

Annual Program of the Journal "Novoe Proshloe / The New Past" 2023

"Metamorphoses" (1/2023)

Editors: Evgeny F. Krinko, Amiran T. Urushadze

The problem of the integration of the North Caucasus is traditionally perceived from the perspective of it being a part of the Russian Empire, from the perspective of the spread of imperial management technologies, norms of social control and cultural standards. This side of the integration process is well represented both in Russian and foreign historiography. However, the internal unification of the territory of the North Caucasus is no less significant. Internal integration manifested itself in the elimination of ethno-territorial isolation, the formation of new administrative borders and practices, the emergence of regional socio-economic and cultural centers, new logistics ties, transport hubs, and a regional market for goods and services. The study of the North Caucasus integration will make it possible to more accurately assess the scale of the transformation of the region during the Imperial and Soviet periods. Within this framework, the search for an optimal model of administrative management and economic zoning of the region was carried out, as well as the development of sub-regional economic specialization. These numerous changes influenced not only the level of political and socio-economic institutions but also directly the structures of everyday life, as well as the images of cultural memory. Therefore, Ovid's "Metamorphoses" was chosen as a metaphor for various transformations in a certain sequence. We look forward to articles that would present Imperial and Soviet integration practices in a comparative manner, which will allow us to assess the effectiveness of various regional transformation strategies.

"For Whom the Bell Tolls" (2/2023)

Editors: Bastiaan Willems, Victor Yu. Apryshchenko

For a long time, the concept of ideology has been one of the central theoretical categories of humanitarian knowledge. The concept of ideology was criticized from different angles. Some researchers draw attention to the weakness of its theoretical foundations, others insist on numerous internal contradictions, while others argue that criticism of ideology is too moralized or politicized to be used as a tool in the social sciences. Most use the concept of ideology as a metaphor when describing social phenomena of the past and the present, i.e. we use the combination of "bourgeois ideology" to explain the internal mechanisms of bourgeois thought, and "consumption ideology" as a way to describe modern commercial culture.

Any ideology, like the metaphorical bell from the title of Hemingway's novel, mobilizes potential supporters under its banner and claims to represent a consolidated idea that reflects the interests of the masses. At the same time, any ideological system is full of internal contradictions. During the Cold War, the very texts of Hemingway, especially after his suicide in 1961, were subjected to analysis from the ideological point of view. The moral, religious, political aspects of his works seemed (and, perhaps, turned out to be)

more important than the literary merits. It is no coincidence that the first researchers of Hemingway's work, fierce American patriots, contributed to the nationwide anti-communist campaign in the 1950s and the formation of the ideological beliefs during the Cold War. As a result, the artistic polysemy of Hemingway's texts gave way to ideological stability and unambiguity, and the author, who preferred to live abroad, expressed doubts about the values of the American way of life, and was skeptical about the world around him, came to be regarded as a spokesman of American ethics. This fact probably reflects the internal logic of the development of any ideology: the desire for homogenization of thought and the need for mass mobilization at the expense of simplifying the surrounding reality.

The main question this issue analyzes is how ideology functions; how it mobilizes supporters, and what motivates people to adhere to different ideological attitudes. Instead of considering the normative aspect and classifying ideologies, this issue asks how internal contradictions function within the framework of ideologies themselves, how in different historical eras they are formulated, represented, overcome at different levels: personal and group levels, ideological and institutional, national and transnational.

The questions planned for discussion are as follows:

1. **(Un)freedom in ideologies.** What are the factors of transformation and evolution of ideological systems? What are the mechanisms for the dissemination of ideas, and what role does coercion play in this process? Who are the hostages of ideologies – the creators themselves, or those who share these ideas? How is a complex reality dissected in ideological systems and reduced to a set of clichés?
2. **Mass and elite aspects in ideology.** Robert Jordan, the protagonist of Hemingway's *For whom the bell tolls*, asks us if "there [was] ever a people whose leaders were as truly their enemies as this one?" What are the mechanisms of assimilation of elite ideas into mass discourse? What is the degree of idealism in ideologies? How do the plans and ideas of intellectuals relate to their implementations? What remains in the mass consciousness of intellectual constructs?
3. **National and transnational aspects in ideology.** Ideologies appear as a result of the need for national mobilization, acquiring one of its features – mass character. But how does the national become transnational? What national ideological materials are used to create transnational ideological traditions?
4. **The role of violence in the assertion of ideologies.** "The Fair of Liberty and from this day, when these are extinguished, the town and the land are ours". The heroes of the novel raise question of dehumanization of the ideological enemies and legitimization of the sacrifice. What determines the degree of acceptability of violence for different ideological systems? Is the revolution not only the "midwife of history" but also of ideology? And more broadly, what kind of conflicts and traumas are capable of generating and adapting ideologies?
5. **Heroes and victims of ideologies / heroes and victims in ideologies.** What is the role of ideological symbols? How are they developed? What is their life cycle? How do ideas and symbols correlate? Is there a gradual replacement of ideas with their symbols? And, finally, who are the victims of ideologies?

"Byzantism and Russia" (3/2023)

Editor: Andrey V. Korenevskiy

The year 2023 is marked by two anniversaries that are extremely significant for Russian culture and social thought. 170 years have passed since the birth of Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov, one of the greatest Russian philosophers and predecessor of the Silver Age. Half a millennium has passed since the moment when Philotheus of Pskov coined the formula that is considered the calling card of the Russian Middle Ages: "two Romes have fallen, the third stands, and there will be no fourth". The intersection of the symbolic vectors embodied in these two iconic figures of the Russian history of ideas is the text, the title of which has been chosen as the topic of this issue. The essay "Byzantism and Russia" was published by Vladimir Solovyov four years before his death, in 1896, and can be attributed to the final texts of the philosopher, because it expresses his most intimate thoughts about the fate of Russia, its place in history and divine plan for humanity.

This text can be viewed both as a reflection of the ideological and political agenda of the late 19th century, and as a landmark in the centuries-old dispute over the historical path of Russia, where the last point has not yet been put. At the same time, this work says a lot about the author himself, whose insight made it possible to see in the idea of "Byzantine heritage" something that neither the accusers of "La misérable Byzance", nor its apologists from the conservators, nor politicians and publicists who dreamed of the conquest of Constantinople. Having chosen the idea of the Third Rome as the focal point of the analysis, V.S. Soloviev came closest to understanding the meaning that Filofey Pskovsky put into it. The core of this idea is not absolute autocracy, and certainly not the dream of the throne of Constantinople, but a warning about the threat of a repetition of the fate of the two fallen Christian kingdoms that could not bear the spiritual burden and moral responsibility.

On this anniversary we propose to reflect on the eternal questions, the comprehension of which are prompted by the insights and warnings of two Russian prophets: the "Byzantine vector" of Russian history and its interpretation in Russian historiosophy and social thought; the place and significance of the heritage of the Byzantium in the culture, ideology, political and legal traditions of Russia; the inspiring motives and dangerous temptations of doctrines and concepts, derived from the theory "Moscow, the Third Rome"; the extent to which these ideas can be relevant today, and to what extent we remain hostage to their misinterpretations.