SECTION XXIV. PHILOSOPHY

Kovaleva M.V., Mikhailov O.V.

Search for Ways to overcome the Crisis by Representatives of Russian Religious Thought*Kursk State and Municipal Service Academy
(Russia, Kursk)**doi 10.18411/gq-31-03-2021-61**idsp sciencerussia-31-03-2021-61***Abstract**

The crisis at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries affected different countries and different aspects of social life, which was inevitable both due to geographical proximity and cultural, economic, political and other intersections. Addressing the topic of the socio-cultural crisis was characteristic of both Russian and Western European philosophers of the early 20th century.

The author in the article refers to the understanding of its features and ways to overcome it in the context of the ideas of Russian religious philosophers. An integral feature of Russian philosophical thought in the context of assessing the ongoing social changes and the search for ways out of a crisis situation is an understanding of the special purpose of Russia and an awareness of its role in human history. The works of Russian philosophers are full of anxiety about the future of mankind, about the fate of Russia, a premonition of possible death, therefore it is no coincidence that the appeal to the theme of the Apocalypse, the impending catastrophe, the end of history is perceived as a real threat to the existence of mankind. With all the diversity of approaches to assessing the sociocultural crisis, Russian thinkers are united by common philosophical roots, religion, national and cultural traditions.

In the context of understanding the crisis processes of the early twentieth century, Russian religious thinkers raise the question of the role and significance of a person in the transformation of life, thereby actualizing the moral and anthropological problems.

Keywords: crisis, culture, ways of overcoming, Russian religious philosophy, anthropological problems, values

The crisis of the turn of the XIX-XX centuries affected different countries and different aspects of public life, which was inevitable both due to geographical proximity, and cultural, economic, political and other intersections. From the point of view of modern researchers, the socio-cultural crisis of this period of time was not a local, narrowly national phenomenon, so it is impossible to limit the national limits in the characterization of this phenomenon (whether European, Russian, Western or Eastern). The impending catastrophe was observed in all culturally developed countries. Russian Federation in the first third of the twentieth century is also experiencing acute crisis events: the first Russian Revolution, the First World War, the events of October 1917, the Russo-Japanese War, etc. After the defeat of the first Russian revolution of romantic ideals and hopes of the fate of the Motherland, the people, replaced by disbelief and despair, a sense of stagnation of Russian life. The series of social catastrophes of the first decades of the century, which passed into the era of "socialism", caused a rapid increase in the crisis consciousness in Russian society and, as a result, a surge of interest in eschatological, "final" problems. It should be noted that "an excessive, sometimes painful tendency to eschatology was not the only one of the spiritual temptations that overcame our thinkers." [1]. The First World War and the subsequent revolution of 1917 exacerbate the situation of the crisis. At this difficult historical moment, Russian religious philosophers turn to a deep understanding of the nature of this phenomenon.

Having identified the causes and essential features of the socio-cultural crisis, we will turn to understanding its features and ways to overcome it in the context of the ideas of Russian religious philosophers.

As we have already noted, the appeal to the topic of the socio-cultural crisis was typical for both domestic and Western European philosophers of the early XX century. However, despite the proximity of the original theme of the works of Russian religious philosophers and Western thinkers distinguished, first, certain specifics in the understanding of crisis events, and secondly, different views on how to resolve the crisis. All this is influenced by national and cultural traditions, as well as the peculiarities of the mentality. If the works of Western thinkers are characterized by a clear presentation, sober analysis, certainty, and appeal to the human mind, then the Russian philosophical thought of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reflects the acute and painful experience of the crisis situation in Russia. Philosophers recognize the inevitable finality of the course of history, tragically perceive the cataclysms of the twentieth century, linking them with the events in Europe. It should be noted that Russian thought is distinguished by the breadth of the genre spectrum of the presentation of the topic of the crisis: from the theoretical and historical-cultural analysis of the crisis situation to the rich existential insights, artistic creativity.

It is also important to emphasize that an integral feature of Russian philosophical thought in the context of assessing the ongoing social changes and finding ways out of the crisis situation is the understanding of the special purpose of Russia and the awareness of its role in the history of mankind. The works of Russian philosophers are full of anxiety about the future of humanity, about the fate of Russia, and a premonition of possible death, so it is not accidental that they turn to the theme of the Apocalypse, the coming catastrophe, the end of history, which is perceived as a real threat to the existence of humanity.

Despite the diversity of approaches to assessing the socio-cultural crisis, Russian thinkers share common philosophical roots, religion, national and cultural traditions. These features allow us to distinguish their work as a single separate direction in the philosophy of crisis, the so-called Russian component of the philosophy of crisis[2]. Russian religious philosophers, as well as Russian writers and poets of this era, can be seen in the theme of the cultural crisis.

Already at the beginning of the twentieth century, on the pages of literary publications, there are statements stating the crisis state of Russian society, the instability of public consciousness, culture, and art. The artistic moods of the greatest Russian writers feed on the feeling of boredom of life, the longing for death, express the duality of moral consciousness, the replacement of the natural attitude to life with occult and mystical symbolism[3]. At the same time, there is an obvious commonality in understanding the trends of the Russian and European socio-cultural crisis. So, a well-known publicist of that time, A. Gilyarov in his work "Dying thoughts of the nineteenth century in France" writes about the situation in Russia, specifying that "this situation, however, is not only local, but also of general European significance[4]."

T. Y. Sidorina emphasizes that "if for Europe the essence of the tragedy is the loss of spiritual, intellectual, and creative heights, for Russian philosophy it is the realization of the possibility of the end of human history in the direct, physical sense. Awareness, which was aggravated by the social situation first in Europe, and then in Russian society. This is largely due to the special vision of ways to overcome the crisis in Western European and Russian philosophy. For Western thinkers, it is important to overcome the devastating consequences of the crisis, to preserve the Renaissance culture and its spiritual values – in this they see the salvation of Europe. For Russian thinkers, it is not a matter of getting out of the crisis, but of the certainty of Russia's future, of its destiny. The crisis of Europe and its reflection in the fate of Russia (war, revolution) are perceived as something temporary, accidental, incommensurable, with the grandiosity of the historical path intended for the Russian people. The concrete situation in Russia is considered as a historical fact, a historical fact that cannot

fundamentally change what is destined for Russia and what should happen." For example, in the work "The Will to Live and the Will to Culture", N. A. Berdyaev, comparing the manifestations of the socio-cultural crisis in Russia and Europe, notes that "Russia has always been a mysterious country, incomprehensible even in its fate, a country in which a passionate dream of a religious transformation of life was burning. Will the culture is always sales cialis the will to live and the will was of two kinds, which are often mixed, an orientation to social transformation of life in civilization and direction to the religious transformation of life, the miracle of the fate of human society, the fate of the nation. We began to experience a cultural crisis without having fully experienced the culture itself. The traditions of our culture have always been too weak[4]."

For N. A. Berdyaev, the crisis in Russia is something significantly different from the Western European cultural crisis. "The Russian consciousness is given to understand the crisis of culture and the tragedy of historical fate more acutely and in depth than the more prosperous people of the West[4]."

T. Y. Sidorina emphasizes that the philosopher clearly feels that "the world is entering a period of long-term trouble and great upheavals. But great values must be carried through all the trials. To do this, the human spirit needs to be clothed in the armor should be chivalrous armed[4]."

It is important to note that the emergence of a cultural crisis is influenced by social cataclysms. A significant part of humanity, according to N. A. Berdyaev, was spiritually unprepared for the catastrophe of the World War. In the vast mass of the Russian intelligentsia, the war creates a deep crisis of consciousness, a change in the main priorities of life. The thinker analyzes the crisis of intellectual consciousness in Russia, paying attention to the transformation of its two important parameters: first, the appeal of consciousness to social and domestic political problems, and secondly, the system of values formed over a long time. These mechanisms do not stand up to the test of the World War and the Russian revolution, which, in turn, causes, from the point of view of the philosopher, a crisis feeling of "abandonment", insolvency, untimeliness, incapacity, etc. The usual proven doctrines and theories are powerless in the face of the "terrible face of the world historical fate, unable to explain what is happening. All this requires, according to N. A. Berdyaev, an urgent restructuring of consciousness, traditional values. Thus, one of the characteristic features of the cultural crisis in Russia at the beginning of the XX century is that, unable to withstand the yoke of a social catastrophe, the value system begins to change radically.

Disillusionment with values, as N. A. Berdyaev emphasizes, thus befalls both the West and Russia. However, disillusionment with traditional intellectual values, according to N. A. Berdyaev, also has positive consequences for Russia: "To the broad circles of the intelligentsia, the war brings a consciousness of the value of its nationality, the value of any nationality, which it was almost deprived of. For the traditional intellectual consciousness, there was the value of goodness, justice, the good of the people, the brotherhood of peoples, but there was no value of nationality, which occupies a special place in the hierarchy of world values. Nationality was not seen as a value in itself, but as something subordinate to other abstract values of the good. And this is explained, first of all, by the fact that the traditional consciousness of the intelligentsia has never been turned to the historically concrete, it has always lived in abstract categories and assessments[5]." Thus, the philosopher considers the consequences of the crisis as the emergence, the birth of a new consciousness, turned to the historical, concrete[5].

Assessing the destructive and negative consequences of war, N. A. Berdyaev notes that war shows the trends of the civilizational path of development, reflects the meaning of events and the nature of the era. It contributes to the deepening of life, the awakening of creative forces, the demonstration of mistakes, and the utopianism of most social trends. This experience, the philosopher concludes, must be used to choose. Just like N. A. Berdyaev, S. L. Frank believes that the war is a complete surprise for the majority of Russian educated people,

no one believes in its destructive nature. But, having realized the enormity of what is happening, it is necessary to learn lessons and conclude that it is possible to return to the lost cultural life only by finally eliminating the very source of war.

S. L. Frank argues that in a crisis, the old foundations are destroyed, society begins to believe that they are, if not false, then relative. Crisis processes have a destructive beginning. However, from the point of view of S. L. Frank, under the influence of a negative-perverted beginning, the crisis, in fact, fruitfully heals the spiritual sphere, clearing a place for a solid foundation of being. A person, from the point of view of S. L. Frank, risks losing a reasonable and lively attitude to reality if he believes in the old values. This is the meaning and consequences of the crisis.

S. N. Bulgakov in his work "Heroism and Asceticism" notes that the crisis must necessarily end with a rethinking of existing values. In Russia, "after a political crisis comes a spiritual crisis that requires deep, focused reflection, self-reflection, self-examination, self-criticism[6]."

In the context of understanding the crisis processes of the early twentieth century, Russian religious thinkers raise the question of the role and significance of man in the transformation of life, thereby actualizing the moral and anthropological problems.

So, according to N. A. Berdyaev, the will to live in a religious transformation is the will to transform culture, it is really symbolic, like all spheres of culture, and in itself is not a religious transformation of life, but only a symbol of this transformation. Asserting a new creative religious era, N. A. Berdyaev defines it as the transition of the church from the era of culture to the era of religious transformation. The philosopher evaluates religious transformation as a way to save humanity, which has become on the path of self-destruction. From the point of view of N. A. Berdyaev, a person should not lose his connection with God, it is necessary to assert the image of God in himself. Only in this case will a person be able to assert himself to the end and preserve the source of his creativity: "If he does not bear the image of the Supreme divine nature, he loses the way, he begins to obey the inferior processes of the lower elements, begins the dismemberment of the elements of his own culture, he begins to obey the artificial nature that he brought to life, to submit to the mechanical nature of the machine, and it is depersonalizing, weakens, destroy[7]".

When the human personality, N. A. Berdyaev notes, wants to know nothing but itself, it is dispersed, allowing the invasion of the lower natural elements. When a person recognizes no one but himself, he ceases to feel himself. To be an individual to the end, it is necessary to recognize not only another human personality and individuality, but also, according to N. A. Berdyaev, the Divine personality. This gives us a sense of human individuality; the boundless self-assertion, which does not want to know anything about itself, leads to the loss of a person.

It is also important to note that N. A. Berdyaev believes in the spiritual rebirth of the Russian people. The philosopher largely connects the ways of overcoming the catastrophe with the unification of all Christian humanity, all positive spiritual, Christian forces around the world against the forces of antichrist and destructive forces. He believes in the possibility of a "sacred union" of all creative Christian forces, which begins "with repentance and atonement for the sins for which terrible trials have been sent to us. All camps and all classes are guilty. The exclusive immersion of Europe in social issues, solved by malice and hatred, is the downfall of humanity. The solution of social issues that overcomes social injustice and poverty presupposes the spiritual rebirth of humanity[8]."

N. A. Berdyaev expressed deep hope that the Russian intelligentsia would play a significant role in overcoming the social and cultural crisis. "A whole century of the Russian intelligentsia," notes N. A. Berdyaev, "lived in denial and undermined the foundations of Russia's existence. Now it must turn to positive principles, to absolute shrines, in order to revive Russia[8]." It is important to note that this high purpose involves a huge internal

educational work, which includes the re-education of the character of the Russian person, as well as a radical change in the worldview.

N. A. Berdyaev emphasizes that, while remaining Russian, it is necessary to learn some Western virtues. Russian Russians in Western Europe should find the universal shrine, thanks to which the Russian people have been spiritually alive for centuries. It is necessary to find this Universal shrine and get closer to it spiritually. Russian intelligentsia should also preserve its truly Russian and enduring values, from the philosopher's point of view. The philosopher also expresses the hope that "the Russian intelligentsia, freed from provincialism, negative connectedness and limitations, will finally come out into the historical expanse and there will carry its thirst for truth on earth, its often unconscious dream of world salvation and its will for a new, better life for humanity[9]."

The modern reader is well acquainted with the "Milestones" and the controversy surrounding them. All the authors of this collection express the idea that the way out of the social and cultural crisis lies in the creative self-improvement of the individual, in the education of his responsibility.

In the work "The Fate of Russia", N. A. Berdyaev justifies the position that the future of Russia is predetermined and depends on the religious beliefs of the Russian people. He believes in the salvation of Russia, and believes that it will be sent by God. "The process of recovery is a slow but organic process. This is, first of all, the redemption from the spirit of lies, the exit from the realm of phantasmal ghosts to the realities. What is most necessary now is to assert the primacy of spiritual activity over political activity... the free spirit must act regardless of which forces prevail and triumph. Christianity ...must once again conquer the world". He's writing: "Russia must enter the world wide... A strong cosmic wind shakes all countries, peoples and cultures. To resist this wind, you need a great spiritual focus and depth, you need a religious experience of historical catastrophes[4]."

S. L. Frank more pessimistic in their assessment of the contribution of the Russian people in the construction of culture, the assessment of the Russian intelligentsia as a carrier of cultural traditions. The Russian intellectual, the philosopher notes, is alien and partly hostile to the concept of culture in the exact and strict sense of the word. The Russian person is not related to the pure concept of culture, which is ingrained in the consciousness of the European[10]. The development of external and internal conditions of life, the increase of material and spiritual productivity, the improvement of political, social, and everyday forms of communication, the progress of morality, religion, science, and art – this is the concept of culture that inspires the European. Culture does not exist for anyone's good or benefit, but for itself; cultural creativity means the improvement of human nature and the realization of ideal values.

From the point of view of S. L. Frank, in Russia, culture is understood as that which is marked by the seal of utilitarianism. When we talk about culture, we mean either railways and bridges, or the development of public education, or the improvement of the political mechanism. But such a utilitarian evaluation of culture is as incompatible with its pure idea as an exclusively utilitarian evaluation of science or art destroys the very essence of what is called science and art. It is this pure concept of culture, as S. L. Frank asserts, that has no place in the mindset of the Russian intellectual; it is alien to him. The squalor, the spiritual poverty of all life, prevents us from developing and strengthening an immediate love for culture, as if it kills the instinct for culture and makes a person immune to the idea of culture. From the point of view of the philosopher, the Russian intellectual does not have a pure concept of culture, it is antipathetic to him. He instinctively feels in it his enemy, culture is for him an unnecessary and morally impermissible barstvo. S. L. Frank justifies the idea that the struggle against culture is one of the characteristic features of the Russian people. Thus, our historical, everyday unaccustomed to culture and the metaphysical repulsion of the intellectual worldview from the idea of culture psychologically merge, according to S. L. Frank, into one whole and cooperate in perpetuating the low cultural level of our entire

history. Such an attitude to culture, from the point of view of the philosopher, is the basis of the acute crisis that arose in the early twentieth century and fell like an avalanche on all that is best, valuable, universal, that was created by Russian culture.

"The struggle is needed not with the intelligentsia," S. N. Bulgakov notes on this occasion, "but with the intelligentsia in the name of spiritual culture. And we must hope that the lessons of history and the trials experienced will teach the intelligentsia a lot, deepen its spiritual consciousness and, most importantly, move it to church formation. In the meantime, the intelligentsia, indeed, is experiencing a severe crisis, but it is, at the same time, the crisis of Russia[11]."

S. L. Frank in his work "The Collapse of idols", which is a program for the philosophy of culture of Russian religious thought, notes that, first, it is impossible to identify progress in the development of culture. Humanity does not go steadily on some smooth and direct path to the realization of good and truth. It is much more clearly visible that it wanders as if in a fog, sometimes rising from a height, then falling again into the abyss. Each epoch has its own ideas about what is good and evil, what is culture and anti-culture, each epoch has its own faith, the falsity and one-sidedness of which is then exposed. So, if earlier it seemed that the new time in comparison with the Middle Ages was an indisputable improvement of humanity, its liberation from intellectual, moral and spiritual darkness, the liberation of the individual, the accumulation of material and spiritual wealth, but now the new time seems to be an era that has made irreparable devastation in the souls of people, caused unprecedented bitterness. This bright and impressive development of culture has led to a new barbarism before our eyes, says the philosopher[12].

Consequently, the philosopher concludes, there is no pre-ordained path, identified and scientifically proven, for humanity. In general, there is no path for society as a whole, the path can only be found by every person who does not expect and does not hope that culture will automatically lead him to a better future. "In order to know what to live for and where to go, everyone needs to find an absolute support in some particular instance, in the depths of their own spirit; it is necessary to look for the age of your path not on the earth, where you are floating in a boundless ocean, on which waves move senselessly and various currents collide – you need to look, at your own risk and responsibility, for a guiding star in some spiritual heaven and go to it independently of all currents and, perhaps, in spite of them[13]."

Secondly, what used to be called a vague and vague concept of "culture", which includes a general set of human achievements: science, art, education, upbringing, economics, legal relations, technology – all this, according to S. L. Frank, decomposed in the twentieth century and turned out to be a complex, contradictory, uncoordinated conglomerate. The philosopher argues that it is impossible to talk about a single culture, you can now observe callousness, cruelty, intolerance. In this sense, the belief in "culture" is dying in our soul, and all the old, previously undisputed values are subject to revision and verification. From the vague, fragmentary, contradictory and illusory concept of culture, we must, as the philosopher believes, return to a more fundamental, simple concept of life, its eternal spiritual needs and needs. This is how the thinker sees a way out of the current crisis situation in Russia.

In the work "The Religion of Man-God in the Russian Revolution" S. N. Bulgakov also suggests a way to overcome the crisis situation in Russia: "We must start something new, take into account historical experience, show ourselves and our mistakes in it, because otherwise, if we see them only in others, on the opposite side, we will remain hypnotized by our hostility to it and will not learn anything. Self-exploration, self-exploration, accumulation of spiritual forces, creativity of culture are needed. The different parties should apply this update themselves, but if you go down to the bottom, at the depth of the soul, is the creation of a new identity and a new life, a new and more conscious of religious self-determination"[13]. S. N. Bulgakov describes the early XX century as "searing and disturbing modern". To understand the beating of its pulse, from his point of view, one should seek the

help of religious-historical intuitions, which allow one to grasp the meaning of time more sensitively than positive historical studies[14].

Thus, S. N. Bulgakov sees the way out of the crisis situation not in returning to the former, once stable situation, but in self-renewal for further cultural creation, in turning to religious "intuitions".

Returning to the analysis of the "Milestones", we can say that one of their semantic plot lines is reduced to an assessment of the revolution of 1905-1907. The initial premise, which unites vekovtsev was their denial of the social revolution. They propose to throw the very idea of revolution "overboard" altogether, thereby finally and irrevocably embarking on the reformist path of social development.

Reflecting on the religious nature of the Russian intelligentsia, S. N. Bulgakov in his work "Heroism and Asceticism" concludes that "the revolution is the spiritual brainchild of the intelligentsia, and, consequently, its history is a historical trial of this intelligentsia[6]." Assessing the state of Russian society, S. N. Bulgakov rightly notes that the revolution calls into question the very viability of Russian citizenship and statehood. "Society is exhausted by failures and is in a kind of stupor, crime is growing, morals are becoming coarser, after a political crisis, a spiritual crisis has come." The philosopher concludes: "The concept of revolution is negative, it has no independent content, but is characterized only by the negation of what it destroys, so the pathos of revolution is hatred and destruction[6]."

S. L. Frank evaluates revolutionism as "fundamental revolutionism, meaning by the latter the belief that the main and intrinsically necessary means to realize the moral and social ideal is the social struggle and the violent destruction of existing social forms[10]." Of course, the destruction of old social forms ensures the realization of the social ideal, but this is an anti-cultural trend. It is necessary, from the point of view of the thinker, to direct all energy to creative creation, because, concludes S. L. Frank in the words of F. Nietzsche, "the world does not revolve around the creators of new values."

At the heart of revolutionism is a motive that, according to the philosopher, forms the driving force of the socialist faith: "social optimism and the mechanical-rationalistic theory of happiness based on it." According to this theory, "the inner conditions for human happiness is always there, and obstacles to the dispensation of earthly Paradise, are within and outside of man in his social environment, imperfections social mechanism[10]." S. L. Frank urges to go to creative, religious humanism, promoting cultural creation.

Thus, S. L. Frank connects overcoming the crisis situation with religious transformation. In the preface to the book "The Collapse of idols", he writes about the need of humanity for true faith, about the presence of "an unconscious aspiration of the will to believe, an unconscious aspiration of the will to something that would not be ghostly, but would be a genuine, solid, real basis of being[10]."

Consequently, Russian religious philosophers see the causes of the socio-cultural crisis in the complexities of social and domestic political development, as well as in the deformation of the existing system of values. Having comprehended the state of Russian life at the beginning of the XX century, they offer the following ways out of the cultural crisis:

- religious transformation of life, establishing the connection of a person with God;
- the revival of spirituality, the appeal to "positive principles", absolute shrines, truly Russian values;
- on these grounds, the re-education of a person, the creation of a new personality;
- self-renewal for further cultural creation;
- taking into account historical experience and mistakes.

Thus, analyzing the topic of the cultural crisis, Russian religious philosophers give it an essential assessment, understanding the crisis as a self-renewal for further cultural creation, and determine the ways out of it.

1. Shusharin D. Return to the context // New world. M., 1994.
 2. Sidorina T.Yu. Philosophy of the crisis. M.:Flinta: Science, 2003.
 3. Solonin Yu.N. Crisis of culture in the context of Russian and Western European mentality // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University, Ser. 6. Issue. 3 (No. 20). 1993. Sidorina T.Yu. Philosophy of the crisis. M.:Flinta: Science, 2003.
 4. Berdyaev N.A. The will to live and the will to culture // Berdyaev N.A. The meaning of the story.
 5. Berdyaev N.A. Cosmic and sociological perception of the world // Berdyaev N.A. The fate of Russia. M., 1990.
 6. Bulgakov S.N. Heroism and selfless devotion // Milestones from the depths. M., 1991.
 7. Berdyaev N.A. Russian idea // About Russia and Russian culture. M., 1990.
 8. Berdyaev N.A. World danger // Berdyaev N.A. The fate of Russia. M., 1990.
 9. Berdyaev N.A. War and the crisis of the intelligentsia's consciousness // Berdyaev N.A. The fate of Russia. M., 1990.
 10. Frank S.L. Ethics of nihilism // Vekhi. From the depth. M., 1991.
 11. Bulgakov S.N. At the feast of the gods. Modern dialogues // Heroism and selfless devotion. M., 1992.
 12. Frank S.L. Twilight of idols // Works. M., 1990.
 13. Bulgakov S.N. Apocalyptic and socialism // Works: In 2 T. - M., 1993. T. 2.
-