of the emergence of a new *Russian-Siberian* culture.

In his opinion, the time of existence of each culture from the moment of its origin to its death is about a thousand years. Culture, having fallen into decline, is transformed into civilization [19, p. 39].

A. Toynbee's classification of civilizations was based on religious and territorial criteria, i.e., the presence or absence of religious ties between societies, as well as the degree of remoteness from the place where a particular society originated. Initially, he identified 21 civilizations: *Western, fundamental Orthodox Christian (Byzantine-Balkan), Orthodox Christian in Russia, Iranian, Arab, Indian, Hindu, Far Eastern fundamental, Far Eastern in Korea and Japan, Hellenic (Greco-Roman), Syrian, Chinese, Minoan, Sumerian, Hittite, Babylonian, Andean, Mexican, Yucatan, Mayan, and Egyptian*. Later, A. Toynbee reduced the number of independent civilizations to ten.

Perceiving history as a cyclical process, a cycle of local societies, and calling it civilization, the English historian rejected the definition of the general terms of the existence of civilizations. For example, the historical process of the origin, development, flourishing, decline, and death of the Egyptian civilization, according to the scientist, took about two thousand years [17, 77-79].

The Turks, according to the authors of these concepts, belong to the "destroyers" of civilizations or represent "frozen" civilizations. The civilizations created by the Turkic peoples are briefly indicated as not quite certain types ("Nomadic" and "Ottoman"). It is surprising that none of the authors above identified turkic as a cultural-historical type in the list of the main civilizations.

N. Danilevsky, as an ardent Russian Slavophile whose views reflected the ideas and moods of the Russian intelligentsia of the second half of the 19th century, was a supporter of the Greek-Slavic path of development in Europe. He was not satisfied with the existing division of the territory of Eurasia between the Romano-Germanic and Greek-Slavic worlds due to the backwardness of the regions inherited by Russia, among which was Central Asia, the Turkestan cultural-historical area. A contemporary of N. Danilevsky, K. Leontiev, a Russian diplomat in Greece, was more skeptical and sober about the Slavophile illusions of the scientist. The sincerity and credulity of the Slavs of Eastern Europe and the Balkans, despite the efforts of Russia, stirred doubts in him. He called Slavism a "sphinx-riddle": "Imagining All-Slavism in our mind, we get only some kind of amorphous, spontaneous, unorganized representation..." [13, 1-7]. Byzantism, in his opinion, "in the state means autocracy. In religion, it means Christianity with certain features that distinguish it from Western churches, from heresies and schisms..." [13, 1-7]. N. Danilevsky and K. Leontiev divided humanity into cultural and historical types that overcame certain stages of development: youth, maturity, and old age.

In parallel, other views on the development and existence of cultural-historical types have been estab-

lished. When O. Spengler came to the idea of the decline of European (Western) civilization, the Azerbaijani ideologist of Turkism, Ahmed Aghaoglu, argued about the dominant role of Romano-German culture in the world: "European culture, flowing in a powerful stream and not encountering any obstacle, removes everything in its path. The only way out of this state is to accept this culture" [1, 30]. A. Aghaoglu comes to these conclusions in a book published in 1927. By this time, a school of Turkism had already developed in Russia and Turkey, pan-Turkic ideas were vigorously discussed in the works of Ismail Gaspirinsky, Yusuf Akchura, Ali Bey Huseynzade, etc. In 1923, Zia Gekal-p's book "The Basic Principles of Turkism" was published. In Turkey, the government of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was oriented towards European values. Being an associate of Atatürk, A. Aghaoglu recognized the backwardness of the culture of the Turkic world compared to the Western one and emphasized the impossibility of bypassing the victorious culture [1, 35].

Based on the theses of Francois Guizot, we can understand A. Aghaoglu, who was looking for a path of cultural development through the unconditional acceptance and assimilation of the achievements of European civilization.

And now let's turn to the works of one of the main representatives of existentialism, the German philosopher, cultural historian, psychologist, and psychiatrist Karl Jaspers, who, summing up the experience of his predecessors, gave a clear definition of the concepts of "culture" and "civilization". The scientist, who went through two world wars, was worried about "philosophical, historical, and ideological problems: how can we overcome the cataclysms that befell European civilization in the 20th century? What spiritual guidelines do European people have and how do you find them in a modern industrial society?" [22, 8]: "Over the past five centuries, Europeans have drawn the whole world into their orbit. They spread their civilization everywhere and took from other civilizations what they themselves did not have... The Europeans were the first to make the unity of the world conscious, communication systematic, long-lasting, and reliable..."

There is a unity of cultures as a unity of a virtually common world of life forms, institutions, ideas, and beliefs – the unity of peoples by origin, language, and fate; the unity of religions as "world religions" ... [22, 260-261]

Most of the works that appeared after the publication of the books by Russian scientists N. Danilevsky and K. Leontiev continued to present the history of world civilizations one-sidedly, especially cultural-historical types. Therefore, it is no coincidence that Rustam Rahmanaliyev used it as an epigraph to his book "The Empire of the Turks. The History of a Great Civilization" uses Goethe's words: "Nowadays, there is no doubt that world history will have to be rewritten from time to time. Such a need arises not because more and more new events come to light over time, but because new views appear that encourage the advanced man of the new time to take a point of view from which he could see and evaluate the past in a completely new way." [16, 5]

Our searches have shown that although the history of studying the issue begins with N. Danilevsky, philosophers and writers in Western Europe have long been thinking about the essence of human civilizations, about their origin, development, decline, and death. They were looking for answers to questions: how to explain the disappearance of the great Egyptian civilization, the Library of Alexandria, the Khazar Khaganate, etc. What was the reason for their extinction? Natural phenomena, great migrations of peoples, world wars, confrontations of civilizations, or the natural course of their origin, development, prosperity, and decline?

Each new stage of the outbreak of disputes and discussions about the development of world civilizations and cultures and about their types began in relation to the peculiarities of the current historical situation: during confrontations, world wars, or after their completion.

At the root of all these discussions around the concepts of N. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, and A. Toynbee, there were so many disagreements that modern historiography and philosophy became disappointed with them and put forward alternative options, completely different interpretations of the course of history. But no one has been able to overcome the basic contradictions of these concepts. The history of fierce confrontation between world religions-West and East, Russia and Europe-continues to this day, even tougher and more severe. How is that possible? Atilla was recognized as a man of the first millennium, and Genghis Khan was recognized as a man of the second millennium. The leaders of the first and second great migrations were the Turks. Only listing the names of the greatest Turkic states and empires could take up more than one page of our article. The idea of collecting all the lands and states of the world belongs to Genghis Khan and Amir Teymur. The Orkhon-Yenisei writings, the great epics of the early Middle Ages (Kitabi-Dede Gorgud, Manas, etc.), belong to the Turks. Outstanding representatives of the Renaissance of the same era are Jalaleddin Rumi, al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, Nizami, Nasimi, Navoi, Fuzuli, etc., but there is not a word in any of the concepts of world civilizations about the wealth, depth, and prevalence of Turkic civilizations, the Turks are not mentioned by anyone in a positive way. After all, the Turkic civilization, as well as the other civilizations listed by N. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, and A. Toynbee, were characterized by stages of emergence, development, prosperity and decline. The Turkic cultural-historical type that we assume has undoubtedly passed through all the stages of existence, according to the five laws of movement and development of cultural-historical types mentioned by N. Danilevsky. The Turkic cultural-historical type, as well as the Slavic one, can be described as four-basic, having religious, cultural, political, and socio-economic activities.

And why are the definitions applied to the Turks not attributed to other civilizations, to the same Romano-Germanic, to the participants of the crusades who massacred hundreds of thousands of Orthodox Christians and Muslims, who destroyed Constantinople long before its conquest by the Turks in 1453? If the Turkic cultural-historical type, in our opinion, has the right to

be named among the main ones for the simple reason that it meets all five laws of movement and development of cultural and historical types, approved by the pioneer of these theories N. Danilevsky, then why didn't his followers, K. Leontiev, O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, B. Russell, and others, refute it? Javad Hayyat's article "The Influence of Islamic Culture on the Development of Western Culture" became a kind of response to the general methodological miscalculations of these theorists. It puts forward a scientifically based idea that the origins of modern flourishing Western culture were not Roman and Byzantine cultures, but eastern Islamic and Turkic. [12] The recognition of this just statement is very timely for the realization of the idea of the unification of the Turkic states. On the other hand, the article by J. Haight can be evaluated as a reaction to the views of modern American philosophers Francis Fukuyama [19] and Samuel Harrington [20] about the confrontation of Islamic culture with Western ones and the future clash of these civilizations.

After all, the days have long passed when everyone was engaged in refuting the opinion, "Scratch a Russian, and there will be a Tatar." On the other hand, today in Europe, in the Slavic world, and in Eurasia, a completely different world order has been established. F. Dostoevsky's statement has lost its relevance. : "Russia cannot step aside from the great idea left to it by a number of centuries and which it has followed steadily up to now. The idea is the unity of the Slavs, but this unity is not to occupy or use violence, but for the sake of serving humanity...". The great writer is right that Russia's forces were "quite mistakenly directed in this direction." [9, 258] This also follows from K. Leontiev's statement that the rivalry for a dominant role in the Romano-German world between France and Germany continues, while Russia vainly claims a leading position in the Greco-Slavic world. At the same time, F. Dostoevsky, an ardent supporter of the theory of N. Danilevsky, assumed the unity of all peoples without any exceptions: "We will announce to the world for the first time that we do not want to achieve our own prosperity through the suppression of personalities of foreign nationalities, but on the contrary, we see it only in the freest and most independent development of all other nations and in fraternal unity with them, replenishing one another, grafting their organic characteristics to ourselves and giving them branches from ourselves for grafting communicating with them with soul and spirit, learning from them and teaching them, and so on until humanity, replenished by the world communication of peoples to universal unity, like a great and magnificent tree, overshadows the happy earth." [11, 100]. In our opinion, in the above statements, F. Dostoevsky sees a certain contradiction. On one hand, he is a Slavophile, a supporter of N. Danilevsky, one of the active ideologists of the so-called Eastern question, and on the other, the author of the "Russian idea", which became the basis of Russian philosophy. This is universal responsiveness, i.e., the absence of national egoism, willingness to help other people. It seems that today the writer's speech about Pushkin, addressed to the Russian people, the Slavic world, and Europeans, is very relevant. According to Arseny Gulyga, "... Dostoevsky sees

the true "feat of Pushkin" in the fact that universal ideas shine in his poetry. Since "what is the strength of the Russian nation, if not its striving for universality and universal humanity in its ultimate goals? Oh, the peoples of Europe do not even know how important they are to us Russians! And subsequently, I believe in this: we-that is, of course, not we-but in the future, every single Russian will already understand that becoming a real Russian will mean striving to bring reconciliation about European contradictions" [6, 86]. Yes, "Dostoevsky spoke about the future. He drew attention to the fact that in Russia "there will be a higher cultural type that does not exist in the whole world – a type of worldwide support for everyone." This "world enthusiast" will arise from the "earth patriot": the stronger the attachment to the native land, the sooner it develops into an understanding that the fate of the motherland is inseparable from the fate of the whole world. Hence the desire to arrange European and world affairs as a characteristic Russian feature" [6, 86]. As a result of technological progress, globalization, wars, and cataclysms, the world has become so small, fragile, and defenseless that each of us today is confused by the questions "How to preserve and protect it, not to lose the achievements and results of civilization, multicultural and ethnic identity of the planet? What should we do to know, see, appreciate the cultural diversity of the world and skillfully use, enjoy and cherish everything that we have on Earth? Are not the teachings of F. Dostoevsky's answer to these questions the tragic consequences of the confrontation in Eastern Europe between Russia and Ukraine? Was this the all-Slavic unity dreamed of by the Slavophiles? Did such a confrontation between Russia and Europe worry the authors of the Russian idea? Were these supposed to be the results of the Romano-Germanic and Greco-Slavic development of the European way?

This is what our thoughts lead to around N. Danilevsky's "suspicious" concept of cultural-historical types, where even prehistoric civilizations, civilizations that do not touch Russian borders, found a place. It is fair that, based on the realities of European development, the present and future plans of the main players in European politics, he distinguished the Romano-Germanic and Greek-Slavic cultural-historical types. It was only unclear how he kept silent and missed the history of the great Turkic civilization, which for centuries was closely intertwined and coexisted with the ancient Russian and ancient Slavic cultures. Although F. Dostoevsky waited with great interest for the appearance of the chapters of the book "Russia and Europe" by N. Danilevsky in the era of incessant disputes between Westerners and Slavophiles, in our opinion, it is impossible to understand and adequately perceive him in terms of the "flaw" of interest to us without notes by the same F. Dostoevsky. In his comments under the titles "My Paradox", "Conclusion from the paradox" and "The Eastern Question" [10], the writer explained all the reasons for not including the Turkic cultural-historical type in the list under discussion. It turns out that Russia, ashamed of its Hunnic, Avar, Khazar, Pecheneg, and Tatar pasts, abandons the history of its

revival in the XIV-XVII centuries, largely made possible by relations with the Golden Horde, and then with the Ottoman Porte, which contributed to its elevation to the rank of a great Eurasian power. And this is only to be heard and accepted in the West, in Europe. It turns out that by cutting a window to Europe, Russia had to abandon not only its Orthodox, but also its Turkic past. All that remained was to "drag a sick man out of bed (Dostoevsky meant Ottoman Turkey, *our remark*) completely off." But for the sake of Slavic unity, the Russian theorist N. Danilevsky and the writer F. Dostoevsky did not want Europe to call a consilium "to treat him again." It is clear that the intervention of European countries in the so-called "eternally insoluble Eastern question" would then have prevented Russia's plans, according to the political theory of Philotheus and the testament of Peter I, to liberate Constantinople from the Turks and turn it into the center of the All-Slavic Union.

From the point of view of a Western observer, this special path is due to two interrelated factors: on the one hand, Peter's reforms, which brought Russia as close as possible to the West, and on the other, the "resistance of the material", some features of a historical, religious, and cultural nature that do not allow Russia to dissolve into Western civilization" [2, 336]. It seems to us that the problem is not in the "resistance of the material", i.e., religious content, ethnic diversity, or the history of the formation of Russian statehood. From the point of view of politicians, publicists, and thinkers in the West, a number of events led to the formation of the myth of the Russian threat, ideas about a semi-Asian country, the purpose of which is to "drown in blood the European civilization weakened by its age-old foundations" [2, 339].

CONCLUSION

Today, in the Turkic countries, along with large-scale international and interregional socio-economic development projects, cultural, informational, scientific, and technical measures are being implemented that contribute to strengthening integration processes within the framework of the Unification of the Turkic States. This is important for every Turkic state in terms of defining its historical, cultural, and national identity. We need to consider our history and culture in the context of identifying the contribution of the Turkic peoples to world culture and civilization. Today, Azerbaijan is experiencing a peculiar national-patriotic upsurge. Historical justice is being restored: the native Azerbaijani lands occupied by the Armenians as a result of mass migrations are being returned. Thanks to socio-economic, cultural, and scientific projects, the Karabakh and East Zangezur regions of the republic are being revived, and historical memory is being restored... We are looking forward to the imminent opening of the Zangezur Corridor, which is economically beneficial for all countries in the region...

We are particularly impressed by the Turkological studies of Kazakhstanis. In this regard, Sagadi Bulakbayev's article "The Turkic world in the context of the history of philosophy", which recently appeared in one of the scientific journals of Kazakhstan, is noteworthy.

[3]. Firstly, in this publication, the author makes an attempt to "combine individual "stories" into a single world history", second, he frees us from the task of providing irrefutable facts about Turkic history and culture in favor of its assertion as one of the main cultural-historical types. Let's pay attention to Bulakbayev's arguments: 1) starting from the end of the VI century, the borders of the Turkic Khaganate closed in the west with Byzantium, in the south with Persia and India, and in the east with China; 2) contrary to the claims of historians, the Turks had their own self-sufficient culture and civilization in the center of Eurasia, created several centers of world culture and civilization, which had a significant impact on other cultures and civilizations, primarily European; 3) referring to L. Gumilyova the author gives numerous facts of technological progress (*the invention of metal stirrups and pack harnesses, metal smelting, production of cast iron and steel, the invention of the curved saber, the appearance of printing technology eight centuries before the discovery of Guttenberg, "equestrian culture", irrigation art, the conquest of peoples and countries, the ability to keep them under their power, the stretching of conquered territories from The Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic, in particular, the possessions of the Turkic Khaganate, the empire of Genghis Khan, the empires of the Timurids, Ghaznavids, Mughals, Zhalairs in Iran, the Ottoman Empire, possession of the best military art, the use of Turkic troops as allies or mercenaries, perfect forms of social existence and social institutions, nomadic democracy, tax system, money circulation, safe trade, ideal communication network, diplomacy, tolerant attitude to the language, culture and traditions of all peoples, etc.* – italic added).

Based on the "Persian Letters" of the French philosopher Charles Montesquieu, the Kazakh scientist expresses the following interesting idea: "The conquests of Genghis Khan significantly surpass the conquests of seven major European generals recognized by the whole world: Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Caesar, Swedish King Charles XII, Frederick the Great, A.V. Suvorov, and Napoleon Bonaparte ..." [3].

We agree with the opinion that "... in the context of modern cultural methodology, the concepts of Danilevsky, Spengler, and Toynbee are quite working and in demand" [15]. We take these concepts as the basis for our views and future research on the Turkic cultural-historical type. At the same time, we support the restoration of historical justice and offer a scientific and theoretical platform necessary for the unification of the Turkic states. In contrast to N. Danilevsky's theory, we consider the Eurasian concept of Russian history, proposed by Eurasian scientists G. Vernadsky [3], N. Trubetskoy [17], L. Gumilev [6] and others, to be quite objective, corresponding to the nature and logic of the development of centuries-old Slavic-Turkic ties and relations between Russia and Europe. The works of Eurasians of the Soviet and post-Soviet times, the neo-Eurasian movement in Russia, the Eurasia platform in Turkey, the concept of Turanian Eurasianism by O. Suleimenov, N. Nazarbayev, as well as Turkological studies of recent decades in Turkic countries, indicate that the existence of the Turkic cultural-historical type

is beyond doubt. The problem is how to present it, how to broadly and deeply cover and describe the entire process of its emergence, development, and flourishing, and how to determine the current state of civilizational trends.

It is necessary to adhere to L. Gumilev's well-known thesis that "if Russia were saved, it would be only as an Eurasian power and only through Eurasianism." [6]. In this sense, the opinion of one of the well-known representatives of the Turkish platform of Eurasianism, Omer Geksel Ishyar, is also important.: "In the Eurasian region, Turkey and Russia should not oppose each other but act together, achieve political flexibility among themselves, and not get carried away by superiority and competition in their relations..." [12, 89]. This request is relevant and viable for the stability of relations between the Union of Turkic States and the Russian Federation in all spheres of life. Today, new scientific fields have emerged that integrate with culture: cultural studies, ethnoculturology, linguoculturology, multiculturalism, ethnopscychology, and other meta-disciplines of practical importance in the study of the language, culture, and history of the peoples of the world. In our opinion, ignoring or distorting the history and culture of any nation limits the possibilities of cultural and scientific exchange, rapprochement, dialogue, and comprehensive cooperation between peoples.

References:

1. Ağaoğlu Ə. Üç mədəniyyət / Ə. Ağaoğlu. – Bakı: Mütərcim, 2006. – C. 24-36.
2. Bagno V.E. Myth – image – motive (Russian literature in the context of the world). – St. Petersburg: Pushkin House Publishing House, Vita Nova Publishing House, 2014. – 480 p.
3. Bulekbaev S. The Turkic world in the context of the history of philosophy // <https://mysl.kazgazeta.kz/news/2265>
4. Vernadsky G. V. Moscow Tsardom: trans. from English / G. V. Vernadsky. - Tver: LEAN, , 1999. – 448 c.
5. Guizot F. History of Civilization in Europe // <https://mybook.ru/author/fransua-gizo/istoriya-civilizacii-v-evrope-2/read/?page=3>
6. Gulyga A.V. Creators of the Russian idea. – M.: Molodaya Gvardiya, 2006. – 316 p.
7. Gumilev L.N. Rhythms of Eurasia: Epochs and Civilizations. St. Petersburg: SZKE: OOO "Izdatelsky Dom "Kristall", 2003 <http://flibusta.site/b/192539/read>
8. Danilevsky N.Ya. Russia and Europe / N.Ya. Danilevsky. - Moscow: Publishing House AST: OGIZ, 2023, 624 p.
9. Dzhafarov T.G. Ancient Rus' and the Turks: in literary monuments of the 12th-17th centuries / T.G. Dzhafarov. - Astrakhan: Publishing House "Astrakhan University", 2013, - 267 c.
10. Dostoevsky F.M. Writer's Diary: Selected Pages / F. M. Dostoevsky - M.: Sovremennik, 1989, 557 p.
11. Dostoevsky F.M. Complete Works in 30 Volumes. Vol. 25.
12. Heyət C. İslam mədəniyyətinin Qərb mədəniyyətinin inkişafına təsiri / C. Heyət // 525-ci qəzet. – 2010. – 19 mart.
13. İşyar Ö.G. Avrasya ve avrasyacılık. – Bursa: Dora, 2013, 352 s.
14. Leontiev K.N. Byzantium and Slavdom. – M.: Publication of the Imperial Society of Russian History and Antiquities at Moscow University, 1876, 144 p.
15. Ravochkin N.N. Culturological Theories of Danilevsky, Toynbee and Spengler in the Context of Modern Cultural Methodology // <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kulturologicheskie-teorii-danilevskogo-toynbi-i-shpenglera-v-kontekste-sovremennoy-metodologii-kultury>
16. Rakhmanaliev R. Empire of the Turks. History of a great civilization. - Moscow: Ripol Classic, 2013.
17. Toynbee A. Understanding history /A. Toynbee. - M.: Academic project, 2023, 798 c.
18. Trubetskoy N.S. History. Culture. Language /N.S. Trubetskoy. – M.: Progress, 1995. – 800 c.
19. Fukuyama F. The End of History and the Last Man. The Free Press, 446 p. https://old.tsu.ge/data/file_db/anthim/011.pdf
20. Huntington S. The Clash of Civilizations? // Foreign Affairs. – 1993. – Summer (vol.72, № 3). – P. 22–49.
21. Spengler O. The Decline of Europe: in 2 volumes. Moscow, 2004. Vol. 2
22. Jaspers K. The Meaning and Purpose of History: Trans. from Germ. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1991. – 527 c.