

**CHARLES UNIVERSITY**  
**FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Institute of Political Studies

Department of Geopolitics

**Bachelor's Thesis**

**2023**

**Yelizaveta Frolova**

**CHARLES UNIVERSITY**  
**FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Institute of Political Studies

Department of Geopolitics

**The influence of geopolitics and philosophy on each other. Particularly explored through the lens of communism and its impact on Britain and Russia.**

Bachelor's Thesis

Author of the Thesis: Yelizaveta Frolova

Study programme: Politics, Philosophy and Economics

Supervisor: Mgr. Martin Riegl, Ph.D.

Year of the defense:2023

## **Declaration**

1. I hereby declare that I have compiled this thesis using the listed literature and resources only.
2. I hereby declare that my thesis has not been used to gain any other academic title.
3. I fully agree to my work being used for study and scientific purposes.

In Prague on May 3, 2023

Yelizaveta Frolova

## **References**

FROLOVA, Yelizaveta. *The influence of geopolitics and philosophy on each other. particularly explored through the lens of communism and its impact on Britain and Russia*. Praha, 2023. 57 pages. Bachelor's thesis (Bc). Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Political Studies. Department of Geopolitics. Supervisor Prof. Martin Riegl, Ph.D.

**Length of the Thesis: 75,051 characters including spaces**

## **Abstract**

This thesis aims to explore the connection between geopolitics and philosophy.. Geopolitics is responsible for countries' external positions; they allow one to see and better understand international interactions. On the other hand, philosophy is in charge of internal opinions. It formulates individual views on various topics and aids in establishing national ideologies that will drive a country toward its goals. Both of these terms are broad, so to specify research, the goal will be achieved by looking specifically at Communism as a philosophy, and its impact on Britain and Russia, as geopolitical points. In each case, the thesis will explore the geopolitics of each country as well as the organization of society. The paper also examines the role that religion and the church played in developing social views and, consequently, its influence on the state. Research is limited to a specific time frame - 70 years before and 70 years after the publication of the communist manifesto. The research led me to conclude that a connection between geopolitics and philosophy exists. They both influence each other's development. The circumstances, such as geographical location, alliances, participation in wars, predominant religious views, and social conditions of the majority, play a significant role in the development and adoption of ideologies. The difference between the circumstances of the two countries is what determined why one country adopted Communism and the other did not.

## **Keywords**

**Britain. Russia. Communism. Geopolitics. Philosophy.**

## **Title**

**The influence of geopolitics and philosophy on each other. Particularly explored through the lens of communism and its impact on Britain and Russia.**

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Martin Riegl, for his patience with me and my work.

# Table of Contents

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>		<b>3-4</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>		<b>4-5</b>
1.	61.1	<b>Ошибка! Закладка не определена.1.2</b>
	The impact of Communist Manifesto	11-15
	1.2.1 Briefly about the Manifesto	11-
	12	
	1.2.2 About the Manifesto's influence	12-15
2.	6 2.1	Definition of geopolitics
	15-18	
	2.2	How does geopolitics affect a country's internal politics and ideology?
		18-22
3.	6 3.1	Geopolitics
	22-26	
	3.1.1 Britain	22- 24
	3.1.2 Russia	24-26
	3.2	Society
		27-29
	3.2.1 Britain	27
	3.2.2 Russia	27-29
4.	6 4.1	Geopolitics
	30-34	
	4.1.1 Britain	30- 31
	4.1.2 Russia	31-34
	4.2	Society
		34-35
	4.2.1 Britain	34-35
	4.2.2 Russia	35-36
5.	6 5.1	Britain
	36-38	
	5.2	Russia
		38-40
<b>CONCLUSION</b>		<b>40- 44</b>
<b>LIST OF REFERENCES</b>		<b>45</b>

## **Introduction**

The goal of the thesis is to investigate whether or not there is a connection between the development of philosophical ideas and the changes in geopolitics. Since it is a broad question, it will be narrowed down to Communism, Britain and Russia. The goal is to see how the philosophy proposed by Karl Marx influenced the way Britain and Russia practiced their international relations. The objective is to study geopolitical policies, the organization of society, and the role of church and religion in both of these countries, Britain and Russia, and to discover what served as the vital element to Communism's adoption in one country and what was missing in the other. The ultimate goal, however, is to see the connection between geopolitics and philosophy, particularly the influence that philosophy has on geopolitics – whether it is immediate or delayed and if it exists in general.

As a result, the hypotheses are as follows: (1); geopolitics influence the development of philosophical ideas; however, those ideas do not right away change/influence geopolitics: and (2) communism was not adopted in Great Britain as it was in Russia due to significant cultural differences that include, but are not limited to, society, the role of the church (religion as a whole), historical background, and geopolitical stance that affected an overall development of these countries. The first hypothesis is the main one, whereas the second one will play a supporting role.

To achieve the goal, the thesis will explore geopolitics, society, and the role of church and religion. The reason for choosing these fields is explicitly their interconnectedness. They all form a good picture of a country's political goals and government, but they also show how regular people lived and what changes they would support and push through. The study of these factors will be limited to the 19th century,



the immediate time frame from when the Communist Manifesto was published to when it took effect—specifically, 70 years before 1848 and 70 years after.

For the research, I intend to use Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' Communist Manifesto to understand what Communism is, what changes it entailed in general, and what the authors meant, particularly for Britain and Russia. Although understanding why Communism worked in one country and did not in the other is not the primary goal of this research, it allows one to understand what influence philosophy has on geopolitical factors. All the necessary information will be retrieved from existing research papers, articles, books, academic journals, and encyclopedic entries.

This topic is as relevant today as it can get. With the current state of world affairs, it may seem like Communism might come back, as Russia has hinted during the past few years. This analysis might help to understand better whether or not current conditions could be plausible for a return of the familiar philosophy and whether or not there is a specific factor that plays a more significant role than others.

## **Methodology**

The research uses qualitative and descriptive methods of research. I intend to use Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' Communist Manifesto to understand what Communism is and what changes it entailed in general. I will also explore the impact it had through reviewing the history of both countries. Another important factor that I intend to explore is sociological, as well as possible psychological, factors of societies at the time and currently to see the changes, if any, and possibly make future predictions. Finally, I also expect to research the role of church and religion in both countries – how close it was or was not to the government, how much people valued that aspect of life, and how it

influenced Communism in general. All of this information is going to be retrieved from already existing research papers, academic journals, textbooks, and surveys.

# **1.ABOUT COMMUNISM**

## **1.1. Overview of the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels**

Communist Manifesto is one of the best-known works in political philosophy. It became so popular that, at a certain point, it influenced the politics of every big country – it would either push a country towards adopting at least some of the principles of Communism or it would scare a leadership like a fast-spreading wildfire, so much so that the country would do anything not to be associated with the ideology. Either way, Communist Manifesto continues to impact the world to this day.

At the beginning of the work, it is clear that at the time of its publishing, Communism was not just known but was already gaining popularity. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote, "Communism is already acknowledged by all European Powers to be itself a Power" (Marx & Engels, 1848). The Manifesto became the first official declaration of the ideology's views, aims, and tendencies. It outlines the relationship and the history of bourgeois and proletariat, highlights the relation between proletariat and communists, reviews already published socialist and communist works, and finally, describes the position of communists to the various existing opposition parties.

Karl Marx describes social relations simply and plainly – there are always opposing sides, one more potent than the other. Any changes in power that each side possesses result in a revolutionary reconstruction of society. He divides society into two classes - the bourgeois, the powerful elite that rules the society, and the proletariat, the working labourers. Marx admits that this division system stems from feudal times and has not changed much over time. However, the industrial revolution played a vital role in the standing of the bourgeois; as steam and machinery reformed the world of production and

gave way to commerce, the bourgeois developed. It increases its capital and advances in its political stature gaining new power. Marx calls bourgeois "the product of a long course of development of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange" (Marx & Engels, 1848) and highlights that it played "the most revolutionary part in history... and has resolved personal worth into exchange value" (Marx & Engels, 1848). He accuses the bourgeois of reducing all relations, even familial ones, to a mere money transaction. He summarizes it by saying, "In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation" (Marx & Engels, 1848). An essential factor for this work is that Marx, the father of Communism, regarded religion as a tool used by the bourgeois to enforce its agenda on the proletariat.

The author points out that by establishing free trade, the bourgeois gave production and consumption a cosmopolitan character, drawing nations into universal interconnection. He writes that bourgeois "compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves" (Marx & Engels, 1848). However, the bourgeois' powers cannot stay constant. The class strives to constantly advance the modes of production, as that is the source of its power, but that eventually leads to over-production, which defeats the power purpose that the elite has intended in the first place. Bourgeois resort to either destroying some of the existing production to slow it down or conquering new markets and exploiting the old ones even further. That, in turn, will either significantly affect the conditions of life of a country in question or rearrange the world's geopolitical map, or both things could happen simultaneously.

The proletariat, the working class, develops in the same proportion as the bourgeois. This class is also after the capital; however, since it has significantly less

power, it can only achieve it through labour. As mentioned above, the bourgeois reduced all relationships to monetary exchanges, which means that workers' jobs lost their charm, and professions lost individual characters. The proletariat lives only as long as it finds work and works only as long as it increases capital. Marx points out that "only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine" (Marx & Engels, 1848). There is no difference in age or sex - parents force their children to start working as soon as possible, and men and women are equal instruments of labour. The proletariat goes through various stages of development. The struggle with the bourgeois is there from the beginning. The conflict is carried out by an individual, then by a workplace, then the initiative spreads to the whole trade, and finally, it gains a geographical factor when proletarians start to fight against the bourgeois that directly exploits them. As much as the proletariat, at this stage, may try to form a union, it will only be formed with the permission of the bourgeois, which will purposefully set the proletariat in motion to achieve its advancement. As Marx puts it, "Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie" (Marx & Engels, 1848). However, the proletariat is a much larger and more concentrated class, and as society develops further, the class grows even more. As a result, it is able to form trade unions to negotiate the conditions of their work or, if the former is not met, organize a revolt. Marx points out that the "proletariat cannot become masters of productive forces of society except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation" (Marx & Engels, 1848), and that cannot happen without stirring up the whole society – if one class decides to change things up, the other will have to put up a fight. He firmly believes that the bourgeois cannot continue to be the ruling class because it can no longer ensure that the proletariat has the necessary conditions. Marx and Engels suggest the following change

in the way society is – the proletariat must cease all capital from the bourgeois and centralize the means of production in the hands of the State, which will be comprised of the proletariat turned into a ruling class. Marxist communists, therefore, suggest the following changes and measures:

"1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of wastelands; and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

8. Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c., &c."

While the changes will be different in different countries and states, the ten measures mentioned above should be universal. After these changes take place and class distinctions to disappear, along with them should disappear the public power of the political character of the proletariat. Marx and Engels conclude that instead of "the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Marx & Engels, 1848).

## **1.2. The impact of Communist Manifesto**

### **1.2.1. Briefly about the Manifesto**

Communist Manifesto is considered to be one of the most influential pieces of writing. Rightfully so, if, to this day, 175 years after its publication, it can still stir up heated debates. The pamphlet was published days before a series of revolutions swept across Europe. Although it was published in several languages, the initial impact was first and foremost made by the German publication. The Communist League (initially League of the Just) that Marx and Engels had joined only a year before publishing the work played a significant role in spreading the ideas through the newspaper *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (1848-9), which Marx was an editor of. The already mentioned revolutions had failed, and despite the first edition of the Manifesto being reprinted several times within a time frame of only a few months, it ended up being abandoned.

However, a small edition was published in London around 1864, and another was published in 1866 in Berlin (this was the first publication of it in Germany). Between those years and 1848, when it was published for the very first time, there were only two translations – one in Swedish and one in English. By the middle of the 1860s, none of Marx’s works were in print. Nonetheless, Marx’s next endeavours again put him and the Manifesto on the map. Eric Hobsbawm writes that “his eloquent defence of the Paris Commune of 1871 (commonly known as The Civil War in France) gave him considerable notoriety in the press as a dangerous leader of international subversion, feared by governments (Hobsbawm, 2011)”. Between 1871-1873, the Manifesto was published several times in six languages.

Following the next 40 years, this work gained popularity and advanced worldwide due to the establishment of new socialist labour parties. However, none of those chose to be called Communist parties until after the October Revolution in Russia when Russian Bolsheviks took over. The movement was now not only in Europe but in Russia as well, where it gained the most popularity. In Russia, all party members were expected to understand Marx’s theory. Subsequently, all leaders had also to be theorists. Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, the most prominent leaders, published their works that influenced the flow of development of Communism in Russia. More than a third of the world’s population lived in a Communist system of sorts by the 1970s.



### **1.1.2. About the Manifesto's influence**

The impact of this literary work is highly significant. Even with an initial stall in its popularity, it took on a turn that nobody thought it would. It did not just spread globally; it continues to spread through the centuries, adapting to all the accompanying changes the world has been going through. Some of its impacts are of the following character: political and social movements, economic thought, labour rights, and literature and culture.

The Manifesto served as an inspiration for political and social movements throughout the world. It became the basis on which new political parties were formed; it encouraged countless political theories, studies, and research; it influenced the development of ideologies. Leslie Holmes, the author of *Communism, A very short Introduction*, writes, "A fundamental tenet of Marxism is that socialism has to be an international movement. It is, therefore, not surprising that many Communist states sought closer ties with each other. While many communist leaders claimed that this was primarily for principled reasons of socialist internationalism...above all, cooperation could have economic and security-related advantages (Holmes, 2009)". In the 20th century, there were several Communist, sometimes referred to as Socialist, revolutions worldwide. The revolution in Russia, which happened in two phases a few months apart, took place in 1917 when it first overthrew the Tsarist regime and then established a communist party (Bolsheviks) in power.

Chinese Civil War, specifically the second phase of the war that took place in 1945-49, was a military conflict between the Nationalist and Communist parties. In 1937-45, China was divided into three regions: Nationalist China, Communist China, and areas occupied by Japan. When World War II ended, and Japan surrendered, tensions between

the two remaining regions, and parties, intensified. Now that there was no international struggle, it became internal. The conflict's aim was the control of vital resources and population centers. In 1949, the Nationalist government appealed to the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union to help mediate a settlement with the Communists. The Communist leader, Mao Zedong, declared his openness to negotiations proposing eight conditions for it, which were accepted when China's president resigned only a week later. After a series of negotiations and military offences, in October of that year, May proclaimed the establishment of the People's Republic of China.

These examples of political and social movements in the name of Communism are not the only ones, but they are the most prominent for several reasons:

1. They were significant struggles that changed the course of politics for each country.
2. Not only was there an internal change, but countries worldwide were forced to react and take action as well; Cold War and the Vietnam War are the most prominent examples.
3. Both countries still sympathize with the ideology; some major political parties are communists.

The Communist Manifesto has also influenced the development of economic thought. While the change that it aimed to achieve was heavily political and focused on changing the relationship between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the way of achieving the goal was economic. The Manifesto presents a critique of capitalism and offers to replace it with a socialist economy. This theory argued for shared ownership of resources and central planning. It is evident from the famous slogan, "From each according to their ability, to each according to their need (Marx, 1875)". This work has

also contributed to the further developing of the labour theory of the market, which states that "the value of economic goods derives from the amount of labour necessary to produce them (Labor Theory of Market, 2022)". Marx is known as one of the advocates of the theory. He used it to critique classical free-market economists.

One of the social changes that the Communist Manifesto influenced was that of labour rights. The Manifesto is heavily focused on the difference between the two social classes and, precisely, the life conditions of the working class. Ideas put forth by Marx and Engels suggest that a capitalist society views the proletariat merely as work machines with no regard for them as human beings and, therefore, their basic needs. While labour unions began to form even before the Manifesto, it certainly encouraged growth in that area. The unions, to this day, advocate for issues such as hour limits, child labour, workplace conditions, safety and social sustainability, living/minimum wage, and the rights of pregnant workers and migrant and undocumented workers. All this contributed to the development of labour laws that now validate workers' lives.

Finally, the Manifesto influenced literary and cultural aspects of life as well. It has been mentioned numerous times in various works of literature and inspired many artists. For example, it encouraged the emergence of "proletarian literature," which is defined as "literary writing by or about working-class people with anti-capitalist or pro-socialist themes (Mullen, 2022)". Some examples of such literature include Charles Dickens's "Hard Times," John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath," Henry Green's "Living," William Blake's poem "The Chimney Sweeper," etc.

## **2. What is Geopolitics?**

### **2.1. Definition of Geopolitics**

*Geopolitics* is a multidisciplinary field that aims to understand how geography affects politics. Klaus Dodds (2007) claims that there is little point in establishing a concrete definition of the term "geopolitics" due to various opinions among the experts; however, he offers two ways of understanding it. According to K. Dodds the first way of understanding this field of study is to focus on the fact that "geopolitics offers for many a reliable guide of the global landscape using geographical descriptions, metaphors, and templates such as "iron curtain," "Third World," and/or "rogue state." Each of these terms is inherently geographical because places are identified and labelled as such. It then helps to generate a simple model of the world, which can then be used to advise and inform foreign and security policy-making" (K. Dodds, 2007). This first "definition" is efficient in everyday use for media purposes such as political news in the newspaper, radio, television reports, etc. The second way of understanding geopolitics focuses on the practice's academic and widespread use. According to Dodds, "rather than assuming labels such "iron curtain" and "axis of evil" have a certain heuristic value, we proceed to question how they generate a particular understanding of places, communities, and accompanying identities" (K. Dodds, 2007). He offers an example based on the term "Third World" as it not only identifies specific places in Africa, Asia and Latin America but also helped to "triangulate" the political geographies of the Cold War that involved the United States of America and "First World" and the Soviet Union and the "Second World." Regardless of which approach is favoured, geopolitics is a spatial and visual field of study; it allows one to look at the world and see the way humankind develops relations based on slowly changing factors, such as geography and natural resources, or factors that are more rapid in their transformation such as alliances, country's individual goals and agendas. The study uses a variety of visual aids such as maps, tables, and photographs to understand all kinds of international relations better.

The term "geopolitics" is linked to the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellen. According to the online Encyclopedia Britannica, Kjellen coined three terms together: "terms geopolitics ("geopolitics"), the problems and conditions within a state that arises from its geographic features; realpolitik, the economic factors that affect the power of the state; and demopolitik, the nation's racial elements and the problems that they create (Rudolf Kjellén). Together these terms capture the complexity of international relations. Although geopolitics began as a field focusing only on geographical factors, as technology progressed, the term too began to include more areas of consideration to allow one to see the whole picture.

The field as a study has its origins in the late 19th-early 20th century, and the use of the term progressed between World War 1 and World War 2. Much of the literature about geopolitics focused heavily on the industrial revolution's impact on politics. Geopoliticians, such as Halford Mackinder, Alfred Thayer Mahan, and Karl Haushofer attempted to understand how the new technologies would shape political changes. The aim was to recognize how the new capabilities of transportation, communication and destruction could affect the character and nature of international relations.

In his analysis "The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783," Alfred Thayer Mahan (1890) argued that the control of the sea route essentially determined world dominance because maritime trade was much more efficient than animal-powered land transport. With the advancement of the railroad system, Halford Mackinder suggested that land power would beat sea power. In his book "The Geographical Pivot of History," Mackinder writes, "A generation ago, steam and the Suez Canal appeared to have increased the mobility of sea-power relatively to land-power. Railways acted chiefly as feeders to ocean-going commerce. But trans-continental railways are not transmuting

the conditions of land-power, and nowhere can they have such effect as in the closed Heartland of Euro-Asia" (Mackinder, 1904).

Mackinder's heartland theory is prominent and one of the best-known in geopolitics. He argued that the key to world dominance is the control of the "heartland." The Heartland refers to the vast interior of Eurasia, which includes the steppes of Russia and Central Asia and the agricultural regions of Eastern Europe. According to Mackinder, "Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland; who rules the Heartland commands the World-Island; who rules the World-Island commands the world." (Mackinder, 1904). The theory is based on observing the dynamic of international relations at the beginning of the 20th century, precisely the changing balance of power. Russia started to gain power, and the US became a power in the east, threatening Europe's dominance. Mackinder argued that the Heartland did not only possess a significant amount of natural resources, both in terms of variety and quantity, but also, due to its location, had a strategic advantage. Buffer states protect Heartland on one side and oceans on the other. As a result, it is easier for the "heartland," or whatever state controls it, to grow to expand its borders than it is for outside states to gain control of the territory.

Another interesting and relevant theory for this paper is that of Karl Haushofer about pan-regions. According to *Political Geography of Pan-regions*, by John O'Loughlin and Herman van der Wusten, "a pan-region is a large functional area linking core states to resource peripheries and cutting across latitudinally distributed environmental zones" (O'Loughlin, van der Wusten, 1990). Pan-regions are regions with distinct cultural, economic, and political characteristics divided based on natural geographic features, such as mountain ranges, rivers, etc. The main idea behind pan-regions is that they are self-sufficient and have no need for external support of any kind. Haushofer and other German geopoliticians offered to divide the world into four pan-regions – pan-Europe, including

Africa, pan-Asia, pan-America, and pan-Russia. Each pan-region would be dominated by one country, Germany, Japan, the United States, and the Soviet Union, respectively. However, due to Haushofer's association with Adolf Hitler, and the further adoption of the theory by Nazi Germany, the theory remains controversial in geopolitics.

## **2.2. How does Geopolitics affect a country's internal politics and ideologies?**

The question of national identity is ever relevant to each country. It sometimes takes centuries to form, and sometimes, in a matter of one revolution, it becomes something completely different. Regardless of the time frame, there are always factors affecting how a country perceives itself and how it wants other states to perceive it. Geopolitics is one of those factors. In international relations, "peer pressure" country states to adapt to whatever trends are popular at the time.

Klaus Dodds writes, "The creation of a modern international political system based on national states with exclusive territorial jurisdictions is commonly dated to 17th century Europe. Over the centuries, national governments emerged and established via diplomacy and international law, a mosaic of states.... As the apparatus of the state began to envelop the everyday affairs of citizens, national governments, through their control and/or monitoring of national media and/or school-level education, began to concentrate ever-greater energy on the creation and maintenance of national self-identity (Dodds, 2007)". It is through outside influence that country states determine what their internal identity would be. Territories would separate from each other and form independent states, producing patriotic programs to raise the next generation or even reform the minds of the current generation with a new national identity. Regionally, countries would negotiate border positions, sometimes involving the military. As a result, subregions

could end up "on a different side of the barricades"; the population of those places would start to adjust to the changes in accordance with their own cultural ideas and consequently create a new identity. Media would blast news, trying to persuade each to side with their opinion. One state would promote one side of the coin; the other would say something completely different. Finally, the rest of the world would interpret the event based on their relationship with each state involved and their national identity. Those changes from abroad would influence people to question their way of living, whether it is good enough or if it can be better. Despite the final decision, it will cultivate a beginning of adjustments and modifications, maybe not significant enough to notice or keep track of in that particular moment but big enough to push people to, over the years, question who they are individually and collectively. That questioning will lead people to change their voting habits at the next election, or maybe collect their whole life together and move somewhere else entirely, or maybe it would push them to join a group that will cause a conflict of some sort.

Samuel P. Huntington, in his work *The Clash of Civilizations?* suggest that "it is far more meaningful to group countries not in terms of their political or economic systems or in terms of their level of economic development but rather in terms of their culture and civilization (Huntington, 1993)". He defines "civilization" as "the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species (Huntington, 1993)". It is therefore defined by things such as language, traditions, religion, history, customs, institutions, etc. A single citizen can identify themselves in various ways – as a citizen of that particular city, or of that country, a supporter of a specific religion, or as belonging to that continent, or a general culture (e.g., West vs. East). People have always had a broad range of how to perceive themselves, and as time progresses, that choice becomes even broader. That



also determines the composition of boundaries for each "civilization," Further, it affects the whole scene of international relations. Geographical characteristics go hand in hand with historical and cultural ones, giving people yet another reason to find differences or similarities.

However, identities might not only be national. Klaus Dodds, in his book *Geopolitics*. A very short introduction suggests that there is also a pan-regional identity along with national identities. He writes, "National expressions of identity are arguably still the most significant, given the prevailing international political system based on nation states and territorial boundaries. However, identities are not always territorially bounded. Sometimes identities can simply leak beyond particular territorial boundaries or be deliberately produced to transcend the existing mosaic of states and their national boundaries (Dodds, 2007)". The most obvious example of that today is the European Union. Having been through two world wars, several countries decided to form a political, economic, social, and cultural union to promote cooperation. However, such an endeavour raises many questions. Who should be a part of this union? Where does Europe start, and where does it end? On what basis should future states be admitted into it? How integrated should the states be? Are there specific language/cultural/religious/social norms each state has to follow? Should there be specific geographical boundaries? All these, of course, were addressed and worked through in this particular case. However, on a global scale, it shows that any boundary change, whether it means an actual change of physical borders or not, causes all parties to make certain adjustments to their internal customs. "All parties" because, again, not only those involved are required to make changes but also those surrounding those states need to make arrangements to ensure they are up to protect their boundaries and interests.

A lot can influence a country's internal politics and ideology. Its location determines the way it makes decisions. For example, a country located in a politically unstable region may have a defensive ideology that will prioritize military development. A small country might focus on building strong alliances with "big neighbours" to ensure its safety. So it will adjust its ideology and values to ensure they are not facing any danger from that neighbour and make a good relationship with them more favourable. On the other hand, a country with rich natural resources may lean towards economic development and trade, leading to a more liberal ideology. Geopolitics plays a vital role in how a country perceives itself and how it wants other states to perceive it.

Theories described in the previous section all relate to the analysis that follows. Britain is described by the theory of Alfred Thayer Mahan as it is a maritime power. It managed to gain control over a significant part of the world because while land transport was still progressing it was able to conquer new lands and increase its power. The 'heartland' theory by Halford Mackinder describes Russia. Russia is heartland. The country might not have had the same opportunities for conquests as Britain did but at the same time it had the resources that Britain could only acquire through conquering other territories. Finally, the theory of pan-regions is fascinating in regards to Communism. When Russia became Communist, it isolated itself into its own region - the Soviet Union. The question then is this - if both countries, Britain and Russia, became Communist, would that have meant a pan-regional division? Although this question is irrelevant to the purposes of this paper, it suggests a course in which one could continue to explore the question of Communism and geopolitics.

### **3. Britain and Russia before Communist Manifesto**

#### **3.1. Geopolitics**

### 3.1.1. Britain

Between 1815 and 1914, the British Empire's territory increased significantly in size. This period was full of geopolitical developments that contributed to the country's status as a world power. According to Britannica, "between 1793 and 1815 Britain gained 20 colonies...by 1820 the total population of the territories it governed was 26 percent of the world's total populations (The Napoleonic Wars, n.d.)

In 1775-83 the American Revolution took place, and Britain lost control of 13 colonies in North America. According to Britannica, until 1778, it was a civil war within the British Empire, but it became international when France and Spain joined the colonies. At the same time, the Netherlands was also at war with Britain. Eventually, the British surrendered and recognized the independence of the United States. 13 colonies were a significant loss of continental proportions. However, a historian, Linda Colley, writes that Britain was not "morally" defeated by it and instead "gave a new sense of purpose and meaning to the emerging British nation. The loss of the American colonies forced the British to think more creatively about their future and encouraged them to find new ways of expanding their influence and power in the world (Colley, 2009)".

Following the American Revolution, Britain engaged in the Napoleonic Wars. This took a significant toll on the country. According to an article on the Napoleonic Wars Revolution published by Encyclopedia Britannica (2022), it cost Britain over £1,650,000,000, most of which was collected from taxes. The wars also required many human resources; the country kept recruiting men to send to the battlefields. At the very same time, there was danger coming from France. At that point, a quarter of adult males in Britain were in the military by the early 19th century.

Britain was a maritime power, so it was hard to defeat France because of its superiority on land. By 1779, the country nearly went bankrupt because of all the military expenditures (Napoleonic Wars, 2022). In 1809, the war finally turned in their favour. Because of Napoleon's strategic mistakes, Britain could ally with Spain in terms of trade which helped the country financially. When Russia defeated Napoleon in 1812, it gave hope to Britain. Napoleon's final defeat occurred in the Battle of Waterloo in 1815, for which Britain took primary credit.

After the end of the Napoleonic Wars, Britain participated in the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The Congress redefined the balance of power in Europe, and Britain played a vital role in negotiations.

Britain and Russia also engaged in the so-called Great Game. "Great Game" is a term used to describe the rivalry between two countries in Central Asia. It began in 1830 and lasted through the whole century as countries fought for influence over Mughal India, Turkestan, and Persia territories. According to Cynthia Smith, the British used Afghanistan as a buffer state, leading to the first Anglo-Afghan War from 1838 to 1842. The second and third wars took place in 1878-1880 and 1919. John MacKenzie believes Britain's real purpose was to create a sense of national purpose and pride. The Great Game allowed the country to expand in India and beyond.

### **3.1.2. Russia**

Over the period between the 1770s and 1848, Russia's central geopolitical policy was focused on the expansion of its territories. During this time, the country was ruled by several monarchs of the Romanov Dynasty, all of whom worked on growing Russia's influence in Central Asia, the Caucasus region, and Europe. The geopolitical strategy

focused on gaining access to warm-water ports and securing its borders against potential invasions.

A series of Russo-Turkish wars took place during this period. According to Britannica, the wars occurred even before the set above time frame but also happened in 1768-74, 1787-91, 1806-12, 1848-29, 1853-56, and 1877-78. As a result of these wars, Russia was able to expand towards the Baltic Sea, the Prut River, and south of the Caucasus Mountains. The War of 1768-74 was the first significant conflict in the series. It began after Turkey was concerned about Russia interfering in Poland's internal affairs. The Russians, however, were victorious in several battles forcing Turkey to seek peace eventually. In 1774, the countries signed the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji, which gave Russia significant advantages such as advancing its frontiers, having the right to maintain its fleet in the Black Sea, and having the right to protect Christians in the Balkans. Richard Pipes wrote, "The Russo-Turkish War of 1768-74 was a complex conflict with far-reaching consequences, as it set the stage for the major geopolitical changes that would shape the region for decades to come (Pipes, 2012)".

During the subsequent two wars of 1787-91 and 1806-12, Russia was again victorious over the Turks expanded its territory even more. In the first war, Russia fought with Austria as an ally, and their successes convinced Turkey to sign the Treaty of Jassy that allowed Russia to gain the entire western Black Sea coast. The second war was slightly trickier because of growing tensions with Napoleonic France. At first, Russia was reluctant about another war with Turkey because of the uncertainties of their relations with France. However, once it was clear that a Franco-Russian war was unavoidable, the country led a quick and successful campaign against the Turks. Jeremy Black, a British historian, in his book *The Ottoman Empire in the Age of Revolutions*, writes: "Taken together, the Russo-Turkish Wars of 1787-91 and 1806-12 marked a significant turning

point in the history of Eastern Europe, as they hastened the decline of the Ottoman Empire and paved the way for the rise of Russian power in the region (Black, 2008)". These wars, as well as the subsequent ones, significantly advanced Russia. The country expanded its territory, and with each war, it declared its power to the rest of the world. As a result of the war of 1828-29, when the aim was to expand into the Caucasus, Turkey recognized the Russian domain in Georgia and Armenia. As a result, Russia emerged as a major political player.

In 1812 Russia was invaded by France. The Russian army was at a loss, significantly smaller than France's, and it also needed to fully understand the French objective and how they were to react to it. In his book *Russia Against Napoleon*, Dominic Lieven notes that "the invasion of Russia is a story of human folly and military madness" (Lieven, 2009)". Although it seemed the French should have no problem in their conquest, that was not the case. Russia assumed a strategy of retreating and not engaging with the enemy. That policy exhausted the French supply, and by the time winter hit, many soldiers died because of cold and starvation. Eventually, Napoleon ordered to retreat, and according to Britannica, less than one-tenth of the army made it back. Nevertheless, the Russian tactic worked great, thanks to the region's climate. After its victory, Russia participated in the Congress of Vienna, that aimed at settling the consequences of the Napoleonic wars, as one of the major European powers alongside Britain, France, Austria, and Prussia.

Following these events, Russia continued to expand its territory, especially in the Caucasus region. Adeb Khalid, author and professor, said, "Russia has always viewed Central Asia as a vital strategic frontier, and the imperial expansion into this region during the nineteenth century was driven by a range of geopolitical and economic considerations (Khalid, 2015)". Both Alexander I and Nicholas I, tsars that ruled one after another,

emphasized advancing into Central Asia during their reigns. Historian Walter Moss also noted that Nicholas strived to preserve Russia's status as a conservative force. He also opposed liberal and nationalist movements that were taking place in Europe in the 1840s.

Overall, Russia's geopolitical policy before 1848 is marked by territorial expansion and growing and maintaining its position as a significant European power.

## **3.2. Society**

### **3.2.1. Britain**

Industrial Revolution was one of the most momentous events of that period on social and political life in Britain. The transition from an agrarian and handicraft economy to an industrial, machine-dominated one led to significant increases in productivity. It also influenced the growth of cities and changes in demographic as factories were built and people started migrating in search of better jobs. The revolution also aided in creating a new social class. Those who owned and operated the new factories and mines became the middle class. Friedrich Engels claimed the following about the workers during the revolution: "During the industrial revolution in Britain, the labouring classes were robbed of their old leisure but were not compensated by any new enjoyment of life. They were merely exhausted and brutalized, and there existed no social power capable of putting an end to the misery of their existence (Engels, 1845)". Although the conditions of physical labour might have changed because of all the new machinery and opportunities, social life did not become any easier. People struggled with finding employment and affording life. This led to the development of slums in the cities.

The gap between the social classes grew. While the industrial revolution meant more profit for the upper class, the workers were scrambling for the bare minimum. As a result, capitalist society's two primary social groups formed and expanded over this period- the bourgeoisie and the workers.

### **3.1.2. Russia**

Socially, Russia was organized into three classes: nobility, clergy, and peasants. Nobility and clergy comprised the privileged class, while peasants were the working class. Peasants were considered to be the property of their lords. Nobility was the largest landowning class. The fields of state apparatus, army, and diplomatic service were also primarily made up of people from this class. This class was the most privileged; it was the closest class to the country's rulers and even possessed its own assembly. The Gentry Assembly was a self-governing assembly with its charter adopted in 1785. Britannica defines some of the privileges described in the charter: "The charter also confirmed the nobles' exemption from compulsory service to the state and from payment of taxes. It granted them the rights of free speech and assembly, as well as the right to a trial by their peers. Members of the gentry exclusively were allowed to own estates populated by serfs (Charter of the Gentry, 2015)". However, although it may seem like the class possessed much power, Walter Moss states that "the nobility controlled vast estates and serfs, but they had little political power beyond their advisory role in the government (Moss, 2002)".

The clergy class was more closed and largely hereditary. Religion and religious leaders played a significant role in forming the society. Russia was Orthodox, and the majority of the population was Orthodox Christian. However, Russia was ethnically diverse, and representatives of other religions lived on its territory. Nevertheless, the most



significant impact was made by the main religion. The system programmed people to be more introverted, i.e. to deny the importance of material gain. Vasily Kliuchevsky, a historian, claimed that "the Russian Orthodox Church was the most important institution in Russia after the state itself (Kliuchevsky, 1984)". This class played a significant role in society, providing things such as education, healthcare and social services. However, according to Moss, "they were seen as corrupt and out of touch with the needs of the people (Moss, 2002)" and so there was a significant gap between the privileged classes and ordinary workers – the privileged did not "come down" to see what the workers needed. Workers could not "come up" to change their conditions.

Around the 1770s, Catherine the Great, who ruled Russia then, introduced several reforms that continued to shape the society even after her reign. She introduced changes to the Legislative Commission that essentially divided the country into provinces, with each province being ruled by a governor that reported directly back to Catherine. The nobility staffed such governing positions. Henri Troyat writes, "Catherine's reign was characterized by a genuine desire for reform and progress (Troyat, 1980)". Indeed, at the time, Russia was striving to modernize itself – change its tactics, expand territory, and increase power. Unfortunately, Catherine's reforms only intensified class divisions.

A class conflict also always gives way to development in the literary department. During this time, writers such as Alexander Pushkin, Fyodor Dostoevsky, and Leo Tolstoy produced some of the greatest literary works ever. All three of these authors criticized the society they lived in, pointing out the human flaws of nobility and the life struggles of the peasants. Their works influenced how people now view Russian history, as Leo Tolstoy, for example, wrote about some significant events.

In general, socially, this time in Russian history may be viewed as a time of modernization and changes, but it also is a time of significant class struggle. External changes bore internal wrestling. Moreover, while it was not so exposed during that period, it built up tension for future revolts.

## **4. Britain and Russia after Communist Manifesto**

### **4.1. Geopolitics**

#### **4.1.1. Britain**

The period between 1848 and 1917 was no less significant. Britain continued to be a major world power. As mentioned, 1848 was not just the year the Communist Manifesto was published, but it was also a year of several European revolutions – based on the Congress of Vienna, and the Concert of Powers external and internal affairs were kept separated. Powers could cooperate despite different regimes and so under these circumstances revolutions were destined to fail as major powers preferred stability. Those revolutions were a series of uprisings against European monarchies. Great Britain was spared from this, except for a brief Chartist revival. However, with the changes on the continent, it was unclear what the country should expect.

Amidst the uncertainties, the country's goal was to remain in power. Miles Taylor, in his article "The Revolutions of 1848 and the British Empire," writes that the "most recent expansion of the British empire was triggered by the need to secure existing frontiers and pacify internal dissent, rather than by the drive for new markets (Taylor, 2000)". Military expenditures were, according to Taylor, reaching a record high. It was unclear whether or not 1848 would impact the country. Britain continued the policy of

"splendid isolation." According to A Dictionary of British History, Viscount Palmerston called it having "no eternal allies – to whom she owed favours (Splendid Isolation, n.d.)."

Britain participated in one of the century's most significant events, the "Scramble for Africa." It began in the 1880s, and between 1885 and 1914, Britain controlled nearly 30 percent of Africa. Britain was in a deficit – its trade slowed, and it was dealing with the financial consequences of costly conflicts at the beginning of the century. Africa presented itself as a good solution; it offered an open market to Britain and other countries. Britain also sought to establish control over Africa's natural resources. Economic and strategic goals drove the interest in the region and ultimately gave Britain more "weight" to its political status.

Before the Scramble for Africa, Britain was also involved in the Second Opium War in 1856-60 in China and the Second Anglo-Afghan War in 1878-80. The country used these conflicts to expand its influence in its respective regions. The Opium Wars arose due to China trying to suppress the opium trade. Britain was one of the primary traders exporting opium from India to China. It led to an extensive addiction in the country, resulting in social and economic disruptions. The second war took place because Britain sought to expand its trading rights. The French joined the British army causing China to eventually sign the Beijing Convention and cede to the British territory adjacent to Hong Kong. In 1914, the British Empire allied with France and the Russian Empire to fight against Germany.

The second half of the 19th century was a politically fruitful time in Britain's history. However, it is characterized by conflicts to achieve the country's colonial ambitions and cement its position as a leading power.

#### **4.1.2. Russia**

Russia, however, was one of the only countries left untouched by the revolutions of 1848. It caught up to the trend later on in 1917. The Russian October Revolution of 1917 is considered to be the starting point of Communism gaining its power. The first revolution occurred in February of that year, overthrowing the Tsarist regime. However, geopolitically, the country had to go through several conflicts before the revolution. Perhaps, all those events between 1848 and 1917 are why the country was forced to face such a significant political change that ended up influencing the rest of the world for the rest of the century.

Between 1853 and 1856, Russia was involved in the Crimean War – that was also a partial blow to great powers' unity established at the Congress of Vienna. The conflict was between Russia and an alliance between Britain, France, Turkey, and Sardinia. Religion and church played a vital role in this war. According to Britannica, it arose because of "Russia's demands to exercise protection over the Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman sultan (Crimean War, 2023)". There was also a dispute between Russia and France over the statuses of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church and their privileges in Palestine's holy places. Russia went against several countries in this conflict, and after one more, Austria, threatened to join the European alliance, it accepted preliminary peace terms and later signed the peace treaty. Orlando Figes, a British historian, in his book *The Crimean War, A History*, writes that "Russia was and remained throughout the war, a military giant, but a political and economic pygmy, its backwardness revealed by the inability of its military establishment to fight a modern war with modern means (Figes, 2012)". The Crimean War exposed Russia's limitations and weaknesses. The country had to change its ways if it wanted to claim more power in the world or, at the very least, make sure it could sustain the territory it already had.

Following this conflict, Russia took a different approach to world politics and instead focused on entering into alliances and developing diplomatic relations. Oleg Airapetov, a candidate of historical studies at Moscow State University, writes that after the Treaty of Paris ended the Crimean War, Russia and France continued diplomatic relations. In his article on the aftermath of the Crimean War, Airapetov notes that "in 1857-1859. Paris and St. Petersburg agreed to consult on matters of "European importance," to act in concert in the East, and to "agree among themselves" in the event of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (Airapetov, 2017)". According to Arnold Blumberg and his article Russian Policy and the Franco-Austrian War of 1859, in 1859, Russia and France signed a secret treaty. Blumberg writes, "Originally, the French had attempted to entice the Russians into an alliance whereby in exchange for their active entry into the war, the greater part of the map of continental Europe would have been redrawn. Prince Gorchakov replied by declining to enter the war, giving as an excuse the great internal reforms with which the tsar was occupied (Blumberg, 1954)". The Franco-Austrian war ended only a few months later, and, as Blumberg notes, Russia might have been the only state fully satisfied with the peace signed between the countries. Diplomatic relations between Russia and France continued their existence.

Late on, however, in 1873, Otto von Bismark, the German chancellor and prime minister, devised an alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia. The alliance was called the League of Three Emperors, originally Dreikaiserbund. It aimed to neutralize the relations and spheres of influence in the Balkans and isolate Germany's enemy – France. A historian D.C.B. Lieven in his book "Russia and the Origins of the First World War," describes the alliance as follows: "The League of Three Emperors was not merely a defensive alliance, it was a fundamentally offensive alliance aimed at checking French revisionism and expanding Austrian influence in the Balkans at the expense of the

Ottoman Empire (Lieven, 1983)". There were several attempts at the alliance. The first lasted between the years 1873 and 1875. The second one was signed in 1881, renewed in 1884 and expired in 1887. Unfortunately, both times the alliances failed due to continued rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans. Although Bismarck attempted to preserve relations with Russia by signing the Reinsurance Treaty, it was never renewed. Instead, the Franco-Russian alliance developed further, eventually leading to both countries and Britain being allies during the First World War.

In 1904-1905 Russia was at war with Japan. The conflict arose due to territorial expansion in East Asia. After a few standoffs, Russia was forced to abandon its policy and come to the table to sign a peace treaty. As a result, it became the first Asian power to defeat a European one. Richard Minear, a professor of history at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, noted that "The Russo-Japanese war was the first war of the 20th century, and its significance was profound. It marked the emergence of Japan as a world power, proved that a non-Western nation could defeat a major European power, and contributed to the destabilization of the Russian Empire (Minear, 2003)".

Indeed, Russia entered an unstable time. For several years before 1905, and especially after the defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, people were discontent with the country's political regime. In 1905 there was a revolution aimed at convincing Tsar Nicholas II to transform the Russian government into a constitutional monarchy. Over the year, tensions grew through various protests, strikes, riots, and even terrorist assassinations. The uprising failed. However, the government did institute some reforms, such as the Fundamental Laws and the creation of Duma. Fundamental Laws served as a constitution, and Duma is an elected legislative body constituted by the legislatures (both terms are defined by the online Encyclopedia Britannica).

## **4.2. Society**

### **4.2.1. Britain**

Social conditions in Britain after the Manifesto was published did not change. The term "Bad England" was created to describe the living conditions of regular people. An important message to criticize the social injustice of British society and to encourage finding a way to a prosperous one was sent by British Prime Minister B. Disraeli's social novel. Disraeli's novel, *The Sybilline or The Two Nations* (1845), was about a prominent statesman who attempted to resolve social problems. The division between the classes was so great that they were referred to as different nations. The author proposed a religious-moral and socio-political alliance between the "two nations" - the ruling and the producing.

Thomas Malthus' philosophy heavily influenced social tendencies. He believed that "poverty is the individual way of man, his destiny, and is predetermined by the inability of the poor in their struggle for existence" (T. Malthus, 1798). Wealthy classes believed that poor people were in such conditions only because they chose to be, not because social and labour conditions were not favourable. The elites widely accepted Malthus' ideas as they diverted attention from socioeconomic failures to individual responsibility.

### **4.2.2. Russia**

In 1861, Russia abolished serfdom. Alexander II released a manifesto along with 17 legislative acts freeing the serfs. After the defeat in the Crimean War, Alexander realized that only internal reforms would allow Russia to compete with European powers externally. This decision decreased the economic power of the nobility. Many peasants started to move to cities causing a great demographic shift. The social organization began to change.

This time was signified by other reforms as well. According to Britannica, in 1864, a new system of elected assemblies at the provincial and county levels was introduced. They were greatly influenced by the legislative reform made by Catherine a few decades earlier. Alexander II refused to consider making constitutional changes and introducing a representative government, thinking it would be a “slippery slope,” leading to significant social struggles for the government and the people. However, that deprived the country of public political education. In turn, a slight disappointment that the abolition of serfdom was received was slightly surprising. The serfs used to view land as their own, even if they belonged to someone. Now they had to pay for this land. Due to this, people started to organize revolutionary groups and express their discontent.

In the 1870s, students who were influenced by socialist ideas coming from Europe continued a revolutionary activity. They saw “revolutionary” potential in peasants – the largest class now especially dissatisfied with its social conditions. Over the next few years, various actions were taken to fight for change. The most significant happened in 1881 when Tsar Alexander II was assassinated by a group formed after a split of political parties advocating for these changes.

The gap between the social classes grew, and the growth of the working class presented a good opportunity for the largest social class to turn against the government. The abolition of serfdom, although they might have had the best intentions about it, ended up serving as the beginning of an end.

## **5. Religion and the Role of the Church**

### **5.1. Britain**

The approach to church and religion in Great Britain in the 19th century is similar



to today's situation. The state allowed people to practice whatever religion they preferred, although Christianity was still dominant. However, we can also observe a more severe involvement of religion in politics and politics in religion. People tried to connect the two as best as they could. This is a significant difference from Russia of the time. The social basis for Christian socialism was the revolutionary movement of 1848 in Europe, the industrial revolution, and the rise and fall of Chartism. In 1836 the Chartists organized the London Working Men's Association, which published "The People's Charter" with demands for universal suffrage, secret voting, and the abolition of the property census. The Charter was submitted to the English Parliament but was defeated. Christian socialist believed that people must be give complete moral and intellectual freedom. That included religious freedom as well.

The religious aspect of the social program of Christian socialists is expressed in the possibility of building a city of God on earth. One of the foremost representatives of English Christian socialism, S. Headlam, wrote: "Christian socialism can be realized only when the church has been given all its educational influence to build up on earth the kingdom of heaven" (S. Headlam, 1909). The Church of England itself published the program of English socialism after the events of 1848 in the magazine *Christian Socialism*, which began to be published in 1850.

Similar views can be traced in the work of such unions as the Brotherhood Church and the Independent Labour Party, which promoted the ideas of Christian socialism. The Brotherhood Church, composed of Anglican and Congregationalist priests, tried to combine the Sermon on the Mount with cooperative ideas, continuing the line of F. Maurice, C. Kingsley, and J. Ludlow. Representatives of these societies adhered to the ideas of non-violence of Leo Tolstoy, whom they regarded as a prophet, in solving social problems. John Trevor, the founder of the Church of Labor, advocated the same position,

believing that social problems could only be solved based on Christian ethics and with the creation of "free religion." He wrote: "Secular socialism and Christian socialism are both in bondage, one to the materialistic and the other to the clerical tradition. However, it is necessary to be freed from the one and the other by entering the realm of free religion." (J. Trevor, 1853). Christian socialists had different attitudes toward the labour movement. Some supported it. Others, like F. Maurice, believed that socialism was not the only means of liberating the working class in industrial England. J. Ludlow repeatedly stressed the need for close contact with German socialists, particularly K. Marx. Ludlow was an active member of the Christian Socialist Union from 1893-1909, unlike F. Maurice, who withdrew entirely from the Anglican Church. Some Christian socialists have defended ideas of secularism. For instance, S. Hedlem defended Charles Bradlow (1833-1891), one of the founders of the National Secular Society in England, editor of *The National Reformer*, and author of *Supernatural and Rational Morality and Mankind's Road to Unbelief*.

From the above statements, we may conclude that the Christian Socialist movement in England was mixed in its confessional, social, and ideological composition. However, they were united in one thing: improving society is possible through strengthening religious and moral education at all population levels. Religion and the church could have played a significant role in British history. Perhaps, the socialist movement that started could have influenced significant changes in the country. However, as there was no unity among the leaders of the various movements and organizations, even concerning religion itself and how to interpret it, this change never took place. Although, it had the necessary preconditions that consisted of people wanting change on several levels of society.

## **5.2. Russia**

At the beginning of the XIX century, the relationship between church and state was complex. The Tsar at the time tolerated the church because he saw religion as an essential moral component that also served educational purposes. So much so that he even allowed Jesuits to function on Russian territory, which led to discontent with the Orthodox Church.

At the beginning of the century in Russia, there was also a widespread fascination with Masonry. In Russia, Freemasons respected Alexander I. Over time, the emperor stopped tolerating these communities since many Decembrists belonged to them. In 1822 a decree banning secret societies and Masonic lodges was issued, and soon after that, Freemasonry in Russia ceased its activities. V. A. Fedorov, in his book on the Russian Orthodox Church and government, notes the following words of Alexander I "The fire of Moscow has brightened my soul, and the judgment of God on the icy fields has filled my heart with the warmth of faith, which I had not felt until then. Then I knew God." (Fedorov, 2013). The emperor believed his religious outlook was dramatically influenced by the events of 1812. At this point, the emperor supports Orthodoxy and all Christian denominations. In 1815 Alexander I created the "Holy Alliance" of Russian, Austrian and Prussian monarchs based on the principle of governing their states according to the laws of Christian ethics.

Nicholas I, unlike Alexander II, was more pragmatic in religion. He was alien to mysticism and aimed to increase the Orthodox Church's role in the country's life. In Russia, it is believed that the Russian people are loyal to the Tsar and keep their traditions, and Orthodoxy serves as a prerequisite. Therefore, issues of faith are given special attention in public policy. Nicholas I developed a brutal policy towards Old Believers. He disapproved of freethinking and encroachments on the Orthodox faith. Nevertheless, Nicholas I's policy toward them did not lead to a decrease in their number. Old Believers

are notable for their diligence and strict morals, but the authorities saw them as a threat to the political order in the country.

The split began between the state and the church in the 1880s. In the context of Russian Christian ideas, it is necessary to mention L. Tolstoy and "Tolstovism." His work "Confession," in which he sets forth the foundations of his doctrine, which differs from the dogmas of the Orthodox Church, was published in 1882 in the magazine Russian Thought. This issue immediately resulted in an arrest. Leo Tolstoy illegally distributed his other works ("What is My Faith?", "The New Gospel") and became widely known abroad. There were many followers of this doctrine both in Russia and abroad. The authorities feared Tolstoy's thesis of universal equality would lead the peasants to demand equalization of lands.

Starting in the 1880s, there was a rapid growth in the number of monasteries. On the basis of these monasteries, Church schools began to play a considerable role in primary education. They prepared many specialists in politics, literature, and the arts. By 1917 came around, those specialists were graduated and gained experience in their careers. The organization of these schools and programs for the kids played a significant role in the revolution's changes. Since peasants were mainly the ones to go to monasteries, graduates of church schools better understood how most people lived and the changes that would be supported.

## **Conclusion**

The answer to why Communism did not gain the same level of popularity in Britain as it did in Russia can include and be dependent on many more factors than were explored in this thesis. However, to understand what played the most significant role in this case,

we must first distinguish the geopolitical policies and the state of society in Britain and Russia.

First, geopolitical differences. Both countries were and still are influential. Both were empires with significant achievements and big ambitions for the future. However, the most important distinction that may play the most crucial role in why Communism was adopted in Russia and not Britain is that Russia is a land empire. It occupies a significantly extensive territory, a big part of the continent. Besides, the heartland is mainly located in Russia, which means the country has reasonable provisions for natural resources. Not only on land, but Russia can develop on the water – ships, trade, other natural resources, Etc. Russia's "middleness" between the East and the West allows for high adaptiveness. The country expanded its territories by territorial conquest, which Britain could not do. In the 19th century, Britain significantly influenced the world by having so many colonies and controlled territories that enhanced its power. Russia's location is highly convenient when it comes to making alliances. Unlike Europe or the Americas, Russia can ally and build relations with both the East and the West. This factor made the adoption of a new, significantly different ideology possible, at least because it unified the multicultural scene of the country. In the case of Britain, if it had done that, it could have lost its colonies and other controlled territories. It would have created an even more significant cultural and political breach, something that Britain would not have let happen because it would have meant the loss of its power and influence.

Societal and religious elements that played a role in this scenario influence each other. Both countries struggled with poverty, and the population of both countries had a reason to want to change that. However, the cases still differed. One of the differences is where people primarily lived. Russia required faster urban growth. People worked and lived mainly in the villages and were not too excited to change that. However, people in Britain

overcrowded the big cities in search of better opportunities that they usually did not find. Poverty and the rate of criminal activity would, as a result, be higher in Britain. However, this is where one must also consider religion. British believed in the idea that material prosperity was possible. It is the reason they went to the cities in the first place. Russians were not so focused on that, so losing private ownership that Communism advocated for was not as significant of a loss for them as it would have been for the British (it does not matter how much people had, but what they believed they could have). Protestant ethics in Britain allowed people to want to take control of their lives. At the same time, traditional Orthodoxy in Russia heavily relied on the idea of the inevitability of some things because that is how God predetermined them.

Interestingly, there was a social Christianity movement in Britain. However, it did not achieve anything or bring the country closer to adopting Communism as an ideology. The reason for that was most likely the division within the movement. Different groups and organizations could not agree on how to interpret their purpose and actions so that they would align with the Bible. There was no chance for them to make a difference in a situation like that.

Although it was not based on religion in Russia, there was a unifying person. Vladimir Lenin was a vital element in why Communism prospered in Russia. Lenin was the last connecting piece of the puzzle that helped Communism become relevant in the country by leading the revolution of 1917. The Communist Manifesto was initially published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages. This factor left Russia out, forcing it to rely on Lenin and his interpretation of the German language and ideology. It gave a possible grace period during which the possibility of Communism moving along in Russia became possible. At the same time, the manifesto had already been published in Britain for years, which could have allowed the proletariat

to unite and overthrow the bourgeois, but it did not. The irony is that changes require time to get familiar with - what to do next and why to do it. The proletariat can do that only if someone takes the responsibility of the frontman and leads them toward their common goal. Marx and Engels died before the century ended, and there was no one else significant enough to take on the role of the leader, whereas, in Russia, Lenin continued to pursue changes.

Finally, the fact that the Russian monarchy was overthrown in 1917 proves that the British bourgeoisie was stronger and more potent than that of Russia. Both countries had poor living conditions for the proletariat, but one kept the class from taking over while the other fell into significant political changes.

Although these factors do not form a complete picture but show the little pieces that played crucial roles in the transformations of countries, although Britain did not adopt Communism, it still changed and was even influenced by Russia's adoption of it.

However, the ultimate question of this paper is to find out how soon philosophy impacts geopolitics. Communist Manifesto was published in 1848. The revolution that changed Russia's ideology vector took place in 1917. It took nearly 70 years and a different country for philosophy to come to life as an ideology. Majorly, it did not impact Russia's geopolitics. The country's size fluctuated slightly but not significantly. However, the impact that mattered was the "Iron Curtain" that the Soviet Union lived behind for nearly 70 years. It changed the country's foreign affairs. It had to become more selective, strict and closed to preserve internal affairs – but also systematically exported communist revolutions. That, in turn, influenced the policies of the rest of the world. It also influenced world economics. However, that is a topic for another research. Even now, over 30 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it continues to impact geopolitics. The 15 countries that the USSR consisted of now share history. When making political decisions and

forming alliances, all 15 states remember and emphasize that they have that in common. However, while some countries might “stick together” because of it, others will make a lot of effort to not associate with that part of history.

To conclude, a simple answer to whether or not philosophy impacts geopolitics based on the case of Communism is yes. However, there is no particular element that has to exist for philosophy to change geopolitics. As shown above, it combines seemingly little things that will result in a change. However, even if all those conditions are met, it is not guaranteed that the change will take place.



## List of References

Backhouse, F. B. A. (2022, May 12). French invasion of Russia | Description & Facts.

Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/French-invasion-of-Russia>

Black, J. (2005). *The Ottoman Empire in the Age of Revolutions* (Vol. vol.4).

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blumberg, A. (1951). Russian Policy and the Franco-Austrian War of 1859 on JSTOR.

Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1874793>

Boyer, G. R. (1995). The Historical Background of the Communist Manifesto on

JSTOR. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2646899>

Chinese Civil War | Summary, Causes, & Results. (2023, March 28). Retrieved from

<https://www.britannica.com/event/Chinese-Civil-War/Nationalist-collapse-and-the-establishment-of-the-Peoples-Republic-of-China-1949>

Colley, L. (2005). *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. Yale University Press.

The Commonwealth and the First World War. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.nam.ac.uk/explore/commonwealth-and-first-world-war#:~:text=14%20July%201916-,Britain,total%20of%20700%2C000%20trained%20soldiers.>

Deudney, D. H. (2023, March 6). Geopolitics | political science. Retrieved from

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/geopolitics>

Disraeli, B. (2021). *Sybil, Or The Two Nations Annotated*.

- Dodds, K. (2019). *Geopolitics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Fedorov, V. A. (2003). *Русская Православная Церковь и государство: Синодальный период, 1700-1917*.
- Figes, O. (2010). *The Crimean War: A History*. Metropolitan Books.
- Foster, J. (2012). Eric Hobsbawm, Marxism and social history on JSTOR. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24246497>
- Hatzivassiliou, E. (2012). The Geopolitical Theories of Ratzel and Haushofer: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, (16(3)), 338–354.
- Haushofer, K. (1938). *Geopolitics of the Pacific Ocean*.
- Heffernan, M. (2019). The pan-regions concept in international relations: a critical assessment. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 60(1), 57–77.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2011). *How To Change The World: Tales of Marx and Marxism*. Hachette UK.
- Holmes, L. (2009). *Communism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20045621>
- Jenks, C. W., & Schregle, J. (1999, July 26). Labor law | Definition, History, Elements, & Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/labour-law#ref21751>
- Jones, P. B. (1968a). I. INTRODUCTION: SOCIALISM AND RELIGION. In *Christian Socialist Revival, 1877-1914* (pp. 3–30). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400876976-003>

- Jones, P. B. (1968b). V. STEWART HEADLAM AND THE GUILD OF ST. MATTHEW, 1877-1909. In *Christian Socialist Revival, 1877-1914* (pp. 99–163). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400876976-007>
- Kamenetsky, I. (2017). Karl Haushofer and his legacy: The geopolitics of the Pan-Regions concept. *Geopolitics*, 22(2), 323–345.
- Kjellén, R. (1899). “*Staten som livsform.*”
- Kliuchevsky, V. O. (1997). *A Course in Russian History: The Time of Catherine the Great*. M.E. Sharpe.
- Kurt, D. (2021). What Exactly Is a Socialist Economy? *Investopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/082014/what-exactly-socialist-economy.asp>
- Lieven, D. (2016). *Russia Against Napoleon: The Battle for Europe, 1807 to 1814*.
- Lieven, D. C. B. (1983). *Russia and the Origins of the First World War*.
- The London Working Men’s Association and the “People’s Charter” on JSTOR. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/649916>
- MacKenzie, J. M. (1967). *The Great Game in Asia* (no. 2, Vol. Journal of Contemporary History, 2).
- Mackinder, H. J. (1904). *The Geographical Pivot of History*.
- Mahan, A. T. (1890). *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660-1783*. London : Methuen.
- Malthus, T. (2018). *An Essay on the Principle of Population (1798)*. By: Thomas Malthus: Thomas Robert Malthus FRS (13 February 1766 - 23 December 1834) Was an English Cleric and Scholar, Influential in the Fields of Political Economy and Demography. Malthus Himself Used Only His Middle Name, Robert.

- McDougall, W. A. (2023, May 1). 20th-century international relations | History & Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/20th-century-international-relations-2085155>
- Miner, R. H. (2003). *The Russo-Japanese War: An Overview* (3rd ed., Vol. 67). The Journal of Military History.
- Moss, W. (2002). *A History of Russia: To 1917*.
- Ollie. (n.d.). Formation of the CPGB (1920). Retrieved from <https://communistparty.co.uk/resources/formation-of-the-cpgb-1920/>
- Pipes, R. (2012). *The Formation of the Ottoman Empire*. (S. N. Faroqi, Ed.) (Vol. vol.2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pletcher, K. (2023, April 28). Opium Wars | Definition, Summary, Facts, & Causes. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Opium-Wars>
- Proletarian Literature. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199827251/obo-9780199827251-0130.xml>
- Russia | History, Flag, Population, Map, President, & Facts. (2023, April 29). Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Russia/From-Alexander-II-to-Nicholas-II#ref38543>
- Scramble for Africa. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://kids.britannica.com/kids/article/Scramble-for-Africa/632997#>
- Scramble for Africa - New World Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Scramble\\_for\\_Africa](https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Scramble_for_Africa)
- Service, R. (2009). *Comrades: Communism: A World History*. Pan Macmillan.
- Smith, F. T. (1977). Great Britain and the Revolutions of 1848. *Labour History*, (33), 65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/27508282>

Splendid Isolation. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.oxfordreference.com/display/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100524374;jsessionid=7915D7828F0902D31698717ED0CB7934>

Story Map Cascade. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.loc.gov/ghe/cascade/index.html?appid=a0930b1f4e424987ba68c28880f088ea>

Taylor, M. (1996). The 1848 Revolutions and the British Empire on JSTOR. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/651297>

Team, I. (2022). Labor Theory of Value. *Investopedia*. Retrieved from

<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/l/labor-theory-of-value.asp>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998a, July 20). Charter to the Gentry |

Russian history. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Charter-to-the-Gentry>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998b, July 20). Congress of Vienna | Goals, Significance, Definition, & Map. Retrieved from

<https://www.britannica.com/event/Congress-of-Vienna>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998c, July 20). Dreikaiserbund | European history. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Dreikaiserbund>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998d, July 20). Duma | Definition, Facts, & History. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Duma-Russian-assembly>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998e, July 20). October Manifesto | Russia [1905]. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/October-Manifesto>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998f, July 20). Revolutions of 1848 | Causes, Summary, & Significance. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Revolutions-of-1848>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (1998g, July 20). Russo-Turkish wars | Russo-Turkish history. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Russo-Turkish-wars>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023a, March 9). Karl Haushofer | German officer and political geographer. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Karl-Ernst-Haushofer>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023b, March 28). Russian Revolution of 1905. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Russian-Revolution-of-1905>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023c, April 2). Industrial Revolution | Definition, History, Dates, Summary, & Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Industrial-Revolution>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023d, April 7). Russo-Japanese War | Causes, Summary, Maps, & Significance. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Russo-Japanese-War>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023e, April 7). Russo-Japanese War | Causes, Summary, Maps, & Significance. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Russo-Japanese-War>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023f, April 24). Russian Revolution | Definition, Causes, Summary, History, & Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Russian-Revolution>

- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2023g, April 26). Crimean War | Map, Summary, Combatants, Causes, & Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Crimean-War>
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.). Causes and the effects of the Russo-Japanese War. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/summary/Russo-Japanese-War>
- Tucker, R. C. (1974). Communist Revolutions, National Cultures, and the Divided Nations on JSTOR. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45366747>
- United Kingdom | History, Population, Map, Flag, Capital, & Facts. (2023, April 29). Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/place/United-Kingdom/The-Napoleonic-Wars>
- Van Der Wusten, H., & O'Loughlin, J. (1990). Political Geography of Panregions. *Geographical Review*, 80(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.2307/215894>
- Wallace, W. M. (2023, April 14). American Revolution | Causes, Battles, Aftermath, & Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/American-Revolution>
- Weigert, H. W., & Haushofer, K. (1942). Haushofer and the Pacific. *Foreign Affairs*, 20(4), 732. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20029189>
- Айрапетов, О. (n.d.). После Крымской войны: борьба России после поражения и изоляции. Retrieved from <https://regnum.ru/news/polit/2251376.html>
- Александрович, Н. С. (2017). Эволюция колониальной политики Великобритании на Востоке (вторая половина XIX -первая половина XX вв. ). *Локус: Люди, Общество, Культуры, Смыслы*, (1). Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/evolyutsiya-kolonialnoy-politiki-velikobritanii-na-vostoke-vtoraya-polovina-xix-pervaya-polovina-xx-vv>

Рыбкина, Н. А. (2023). Геополитика России 16-19 века. *spravochnick.ru*. Retrieved from

[https://spravochnick.ru/politologiya/geopolitika\\_kak\\_nauka/geopolitika\\_rossii\\_16-19\\_veka/](https://spravochnick.ru/politologiya/geopolitika_kak_nauka/geopolitika_rossii_16-19_veka/)

Трофимова, З. (2015). Христианский социализм в Англии в XIX веке. *Вестник*

*Московского Университета. Серия 7: Философия*, (2), 35–45. Retrieved

from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/hristianskiy-sotsializm-v-anglii-v-xix-veke/pdf>