

П. Л. Карабущенко [P. L. Karabushenko]

УДК 323.22/28

ГЕОПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ КОСМОЛОГИЯ: «СЛОНЫ ЕВРАЗИИ»**GEOPOLITICAL COSMOLOGY: "ELEPHANTS OF EURASIA"**

Астраханский государственный университет, г. Астрахань, Россия
 Astrakhan State University, Astrakhan, Russia,
 e-mail: Pavel_karabushenko@mail.ru

Аннотация. В название настоящей работы выведен термин «геополитическая космология» под которым мы подразумеваем способность геополитиков конструировать абстрактные схемы, наглядно объясняющие суть разработанной ими геополитической стратегии. Это своего рода проверка на логическую прочность конкретных геополитических доктрин. Если они выдерживают эту проверку, у них есть будущее. В противном случае – перед нами мертворожденная доктрина. Анализ большинства подобного рода стратегий указывает на то, что они чаще всего имели целью запугать противника своей смелостью и оригинальностью, и кроме психологического воздействия не имели никакой практической ценности.

Рассматриваемая в настоящей работе проблема касается ныне широко обсуждаемой темы смены геополитических полюсов в системе мирового лидерства. Речь идет о новой геополитической конфигурации Евразии, где выстраиваются два треугольника – Западный (Германия, Франция, Великобритания) и Восточный (Иран, Индия, Китай). Оба они находятся на разных полюсах российской границы и оказывают на нее определенное влияние. В свою очередь и сама Россия становится главным геополитическим участником этих международных отношений, на которые оказывает конкретное влияние, реализуя свои национальные интересы. Именно России мы отводим объединительную роль, налаживание равновесного партнерского диалога между Востоком и Западом, которые должны встретиться согласно сформулированной ею международной повестке и предложенной картине мира. Именно рассмотрению ряда этих проблем и вопросов и посвящена настоящая работа.

Ключевые слова: Евразия, международные отношения, геополитика, лидер и аутсайдер, гегемония, многополярность, конфликт интересов, война и мир, интеграция, элиты и лидеры, карнавальная политическая культура.

Abstract. The title of this work is derived from the term "geopolitical cosmology" by which we mean the ability of geopolitics to design abstract schemes that clearly explain the essence of their developed geopolitical strategy. This is a kind of test of the logical strength of specific geopolitical doctrines. If they pass this test, they have a future. Otherwise, we are faced with a stillborn doctrine. Analysis of most of these strategies indicates that they were most often intended to intimidate the enemy with their boldness and originality, and other than psychological impact had no practical value.

The problem considered in this paper concerns the now widely discussed topic of changing geopolitical poles in the system of world leadership. We are talking about a new geopolitical configuration of Eurasia, where two triangles are built – the Western one (Germany, France, Great Britain) and the Eastern one (Iran, India, China). Both of them are located at different poles of the Russian border and have a certain influence on it. In turn, Russia itself becomes the main geopolitical participant in these international relations, which it exerts a specific influence on, realizing its national interests. It is Russia, in our opinion, that plays a unifying role, ensures the establishment of an equilibrium partner dialogue between East and West, which should meet in accordance with the international agenda formulated by Russia and the proposed picture of the world.

Key word: Eurasia, international relations, geopolitics, leader and outsider, hegemony, multipolarity, conflict of interests, war and peace, integration, elites and leaders, carnival political culture.

Introduction. The three most ancient Eurasian cultures and civilizations – Chinese, Indian and Persian (Iranian) – represent in our time very serious political systems that play a leading role in the field of geopolitical and economic relations. And in our time, these three states are the pillars of the Eurasian processes, the stability and prosperity of which will mean the stability and prosperity of the entire Eurasian space as a whole. This is the arc of Eurasian civilizations, a belt of cultural stability.

In recent political history, we see how these three countries (Iran, India and China) were in the 20th century in the humiliating position of colonies and third-rate countries. At the beginning of the 21st century, we are actually witnessing the revival of these states in the status of regional and then world leaders. The spirit of empires is reawakening in them. The fire of the passionary movement starts to ignite in them again. And this growth of them is already beginning to seriously disturb the former world hegemony, who feel that their power is beginning to gradually slip out of their hands.

Against the backdrop of the dying West, the Asian giants look especially menacing to it. These three countries are potential gravediggers for US-European geocentrism. We called them the "Elephants of Eurasia" because we believe that it is on them that the world order of this region is mainly kept. In the past, all three countries have an imperial history of their states. These are the powers with the potential of international leadership inherent in them. And they themselves feel better and understand adequately when they are in a state of empire. The fourth such power (with imperial features) is Russia. But we'll talk about it next time ...

Geopolitical cosmology. Geographically and politically, Eurasia covers the area from Lisbon to Vladivostok, but splits into two unequal zones – Europe (West) and Asia (East). In the past, this inequality was also expressed in the political superiority of the West and the general lagging behind of the East. But at the present time the situation has not only leveled off, there has been a clear lag in the West and the rapid growth of the East. At the beginning of the 21st century, a new geometry of the world's geopolitical structure appears. The world is rapidly rebuilding its geopolitical poles, changing the "magnetic field" of international relations. The monopolar world is being replaced by multipolarity. The United States is losing its monopoly on decision-making in international relations and is increasingly beginning to reckon and put up with the dissent of other strong geopolitical players.

Geopolitics always constructs its own international Universe, the structure of which is in a state of constant restructuring and clarification of the leader's status and the position of an outsider. At present, the Western (European) part of Eurasia is already relegated to the category of periphery, and its Asian part is taking the first place. For a more adequate understanding of the essence of this changing world structure, we will resort to the services of the so-called. geopolitical cosmology and see what these three powers are.

Geopolitical cosmology – elevation to the rank of higher schemes and formulas of abstraction, allowing to comprehend complexity in its simplified form. As an example, we can give the scheme of perception of the assessment of the central geopolitical region – the continent of Eurasia.

Eurasia, from the point of view of geopolitical cosmology, is a world "turtle" on which there are three elephants (Iran, India and China), which in turn hold the "roof of the world" – Russia. The simplicity of this formula ("Turtle Scheme") contains our concrete understanding of the essence of the geopolitical space of Eurasia, in which there is no place for third countries – third world countries (primarily the United States), which in the past carried colonial oppression and a military threat to this region.¹

The "Eurasian elephants" are three empires in the past and potentially in the future, which are reviving in the present time in their former great-power status. The Turtle diagram illustrates Eurasian unity, which is what the United States and its allies fear most, as it threatens their global hegemony.

What other images arise when analyzing this geopolitical triad? This is an image of the four primary elements (elements) of nature: Iran is "fire", India is "water", China is "earth" (we will keep silent about the fourth element for now, although this fourth element ["air"] is Russia). These elements are the spiritual symbols of these countries, what they are associated with in the eyes of the world community. In the scheme of the four elements, the idea of Eurasian unity and the Eurasian world order is again expressed.

From the point of view of the fabulous Russian worldview, Iran, India and China are semi-legendary distant kingdoms, full of wonders and other eastern riches (tea, silk, spices, precious metals, etc.). In Russian epics and fairy tales, the heroes visited these countries and their very journey brought them fame and fortune.

China, India and Iran constitute the cultural security belt of Eurasia. If Eurasia is associated with anyone in the first place, it is with these three countries and Russia. Three elephants of Eurasia – "green elephant" (Iran), "white elephant" (India) and "red elephant" (China) – a symbol of stability and power of the continental powers and the main challenge and threat to the sea power of the Anglo-Saxons and their satellites.

What unites them is their specific attitude to the colonial past of the British Empire. All of them at one time fully drank the cup of London's colonial hegemony and are unlikely to want to have a trusting relationship with the Anglo-Saxons.

If you look at these three elephants, then with the naked eye we will notice that each of them is surrounded by "smaller" countries that are in the zone of attraction of their geopolitical gravitational fields: Iran has always influenced the countries of the Middle East and the Arab world, India has influenced countries Hindustan, China – to the countries of the Indo-Chinese region. And each has its own management traditions.

Culturally, these countries are the custodians of the invaluable world spiritual heritage, which constitutes the true universal human wealth. History is the main asset of these states, which have enriched world science, culture, and religion. In the past, scientists from these countries have made discoveries that continue to be used by all of humanity. In the ranking of historical scientific achievements, they occupy all the first places.

One more concept that is important for our common understanding should be pointed out, which is conventionally fashionable to call "geopolitical strings". The concept of geopolitical strings points to the existing schemes of linear relations between states, which unite them with a certain commonality of ideas, values and goals, making them situational allies and competitors of others, united in the same "structure-strings". For example, we have the right to speak about the "string" of "NATO", which unites 30 countries into a military-political bloc, or the "string" of BRICS, or the "string" of MERCOSUR. The quality of each string is determined by the weight and quality of those players who line up and take part in it. The more such strings a state has, the more complex its "geopolitical tools" and "geopolitical concert" turn out to be. But the most important thing is that it should not be a cacophony, but a symphony. "Strings" – lines of demarcation of interests and the expression of certain common goals. "Strings" cut through geopolitical space both linearly and along a broken curve. They unite, they force, they define.

¹ Author's note. This formula has some universality, since it can be applied to the European part of Eurasia: Western Europe is a world "turtle" on which there are three elephants (Germany, France and Great Britain), which in turn hold the "roof of the world" - the United States. The last part of the "formula" indicates who claims to be existential leadership in the world and who poses a real threat to the world hegemony of the other. He is also the "conductor" of this scheme, since he determines the strategy and tactics of their joint behavior.

The first group of "Eurasian elephants" (Iran, India, China) do not yet have a common geopolitical string, but as soon as it takes shape, there will be no need for many geopolitical mediators and advisers. The second group of "Eurasian elephants" (Germany, France, Great Britain) have a disorganized sound and their trio has gone to pieces, after their conductor (USA) actually refused to lead them.

About the change of geopolitical "magnetic poles". It is known that all modern Western geopolitical strategies (Z. Brzezinski, S. Huntington, G. Kissinger, F. Fukuyama) [2, 5, 10-11] are aimed at explaining why the United States is the main global hegemon. Unlike Anglo-Saxon and German geopolitical thought, the Russian geopolitical school (A.E. Vandam, A.S. Panarin, E.M. Primakov) [See: 3, 8-9] never justified and encouraged colonial policy, but on the contrary, she has always acted with its sharp criticism.

Geopolitical magnetic poles indicate which gravitational forces of attraction or rejection are acting in the world community, and how they, due to these indicated forces, are distributed among leaders and outsiders. The present epoch is characterized by the painful process for the collective West of breaking down the monopolar and building a multipolar world order. This is a very painful process. Over the past century, the West has got used to sewing under the "American umbrella" and has forgotten how to think independently and make responsible decisions. This cannot be abandoned immediately, because there is a "terrible Russia", the demonization of which has reached its apogee at present.

The fact that the collective West is now losing its entire influence and influence can already be seen with the naked eye. The crisis is seen in the negative selection of the elites. On the political Olympus of the West, open dullness has broken through and has taken hold. The personnel crisis is observed in almost all countries of the Western alliance. Instead of real problems, the elites begin to deal with themselves invented problems that lead their public to an incomprehensible direction. The obvious carnivalization of political culture is evident.²

The political class of the West has gathered a critical mass of political "clowns" and tricksters, immersed in games with simorons, which completely supplants real politics. Such politicians begin to believe in miracles more than in reality itself. Their practices are aimed at distorting reality so that it is convenient and manageable for them. In fact, they create a parallel reality, a kind of looking glass, in which they can again be in leadership positions.

Diagnostics of modern political reality indicates that elements of carnival political culture are increasingly being introduced into the geopolitics carried out by Western world leaders – Western "clowns" are turning international relations into a theater of absurdity. Under far-fetched pretexts, they impose sanctions, arrange provocations, blaming their political opponents for, sowing controlled chaos everywhere and persistently promoting the doctrine of a conflict of civilizations. The political carnival organized by them begins to suck in all the more minor participants in international relations. But the main goal of these provocateurs is to draw the main competitors into this carnival they manage, in order to ruin them, weaken them, and incline them before their imperial will.

At the same time, the Western political elites do not care what will happen to this region and to these countries and peoples. The main thing for them is to organize a new robbery of Eurasia under a plausible pretext (there is no one to rob in Africa, Latin America has already been robbed by them). The policy of robbing the world comes to a second circle. The political history of the West indicates that it can prosper only by plundering colonies. He is sorely lacking his own resources. This explains the collective Russophobia of the West towards Russia.

Threats and challenges: real and imaginary. In Eurasia, too often in the past, great wars have flared up for the peoples of this region today to wish for a repeat of these tragic events. The peoples and states of Eurasia must learn to speak not in the language of war, but in the language of culture and science. Unfortunately, military tensions are currently growing around all the key countries of Eurasia. Conflicts are kindled and supported from outside, by those world players who are trying to prevent their unification and prosperity, which would mean the end of their monopoly in the world.

Eurasia is too vast to be governed from one single center. Eurasia is a true symbol of pluralism and tolerance. She doesn't need to be taught these categories. The teachers only spoiled her, for they brought in and tried to introduce their foreign elements.

The most serious threat that the countries of Eurasia have faced over the past two centuries has been imperial Anglo-Saxon expansion. And at the beginning of this skirmish, they succumbed to the technological superiority of the overseas aliens. But having lost the first battle, they nevertheless won the civilization war and proved to the whole world their political vitality and historical viability.

Robbing others is the norm for the Anglo-Saxons. Looting is a historical habit of this nation. The United States is a predator with only its profit figures in its head and no moral and intellectual regrets. "Nothing personal just business"! Such a business also erases the identity of those who put the question in this way. Therefore, the political elites of the Anglo-Saxon world are political groups of swindlers with erased identities. Their personalities begin to wear off and overwrite as they lie. By now, the United States and Great Britain have finally become empires of lies. Lies (fakes) have become the meaning and norm of their political routine.

Western analysts acknowledge that the United States always has its own national interests in mind when it comes to security. [13, p.16] But peace and order will be established in this region only when the Anglo-Saxons, repre-

² We know about the carnival culture itself thanks to the works of Russian scientists (M.M. Bakhtin, A.F. Losev, D.S. Likhachev), [1; 6-7] who managed to reveal the cultural code of this phenomenon. Political carnival is an action divorced from reality, aimed at asserting one's position in an obviously losing situation; it is an attempt to construct such an unnatural situation that would create a more preferable position for its authors, giving them a preponderance of forces in their favor.

sented by the USA and Great Britain, leave it. Consolidation ideas should prevail over confrontational ideas. Namely, the Anglo-Saxons have historically been the bearers of the idea of confrontation – they have long lived and thrived in a war of all against all. It has long been noticed by analysts that the West deliberately creates only such political world structures in which it will obviously play the first role, eliminating competitors on the distant approaches to leadership. [See: 12, p. 219] Therefore, there is no need to rely on fair rules of the game from the West (especially the Anglo-Saxons).

Geopolitical competition is always on a key issue – determining who is the leader and who is the outsider. The collective West for a long time perceived and evaluated the East as an outsider and it is now especially difficult for it to come to terms with the fact that it is losing leadership qualities and leadership status and is gradually turning into a banal outsider. The destruction of the hegemony of the West was a consequence of its aggressive foreign policy, associated with the extremely harsh (brutal) exploitation of the colonies in the previous time. The echoes of this policy are still visible. The collective West, represented by its leaders, is used to living by robbing its colonies and now it still cannot get used to and learn to live without this criminal "doping". The fact that colonialism is a crime is beginning to reach the leaders of Western countries only now.

At a time when the entire political collective West is infected by the virus of carnival political culture, in the political everyday life of the three leading powers of Eurasia + Russia, this carnival is either completely absent, or has a minimal spread. These countries have a certain cultural immunity against this virus, and all attempts by the United States and its satellites to drag them into this nasty tradition have not yet been crowned with success.

Let us especially note the existing mental differences between the countries of the Western and Eastern Triangles. These differences relate to the images of their perception and evaluation. "Asia" for the West is everything that it has not occupied. In this regard, Japan and South Korea are the West, because is under US occupation. For the same reason, Russia has always been, is and will be "Asia" for the West, since it has never allowed itself to be enslaved, but has always given an adequate rebuff to Western aggressors. This is the insistence of the West in Russophobia, which should long ago be equated with racism and anti-Semitism. And no one knows what needs to happen in the world for it to be done.

Eurasian three +. The geopolitical structure we are describing (the Eurasian three will effectively solve its problems if another participant, another Eurasian country, Russia, takes part in their projects. Russia's presence in this scheme is an undoubted plus, a stabilizing factor. It is precisely to remove this plus that the foreign policy of the United States is directed, striving to be the only leading player in this region.

Russia occupies an advantageous geopolitical position, since all the leading Eurasian countries are actually located along its borders from East to West: Japan, China, India, Iran, Germany, France, Great Britain ... Ideally, these countries are not restrictive forces that hinder Russia in its progressive development, but a kind of "necklace" of the most qualitatively developed countries, the achievements of which can and should be fed by Russia. Therefore, it is in the interests of Russia itself not to conflict with these countries, but to build good-neighborly relations that guarantee its peace and prosperity. Unfortunately, Moscow has not yet learned how to use this advantageous geopolitical position and extract full profit from it. It is precisely those who themselves who benefit from this "*belt of the Eurasian necklace*" are hindering it.

It should be noted that, unlike the Anglo-Saxons, the geopolitical thought of Russia has never considered Eurasia as its colonial possessions [4] and has never engaged in the use of Western technologies of "controlled chaos". [14] Eurasia was a goal for Russia, but not as a means. And this is the main value of Russia – its civilizational "kinship" with the ancient civilizations of Eurasia. The presence of the United States in this region only multiplies the lie and the resulting political and economic risks. The United States has shown itself to be the most deceitful country.³

The history of the United States itself is the history of crooked mirrors, where everything is distorted beyond recognition. Official Washington's policy is built on lies. Without lies, the United States simply does not have politics. To customize reality for yourself means distorting objective reality, giving it a carnival character. Carnival politicians have clip thinking and an advertising worldview, when the wishful is passed off as reality. The United States wants to dominate all of Eurasia from Lisbon to Vladivostok. But they simply do not have enough resources to fulfill these desires. Lies are the last resource at their disposal, which they actively and very skillfully use. The US lies in the fact that they call good evil and present their evil as good. US President R. Reagan called the USSR an "evil empire." Perhaps the Soviet Union was not a saint. In global politics, the concepts of good and evil are becoming abstract. The problem of good and evil is exacerbated as one approaches a specific person. But as we move away from it into the sphere of politics and especially international relations, these basic categories are blurred and become interchangeable. As recent political history testifies, ironically, it was the United States that, since 1991, became an empire of evil and lies.

Russia is a civilization of kindness.

If we compare the activities of the Western intelligence services with the Russian ones, the latter will turn out to be just humanitarian organizations ...

* * *

³ The analysis of political liberalism in the United States demonstrates a cognitive dissonance: for a long time the United States asserted itself as a model for the realization of human rights, but in 2020 it unexpectedly began to fight against racism, which has been actively flourishing there all this time. It turned out that human rights in the United States were not for everyone, but only for the elite.

The geopolitical schemes we have considered make it possible to understand most clearly what location today's Russia is and what challenges and threats these "Eurasian triangles" pose for it.

Currently, the Eurasian elephants do not have a triple political union. Their relations are being built along the lines of separate bilateral agreements. The contradictions between India and China hinder their geopolitical rapprochement. At present, Iran cannot become their connecting link. Therefore, Russia is the main Eurasian peacekeeper. It is Moscow that could and should act as the very integrating force that would tie Tehran-Delhi-Beijing together.

And then the scheme «Turtles» immediately comes to mind...

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Бахтин М.М. Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура средневековья и Ренессанса. М.: «Художественная литература», 1990. 543с.
2. Бжезинский З. Великая шахматная доска (Господство Америки и его геостратегические императивы). /Перевод О. Ю. Уральской. М.: Междунар. отношения, 1998. 254с. = Brzezinski Zbigniew Kazimierz. The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives. New York: Basic books, October 1997.
3. Вандам (Едрихин) А. Е. Геополитика и геостратегия / Сост., вступ. ст. и коммент. И. Образцова; заключ. ст. И. Даниленко. Жуковский; М.: Кучково поле, 2002. 272 с. (Серия "Геополитический ракурс")
4. Дугин А.Г. Евразийский реванш России. М.: Алгоритм, 2014. 256с.
5. Киссинджер Г. Нужна ли Америке внешняя политика?. М.: Ладомир, 2002. 352с.
6. Лихачев Д. С., Панченко А. М. «Смеховой мир» Древней Руси. М.: «Наука», 1984. 295с.
7. Лосев А. Ф. Эстетика Возрождения. М.: «Мысль», 1978. 624с.
8. Панарин А. С. Православная цивилизация / Сост., предисл. В. Н. Расторгуев / Отв. ред. О. А. Платонов. М.: Институт русской цивилизации, 2014. 1248с.
9. Примаков Е.М. Собрание сочинений в 10 тт. М.: Издательство ТПП РФ: «Российская газета», 2016.: Т.1. 656с.; Т.2. 608с.; Т.3.592с.; Т.4. 544с.; Т.5. 608с.; Т.7. 416с.; Т.8. 320с.; Т.9. 592с.; Т.10. 336с.
10. Фукуяма Ф. Конец истории и последний человек. М.: АСТ, 2004. - 592 с.
11. Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. М.: АСТ, 2005. 603с. = Samuel P. Huntington. The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order. Simon&Schuster, 1996. 359p.
12. Gaddis J.L. The Cold War: A New History. New York, 2005. 366p.
13. Hoagland R.E. The greater Caspian region: competition and cooperation // Caspian Magazine affairs, January-February 2019. P.10-22.
14. Steven R. Mann. The Reaction to Chaos // Complexity, Global Politics, and National Security. Edited by David S. Alberts and Thomas J. Czerwinski. National Defense University Washington, D.C. 1998. P.135-149.

REFERENCES

1. Bahtin M.M. Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaya kul'tura srednevekov'ya i Renessansa. M.: «Hudozhestvennaya literatura», 1990. 543s.
2. Bzhezinskij Z. Velikaya shahmatnaya doska (Gospodstvo Ameriki i ego geostrategicheskie imperativy). /Perevod O. Yu. Ural'skoj. M.: Mezhdunar. otnosheniya, 1998. 254s. = Brzezinski, Zbigniew Kazimierz. The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives. New York: Basic books, October 1997.
3. Vandam (Edrihin) A. E. Geopolitika i geostrategiya / Sost., vstup. st. i komment. I. Obrazcova; zaklyuch. st. I. Danilenko. Zhukovskij; M.: Kuchkovo pole, 2002. 272 s. (Seriya "Geopoliticheskij rakurs").
4. Dugin A.G. Evrazijskij revansh Rossii. M.: Algoritm, 2014. 256s.
5. Kissindzher G. Nuzhna li Amerike vneshnyaya politika? M.: Ladomir, 2002. 352s.
6. Lihachev D. S., Panchenko A. M. «Smekhovoj mir» Drevnej Rusi. M.: «Nauka», 1984. 295s.
7. Losev A. F. Estetika Vozrozhdeniya M.: «Mysl'», 1978. 624s.
8. Panarin A. S. Pravoslavnyaya civilizaciya / Sost., predisl. V. N. Rastorguev / Отв. ред. О. А. Платонов. М.: Institut russkoj civilizacii, 2014. 1248s.
9. Primakov E.M. Sbranie sochinenij v 10 tt. M.: Izdatel'stvo TPP RF: «Rossijskaya gazeta», 2016. : Т.1. 656s.; Т.2. 608s.; Т.3.592s.; Т.4. 544s.; Т.5. 608s.; Т.7. 416s.; Т.8. 320s.; Т.9. 592s.; Т.10. 336s.
10. Fukuyama F. Konec istorii i poslednij chelovek. M.: AST, 2004. 592 s.
11. Hantington S. Stolknovenie civilizacij. M.: AST, 2005. 603s. = Samuel P. Huntington. The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order. Simon&Schuster, 1996. 359 p.
12. Gaddis J.L. The Cold War: A New History. New York, 2005. 366 p.
13. Hoagland R.E. The greater Caspian region: competition and cooperation // Caspian Magazine affairs, January-February 2019. P.10-22.
14. Steven R. Mann. The Reaction to Chaos // Complexity, Global Politics, and National Security. Edited by David S. Alberts and Thomas J. Czerwinski. National Defense University Washington, D.C. 1998. P.135-149.

ОБ АВТОРЕ | ABOUT AUTHOR

Карабущенко Павел Леонидович, доктор философских наук, профессор, Астраханский государственный университет, 414056, Астрахань, ул.Татищева, 20а, E-mail: Pavel_karabushenko@mail.ru

Karabushenko Pavel Leonidovich, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor. Astrakhan State University. 414056, Astrakhan, Tatischeva, 20a, E-mail: Pavel_karabushenko@mail.ru

Дата поступления в редакцию: 11.09.2019

После рецензирования: 11.04.2020

Дата принятия к публикации: 01.06.2020