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Abstract
This article investigates the influence of Duginist Eurasianism among the elites of the self-proclaimed Pridnestrovian Moldavian Republic. The investigative approach is divided into two major sections: the analysis of Dugin’s Eurasian vision and the investigation of the influences of Duginist Eurasianism among the elites of Tiraspol. Such research is needed in the light of the political situation in Eastern Europe, especially after the opening of the conflict in Eastern Ukraine. It is important to investigate the influence of Duginist Eurasianism in the Transnistrian region in order to anticipate possible decision-making directions. In terms of understanding Duginist Eurasianism, the philosopher’s perspective is investigated through his publications. The same analytical approach is taken in order to capture its position in relation to the importance of the Transnistrian region in its own Eurasian plans. Regarding the research of the propagation of Dugin's Eurasianist ideas among the elites in Tiraspol, the perspectives of some of the region's politicians and intellectuals are investigated. Despite the definite presence of the influences of the Eurasian Duginist among the elites in the Transnistrian region, the research is not able to clarify exactly the extent of the ideas among the Transnistrians. Importantly though, the research records their existence and confirms their spread among the ruling elites in the second decade of the 2000s.
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Introduction

The main research question is whether the ideas of Eurasianism in the version constructed and proposed by the Russian philosopher Alexandr Dugin influence the elites of the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic. To answer the major question the paper was sectioned by investigating three adjacent questions: what is Duginist Eurasianism, what is the place of the self-proclaimed PMR in Dugin’s view, and whether there is evidence of the reception and perpetuation of Duginist Eurasianist ideas among Tiraspol elites. The significance of the research is major. The general area under investigation, the Transnistrian region, represents a risk to the national security of the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Romania and, by extension, the European Union and NATO. The importance of the pro-Kremlin stance of the self-proclaimed elites in Tiraspol has intensified especially after the Euromaidan events. In a specific way, though overrated or denied as important, Aleksandr Dugin wrote the most detailed ideology corresponding to the unofficial policy followed by the Russian Federation (Millerman, 2019). Capturing the ideas that have circulated or are circulating in the Transnistrian space is important in order to determine possible future political directions. The thesis is presented in an analytical and descriptive way. The information is presented in a narrative manner. The investigative approach undertaken to obtain the results of the work is a qualitative one. In terms of analyzing and interpreting the information, raw data were investigated and presented in accordance with the topic of this research. The search for information focused conceptually on Duginist Eurasianism, and in the second stage on spreading the specific ideas of the concept in the discourse of some Tiraspol elites. Thus, methodological aspects were specific to each of the three proposed questions. Dugin’s work on the Eurasian problem was investigated for conceptual clarification of Duginist Eurasianism. An important work in this regard is Eurasian Mission: An Introduction to Neo-Eurasianism. Dugin’s vision of Transnistria’s place within Eurasia was captured mainly from press articles. Some of his contacts and relations with elites on the left bank of the Dniester were also analyzed. Speeches, interviews and articles were investigated to trace the influence and reproduction of Dugin’s Eurasian ideas in Tiraspol. Of great importance in this regard are the collections of articles of the Media
Centre “Eurasian Transnistria”. The limitations of the research are major. The research cannot indicate the level of spread of Dugin’s specific Eurasian ideas in the Transnistrian region, nor can it support the relevance of these ideas in the future decision-making of the region. However, it confirms the existence and assumption of the influence of Duginist Eurasianism among some Tiraspol elites in the second decade of the 2000s.

Alexandr Dugin and Eurasianism

Eurasianist theory was developed in the 1920s. According to this theory, Russian civilization and its margins are centrally located between Europe and Asia. Eurasianist terminology rejects the idea that Russia is the periphery of Europe. Eurasianism argues that a third, original civilization was formed through geographical positioning. Located at the cultural confluence of the Slavic and Turkic peoples, it belongs to both the West and the East (Dugin, 2014, p. 17). In the 1930s, the Eurasianist movement lost its influence. In the post-war period, the existence of two superpowers with diametrically opposed visions overshadowed the Eurasian project. The ideology of the Eastern bloc was reason enough for the existence of a state linking many “Soviet” nations in Eastern Europe and North and Central Asia. The fall of the Soviet bloc and the break-up of the USSR proved facile for the revival of the Eurasianist movement. For various purposes, some academics have argued that there is a difference between the post-Soviet states and the rest of the world. The hypothesis is that, unlike the previous Soviet system, the new differentiation was cultural rather than economic determinism. The common feature of thinkers of Eurasianism after the 1990s, or Neo-Eurasianists, is the presentation of a cultural and historical unity of Russians and non-Russian peoples in Eastern Europe and different parts of Asia. Neo-Eurasianists also see the need for an imperial political entity and support national diversity, but oppose the autonomy of minorities. Neo-Eurasianist perspectives are diverse and sometimes diametrically opposed (Laruelle, 2008).

One of the main thinkers of Neo-Eurasianism is Alexander Dugin. Despite the overestimation or denial of his influence (Kalinin, 2019), Dugin has had an important impact on Russian society and was listed in the top 100 foreign policy thinkers in the world in 2014 (Umland, 2017, p. 469).
Alexander Dugin is one of the intellectuals who did not accept the Soviet interpretation of Marxism. In the 1980s Dugin was a dissident of the communist regime. He came in contact with various traditionalist groups. His ideas began to be influenced by the New European Right (Dugin and Carvalho, 2016, p. 11). Following the Russian Constitutional Crisis of 1993, Dugin founded the National Bolshevik Party. Various contributors to the party newspaper lamented the break-up of the USSR and hoped that a Union would be re-established in a new form. The year 1994 also brought various changes in the attitude of Yeltsin’s regime. He began to discard the liberal ideology that opposed the idea of a strong state. There was a rise of nationalist mentality among the elites around the Yeltsin regime. The agreement with the Chechen regime destroyed Dugin’s hope that Russia would not follow the liberal policy of a weak state. Towards the end of the 1990s, Yeltsin’s regime resumed the vision of an authoritarian state. Dugin has concluded that it is necessary to collaborate with the state in order to influence it towards authoritarianism and nationalism. He began lecturing at the school that trained future FSB officers. Dugin has moved closer to the regime with Putin’s rise to power. In 2003 he formed the International Eurasian Movement and was well received by the Russian authorities. Over time, Dugin’s ideas found their way into growing segments of the population that had never even heard of him. This is probably due to the Duginist vision that more and more Russian elites have taken on board (Shlapentokh, 2007, pp. 216-221).

According to Millerman (2019), Duginist Eurasianism is the most detailed ideology corresponding to the policy unofficially followed by the Russian Federation. Dugin believes that the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War brought Eurasia into an ideological crisis. As has been noted (Backman, 2020, p. 299), Dugin indicated that Eurasia needs an ideology in line with its own particularities. It must be one that counteracts the dominant Atlanticist ideology of economic and political liberalism.

**Duginist Eurasianism**

In the Russian philosopher’s view, Eurasia is the cradle of culture and civilization. Moreover, Eurasia has the characteristics of a continent, but has
a dipolar nature. The two poles of Eurasia are represented by Asia and Europe. Human history has developed as a result of the dialogue and dialectical exchange of the two poles. Being a part of Europe all the way to the Ural Mountains, Russia has an added nuance to European integration. Through its geographical location, but also in a symbolic sense, its contact with the Turkic, Mongol and Caucasian peoples, Russia offers European integration another dimension: the Eurasian dimension. Dugin therefore inserts the imperative of learning in a Eurasian style and the merging of East and West, progress and tradition, sedentary and flexible, and present and future. He argues that dialogue between East and West is essential in the age of globalization. A quite dramatic process is the growing influence of the West on the East. The key identified and proposed is correct mutual understanding and tolerance regardless of the value system assumed by the other. The philosopher proclaims the creation of the International Eurasia Movement for dialogue between cultures and civilizations. The idea of the Movement is opposition to economic, political and value imperialism; in other words, the imposition of one’s own views on the “great” nations of the Eurasian continent (Dugin, 2014, pp. 37-41). The major problem of globalization presented in the volume “Eurasia Mission” is the paradigm of Atlanticism under which it occurs. Nation states are absorbed into a global state. Globalization is one-dimensional and has a single vector that is intended to be universalized: Western civilization, essentially Anglo-Saxon and American. The world today is unipolar. North America is the superpower that is at the strategic center of the world. Dugin goes on to argue that Washington D.C. is running things according to its own imperial interests. The existence of a single authority, of a single pole of power, leads to global dictatorship. The US is taking away freedom. According to the philosopher’s vision, power must and will be destroyed. The unipolarity given by the West is based on modern and post-modern values such as individualism, liberal democracy, capitalism, etc. The West will degrade the planet by its attitude. The West is coming to an end, but with its decline it will drag the world into an abyss. Spiritually, the West is attributed to the kingdom of the Antichrist. Western values are spread either by influences of various kinds or by force (Dugin, 2014, pp. 101-103).

Against the New World Order, Dugin argues that the Eurasian idea coordinates global opposition to globalism. Eurasianism does not advocate the imposition
of values on others; on the contrary, it advocates alter-globalization, a multi-
polar world. Eurasianism also rejects Atlanticist universalism. However, Dugin
wants a pluriverse, with spaces for everyone, including Atlanticists. At the same
time, Eurasia is fighting to defend Africa, the Pacific, South America, and so
on. In accordance with Dugin’s point of view, Eurasianism is not dogmatic.
It is presented as open to new developments in everything from religion
and ethology to science. Although Eurasianist versions may differ among
Germans, Russians and French people, its philosophical framework will
remain invariable. According to what is presented, a definition of Eurasianism
is a “characteristic Weltanschauung”: a political philosophy in which tradition
is found alongside modernity, but also postmodernist elements. Compared
to Atlanticist postmodernism, Eurasianist postmodernism promotes the link
between tradition and modernism as a constructive continuity (Dugin, 2014,
pp. 41-59).

Dugin’s Eurasian plan for the future is to divide the planet into four geographic
zones/meridians/belts. From the Duginist point of view, the four zones will
be vertical, from north to south. Actors in these areas should counterbalance
the influence. These are: the two American continents unified in a common
space, led by the United States, but following the Monroe Doctrine; Euro-
African area, with the European Union at its center; Eurasia, but alongside
three large areas: the Islamic states, China and India; Pacific area, including
Southeast Asia, Indochina, Japan, Australia and New Zealand (Dugin, 2014,
pp. 59-71).

In his view, Dugin presents nation-states as forms of organization that were
specific to the 19th and 20th centuries. Under current trends, states have three
options to choose from. The first option suggested is the liquidation and
absorption of states into a single US-dominated space. The second option for
nation states is to try to resist globalization by fighting for sovereignty. The
last option for states is integration into regional supra-state formations linked
by common characteristics. He states that the third option is the Eurasianist
option. Under this option, states are no longer sovereign, but have autonomy.
Dugin conceptually presents four types of autonomy existing in Eurasia: Of
nations - in the case of peoples who have been included in a historical state
framework with a tradition of self-government; Ethnic - appropriate within
peoples who did not have national characteristics; Theocratic - typical of nations with a high degree of religious consciousness and whose religious institutions are involved in society, e.g., judicial or administrative; Religious - for communities formed within religious parameters where religion is not involved in the running of society (Dugin, 2014, pp. 81-87).

The basic principles proposed by Dugin for Eurasianism are as follows: Differentialism - arguing for the existence of a plurality of ideologies and value systems. As a matter of principle, global domination by a single ideology is rejected, and American liberalism is given as an example; Traditionalism at the expense of abolishing the traditional cultures, teachings and wisdom of some societies; The right of nations against the “zolotoy milliard” and the supremacy of the rich and non-colonial North; Ethnicities as historical subjects and as a primary value against the homogenization of peoples into artificial social constructs; Social justice and solidarity versus human exploitation and humiliation (Dugin, 2014, p. 54).

Liberalism, according to Dugin, is a third totalitarian ideology, next to fascism and communism. From his perspective, the term “totalitarianism” in political science was designed according to the liberal view. The use of the term “totalitarian” comes from liberal positions. Communism/socialism and fascism/national socialism are generally indicated. Pointing to the classical French sociological school (broadly Durkheim’s), Dugin indicates that individual consciousness is formed on the basis of collective consciousness. Individualistic societies are therefore also “totalitarian”. According to the ideas advocated in “Eurasia Mission”, the designation of individuality as the highest value in the state ideologically conditions society. This is a totalitarian form. The notion of the individual is a social concept. A man living outside a society cannot perceive himself as an individual. He is perceived as individual only in a predominantly liberal society. Liberalism insists by various classical totalitarian means on making the individual the highest value of society. Liberal society has become a standardized and stereotyped collective. The more unique an individual tries to be in the liberal paradigm, the more similar they are to other members of society. Thus, for Dugin, liberalism leads to the homogenization of the world. It is against diversity and differentiation (Dugin, 2014, p. 106-110).
Dugin distinguishes three main political theories. The first of these is liberalism. It must be combated. The second is socialism/Marxism. The third political path is fascism and national socialism. From the Duginist point of view, the development of the fourth political theory begins when we merge the theories that tried to combat liberalism. The proposed solution is to eliminate materialism, atheism and modernist features from socialism, eliminate racism and nationalism from fascism and national socialism and combine the rest of the elements of both. Following this step, a preliminary ideological result will be obtained. The intersection of the two leads us to National Bolshevism. To this is added tradition and pre-modern sources of inspiration such as Platonic ideas, the hierarchical society of the Middle Ages, the political systems of earlier civilizations, etc. Therefore, according to Dugin, both anti-communism and anti-fascism, which are liberal tools, must be rejected. The underlying principle of the communist ideology was the class. The underlying principle of the fascist/national socialist one was the nation or race. The underlying principle of religious communities was faith. According to Dugin, the diversity and multiplicity of political perspectives that could arise are not a reason for conflict, but, on the contrary, they should be understood as treasures (Dugin, 2014, pp. 115-128).

But the most important dimension of Duginist Eurasianism addressed in the research is that of the role of ethnicity and Russian distinctiveness. As Shekhovtsov noted (2009, p. 703), Dugin agrees with the New European Right’s vision of an organic nation. He defines the nation as an individual’s immediate identity from which he projects his primary reality. Ethnos is also considered a primary human value and the basis of history (Dugin, 2002, p. 24). But in the 1980s the European New Right took a cultural turn. The followers have moved away from the biological version of ethnicity. Cultural entities have become important and valuable to them. However, Dugin opted for a version of Eurasianism in which culture is only one aspect of an ethnic community and the ethnic element is as a whole superior to the part, the individual (Dugin, 2002, p. 25). Despite these ethnocentric tendencies, Dugin has consistently spoken out against ethnic nationalism and chauvinism (Laruelle, 2008, p. 139).
Ethnic communities are also presented as superior to the state. In the case of a Eurasian federation-type empire, its administrative units would be established in accordance with the regional ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Dugin believes that nationalism without the problem of borders and statehood will strengthen the relationship between nations and give them the freedom to have contacts or to isolate themselves. According to the same vision, no people will feel oppressed by another because ethnic or confessional boundaries will have no political significance. Thus, each nation will live in its own reality, e.g., that of the Russians, of the Tatars, of the Armenians, etc. (Dugin, 2011, p. 173).

Dugin believes that the Russian people are in a difficult situation. Without the Russians, the main unifiers of the Empire, the Eurasian region would be plunged into chaos and conflict. Dugin proposes the implementation of an ethnic and ethno-religious nationalism for the problems of the Russian people. The propaganda of national exclusivism is an educational imperative. These nationalist tendencies must be stimulated to the limit, according to Dugin. The Russian philosopher considers the co-existence with the Russian Orthodox nationalist people an equal one through the existence of a higher imperial instance. In his view, this will stimulate the emergence of a conglomerate of positive nationalist ideologies (Dugin, 2011, p. 173). For Dugin, Eurasian civilization is common to all peoples such as Moldovans, Belarusians, Ossetians, Kazakhs, Yakuts, etc., but the core is always Russian (Millerman, 2019, p. 3). Thus, Russians occupy a special status in this empire of positive nationalism. Unlike the other nations of the empire, the Russians find themselves in a “privileged” situation because they are at the center of the political process. Through the new Empire, the Russians will acquire national unity and a gigantic state. Russians will play the “leading role” in the imperial leadership (Dugin, 2011, 169).

Despite disputing the influence of Dugin’s ideas in the Russian Federation, Millerman (2019, p. 3) provides an account of some of the moments when Putin outlined the plan for the Eurasian Union. Following the analysis, it can be seen that on various occasions Putin has approached the Eurasianist doctrine in Duginist parameters. Thus, the existence of a large Eurasian area integrated
along non-Western lines is required, based on new political and economic values. Its aim would be to limit Western hegemony. From the positions revealed Putin is not calling for the reconstruction of a Soviet Union, but for a strong supranational association to become a gateway between East and West and become one of the poles of the modern world. The Russian leader also argued that Eurasian integration will be achieved on universal principles. Thus, Putin’s views on multipolarity, supranational regional integration and the idea that Russian civilization should not return to the Soviet model, but to an alternative project to Western civilization intertwining economics with politics and values are clear influences of Dugin’s Eurasianist ideology (Millerman, 2019, p. 3).

**Dugin and Transnistria**

According to Dugin, Transnistria is of particular strategic importance for the Russian Federation (2011, p. 17). Transnistria is a tool of influence in the Republic of Moldova. Dugin argues that the region is more important from another point of view: the break-up of Ukraine. The Russian philosopher predicted its break-up as a result of Kiev’s pre-Euromaidan policies. Dugin continued by claiming Transnistria will become an extremely important Russian base in the region. Dugin also mentions Romania in the Transnistrian issue, but also in contexts other than the Romanian one. For example, following a visit to the Transnistrian region, Dugin said that the Transnistrian element plays a key role. He went on to say that both Romania and the Republic of Moldova are wonderful countries. But according to him, Romania became a NATO member because of historical misunderstandings. Therefore, Moldova’s proximity to Romania implies NATO’s proximity to the border of the Russian Federation, and under these conditions, Transnistria becomes a Russian stronghold (Nakanune, 2009).

According to the philosopher’s perspective, Transnistrian society is not Soviet, but on the contrary: as post-Soviet as Russian society. He asserted that Transnistrians are looking for solutions, but not resorting to liberal market reforms. According to Dugin, Transnistrians are turning to the Russian roots,
traditions and brotherhood of peoples characteristic of Russian civilization for many centuries. By its ethnic structure, the Transnistrian region is given as a model for a new post-Soviet society (Nakanune, 2009).

Dugin (2013, p. 26) believes that Transnistria could become the most important center of Eurasian integration. He has words of appreciation for Transnistria on the inter-ethnic issue, part of the Eurasian issue. He describes it as exemplary in many ways.

The geopolitician argued that, as a separatist republic, Transnistria sees its fate and salvation in the Eurasian integration process. Russia is pointed to as the guarantor of Transnistrian social stability and inviolability. Historically, he admits that the Russian troops sent to Transnistria at a critical moment had a strategic purpose. The stated aim was to prevent Moldova’s integration into NATO. Dugin argues that Transnistrians had a somewhat different history than Moldovans in general, they had a more pronounced multi-ethnic structure and a different social profile. However, the credit attributed to the Transnistrians is that they realized that they were part of a continental world: the Eurasian one (Dugin, 2013, p. 21-26). At the same time, it is claimed that Russia will not give it up and will defend the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic by any means (Komsomol’skaya pravda, 2013).

Dugin pointed out that Tiraspol has shown a tendency to integrate into the Eurasian process (Komsomol’skaya pravda, 2013). In the same 2013 interview, Dugin said that he subscribed to the concept of Eurasian integration, and that it is absolutely correct. In his view, Foreign Minister Nina Shtansky and the then president of the self-proclaimed PMR, Yevgeny Shevchyuk, were well adapted to the new situation. An analysis of the work of the unrecognized entity at the time indicates a closeness between the proposed policies and Dugin’s Eurasianist vision. An example and an important document is the Foreign Policy Concept of the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic adopted during the presidency of Yevgeny Shevchyuk and the tenure of Nina Shtanski as Foreign Minister. According to the Concept, the main foreign policy priority is complex Eurasian integration. It is also stipulated as a direction of public information that Transnistria is actively fighting for
a participation in the processes of integration into the Eurasian space as an integrated part of the Russian World (Shevchuk, 2012). This statement can be found in the Image Strategy section of the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic. This statement can be found in the Branding and Image Strategy of the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic. This is part of the information to be promoted along with ideas such as the existence of a new Transnistrian identity based on inter-ethnic harmony (Pricopiiuc, 2021, p. 256).

A report by the Foreign Ministry stated that numerous activities had been undertaken to promote Eurasian integration following the presidential decree. It was also decided to create a Media Center “Eurasian Transnistria” following the establishment of an external strategy and consultation meetings with “specialists”. Opened on 20 April 2013, it aims to communicate and popularize a positive image of the self-proclaimed republic. Other activities have been undertaken in addition to the creation of the media platform. Among them, we find out that Alexandr Dugin participated as a guest in the realization of a television project (Ministerstvo inostrannykh, 2013). According to the presentation of the project (Mediatsentr Yevraziyskoye Pridnestrov’ye, 2013), it was born out of the Transnistrians’ desire to participate in the creation of a new supranational Eurasian association. Collections of scientific or journalistic articles dedicated to Eurasian integration have been published in the media center “Eurasian Transnistria”. Alexandr Dugin is among the authors of the first collection of articles published within the platform (Yevraziyskoye Pridnestrov’ye, 2013). From the editorial description of the article, it can be read that the “well-known” political scientist, philosopher and sociologist presented a special analysis of the Transnistrian Moldovan Republic for the media center. This information is valuable considering the editor of the collection: the Transnistrian Foreign Minister himself. Dugin claims to have “evaluated” the draft of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the self-proclaimed republic. As a matter of course, Dugin expresses his perspective on Transnistria’s place within a Eurasian entity opposed to the monopoly system of “Sea” power. At the same time, he describes the concept which the foreign minister of the self-proclaimed republic presented to him
as being “excellent”. Dugin is speaking on behalf of the entities he leads, the International Eurasian Movement and the Center for Conservative Studies of Moscow State University, regarding the Chisinau-Tiraspol talks. It is thus open to advising dialogue between the two sides in a new, Eurasian style (Dugin, 2013, p. 25).

According to the historical version presented by Dugin, Transnistria was permanently a strip of Eurasian entities starting with the Svyatoslav Empire and continuing with the Mongol Empire, the Russian Empire, and then the USSR. The geopolitician believes that the collapse of the Soviet Union has stimulated some countries to shift from tellurocracy to thalassocracy. The inhabitants of the Transnistrian region have remained faithful to the continental civilization. The Transnistrian conflict is given as proof of their reluctance to follow Romania and Moldova in their chosen process of westernization. So, unlike the Republic of Moldova and Romania, Transnistria opted to stay in Eurasia. Russia’s military support for the separatist Transnistrians is strictly attributed to Russia’s desire to limit NATO’s expansion. The author argues that Russia was forced to take this measure, and its character was not anti-Moldovan, but against Atlantic liberalism. However, the Transnistrians are said to have fought for civilizational unity even when Yeltsin almost lost it. Dugin also believes that the Transnistrians fought not out of inertia, but to defend the historical truth. Thus, Dugin believes, they are in a privileged position in the Eurasian construct (Dugin, 2013, p. 21-24).

Dugin’s solution for prosperity for the people of Transnistria is Eurasian integration. This is presented as the only way without impasse. An interesting element that the philosopher claims is the end of the era of national affirmation of Transnistrian identity. He proclaims the pursuit of a single positive construction: Eurasianism (Dugin, 2013, p. 25-26).

In 2016, Alexandr Dugin teleconferenced at a Tiraspol State University webinar. His lecture was attended by students, teachers and members of the Foreign Ministry of the self-proclaimed republic. The lecture, on US ideology and its global domination, revealed Dugin’s general ideas. However, there is some important information on Transnistria. The political scientist believes
that the Transnistrian region is an obstacle to US expansion more because of ideology than strategic position. It is claimed that Westerners cannot perceive the Transnistrian Moldovan Republic as it does not appear on the coordinate system of liberalism. He also argued that the intellectual centers in Russia and Transnistria should work together for the new ideology that is emerging in the Eurasian space (Novosti Pridnestrov’ya, 2016).

Perpetuations of Duginist Eurasianism to Tiraspol

In the articles of the Media Centre “Transnistria Eurasia” (Yevraziyskoye Pridnestrov’ye, 2013, 2016), one can notice various Eurasianist ideas specific to Alexandr Dugin. Such examples will be listed in the following paragraphs. Stepan Beryl (2013, p. 15-18), rector of Taras Shevchenko State University of Tiraspol and president of the Transnistrian branch of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, advocated a multidimensional Eurasian integration. He stressed the importance of the humanitarian component in addition to the economic dimension of Eurasian integration, but also mentioned the importance of addressing the scientific, educational, cultural and historical dimensions. He argued that Eurasian integration must transcend governments and management systems, and encompass societies, peoples or historical entities to create an integral model. In his understanding, Russian culture has become supranational and supra-ethnic. It should play a greater role in integration processes. Russian culture was presented as a key that should be a model of Eurasian integration. Russia is presented as the most important spiritual link of the Eurasian world and the Russian language as the language of unification. However, other languages, peoples and cultures are also important according to Beryl.

Similar ideas related to the need for multidimensionality of the new Eurasian Union can also be identified in Il’ya Galinskiy’s (2013, pp. 27-33) discourse. He is introduced as the Dean of the Faculty of History of the same Taras Shevchenko State University and Director of the Centre for Social and Political Studies “Perspective”. Speaking at an international conference, he argued for the need to move beyond the single strategic economic space dimension
of Eurasian integration. The option perpetuated by him was the dimension of the constitution of a common supranational political space. However, one problem highlighted was the ideological and spiritual differentiation in Eurasia. He argued that since the project is open to different states it is necessary to shape a Eurasian ideology.

Yakov Chaikin (2013, p. 117-122), a referent of the Public Communication Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic also provides elements that are entirely in line with Dugin’s specific Eurasianist ideas. He argued that as Eurasianist ideology is on the rise there is a counter-propaganda criticizing “Russian imperial ambition”. According to his perspective, the very enemies of a multipolar world, the proponents of monopolistic globalization, and authoritarian sovereign leaders are the issuers of negative propaganda. Russia has been portrayed as the opposite of the negative propaganda being spread. It is presented as having mutually beneficial relations with the Eurasian states. The article specifies the advantage of the Eurasian Union which makes the movement of people and goods in the Eurasian area free. This is presented as positive, especially given the fact that this is achieved without recourse to the construction of the Soviet Union. In what regards the perspectives discussed above, Yakov proposes transcending the economic dimension and focusing on the civilizational aspect in the context of globalization and the general processes related to it. The propaganda of monopolistic globalization is attributed to Western civilization. However, according to the information provided, this is in conflict with the desire of societies to preserve their historical, regional, ethnic and cultural identity. It is argued that this has been found especially in highly religious countries. The solution offered to the problem raised indicates glocalization according to local specificity. It is argued that Eurasia implies globalization on its own local terms. It is also presented as a fact that the states of Eurasia live in a common destiny and tend to eliminate artificial borders. Eurasian integration is presented as attractive beyond the economic and political dimension, in terms of ethno-civilizational unity. Eurasian integration is presented as attractive in terms of ethno-civilizational unity, which is beyond the economic and political dimension.
Among the articles in the collection there is an article by the political scientist Vladimir Bukarskiy (2013, p. 84-88). Although he was born on the right bank of the Dniester, he studied political science at the Taras Shevchenko State University of Tiraspol and is a member of the Izborsk Club. The information he propagated follows an analysis of Putin’s article on the integration project for Eurasia. Bukarskiy criticized the rejection of geopolitics by Russian society as a whole, but also the ignoring, ridiculing or rejecting of alternative ideologies proposed until then. He proposed a return to Russian geopolitics and quoted Dugin as saying that the destiny of states is strictly linked to the attitude towards geopoliticians. Also, according to Dugin, “the founder of the modern school of geopolitics”, he presented that the countries that followed and appreciated their own geopolitics achieved amazing results, even world domination; conversely, the disobedience of geopoliticians has led to ruin. The example is not really a replication of Dugin’s specific Eurasianist ideas, but rather an explicit promotion of him.

In addition to Tiraspol elites, there are also Russian and Ukrainian authors whose perspective has been integrated in the collection of articles. Among the ideas propagated by them in the Transnistrian area there are elements in line with the Eurasianist vision of Duginism. An example of this is Semion Uralov (2013, p. 129-133), editor-in-chief of the project “Odnako. Yevraziya”. He has also worked in the Transnistrian region. Following Putin’s statement on the need to create Eurasia, he specifies the importance of forming the Union. It has been argued that the need for the existence of the supranational entity arose not from Soviet nostalgia or imperial ambitions, but from the survival of the Eurasian states in the face of the crisis caused by the new world order. States are presented with two versions of the future: either to be divided piece by piece by the larger political player, or to form large supranational entities with other states to create their own economies. Sovereign Eurasian states have been portrayed as degrading and national ideas as a dead end. As there are different ethnicities mixed in some Eurasian states, it has been argued that the lack of internal borders should be ensured. These ideas were thought up and/or compiled by Alexandr Dugin earlier. Taken together, these ideas are part of Dugin’s vision of Eurasianism.
Conclusions

The present research focused on Eurasianism according to Dugin’s vision. His vision can be summed up by ideas such as the desire for multipolar globalization as opposed to Western hegemony; supranational regional integration; the creation of a supranational union without internal borders in the Eurasian space; in the Eurasian union states should give up sovereignty; the Eurasian union must be shaped by interweaving the economy with the politics and values common to the space, and not according to the Soviet model; the Russian ethnic element would be the engine of the Eurasian project, but the other ethnicities would be autonomous and other principles that were listed in detail in the first part of the paper.

These principles have been probed in the discourse of some elites in the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic. In addition to the general perspective on Eurasianism, Dugin’s view on the role of the Transnistrian region in the Eurasian project and ideology was explored. Moreover, some of Dugin’s connections to the Transnistrian region were both captured and investigated. The results of the research confirm the existence of influence and reproduction of Duginist-type Eurasianism ideas among elites of the self-proclaimed Transnistrian Moldovan Republic in the second decade of the 2000s. The conclusion of the research is that the perspective of Duginist Eurasianism is worth to be considered among the ideas circulating in the Transnistrian space. Although the research does not capture the level of diffusion of these ideas, they are relevant in the region especially for the social stratum in which they can be found, the elite. Dugin’s claim that Transnistria is an “optimal model” for organizing a post-Soviet Russian society is also noteworthy (Nakanune, 2009).
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