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Abstract. This article discusses the basic concepts of Berdyaev’s philosophy, traces the relationship of his philosophical view and political convictions. This relationship is revealed through the concept of personality, which is the central concept of Berdyaev’s philosophy. Through the attitude to the personality, we can reveal the attitude of N. A. Berdyaev to the institution of the state, understand the social preferences of the Russian philosopher, who has come a long way from the representative of Russian Marxism to Russian religious philosophy. Having understood his ideas about the ideal structure of society, we can understand the attitude of N. A. Berdyaev to the Soviet state. The article distinguishes between two different types of relationships: the individual and society - collectivism and communitarianism. Berdyaev’s view is shown in the origins of Russian communism, which, in the opinion of the philosopher, are found not only in Western European philosophy, but also in the historical mentality of Russian people.

1 Introduction

One of the greatest Russian philosophers of the twentieth century is N.A. Berdyaev. His work is recognized all over the world - it influenced the French personalists (E. Mounier, J. Lacroix), his work was repeatedly nominated for the Nobel Prize in literature, and in 1947, Cambridge University made him a doctor of theology honoris causa. In the work of N.A. Berdyaev, two main directions can be distinguished: actually philosophical and historiosophical. In this article, we will address the purely philosophical aspect of Berdyaev’s work only indirectly, looking more at the historiosophical direction in the work of the Russian philosopher. The purpose of this work is to analyze the basic concepts of Berdyaev’s philosophy, it traces the path from the philosophical worldview of the Russian philosopher to his social and civic position. For this, in the first part of the article we consider the concept of personality in the philosophy of N. A. Berdyaev, which is the basic concept of his philosophy. In the second part of the article, we consider the attitude of N.A. Berdyaev to the institution of the state through the prism of his relationship to the individual. In the third part of the article, we examine the specific political convictions of
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N.A. Berdyaev, in particular his attitude to the Soviet state. In addition, the article considers the view of Berdyaev on the origin of Russian communism.

2 Research method

The main purpose of this article is to clarify the basic concepts of N.A. Berdyaev philosophy. Therefore, this article is built mainly on the analysis of his texts, which is why the hermeneutic method is the main one. In addition, when comparing the views of N.A. Berdyaev and I.A. Ilyin, the comparative method is used.

3 The concept of personality in the philosophy of N. A. Berdyaev

The attitude of N.A. Berdyaev to the institution of the state cannot be understood outside his relationship to the individual. Personality is the center of philosophical interests of Berdyaev. The basic principles of N.A. Berdyaev’s philosophy (freedom, objectification, spirit, creativity) set the intellectual field for the concept of personality, appear in order to adequately convey the philosophical intuitions of the thinker about what exactly is a person in his worldview. According to the comment of a modern researcher I.I. Evlampiev: “Berdyaev’s personality is not only absolutely valuable and independent in a metaphysical sense, it is also metaphysically primary” [1, 342]. Berdyaev talks about two planes of being: the existing world and the objectified world, and essentially this world is one and the same. It should be emphasized that the two planes of being are not two different worlds, but the same world - the difference between these planes of being lies in relation to the being of the one who knows. By virtue of this, Berdyaev’s human is also dualistic - his individuality is categorically opposed to his personality. By an individual, Berdyaev means a person who has not come into an existential movement. The individual belongs to the world of unfreedom and law, he is determined in his being by his time, environment, origin, but the person, according to Berdyaev, is an alien objectified world. The origins of the personality are outside the deterministic world - in meonic freedom, it can only be understood dynamically - it is never given, but it always happens, because it is a continuous dynamic effort and is a process of self-creation. A person can touch freedom only because in man, as in God's creation, freedom, which is this nothing, is already ontologically given - God creates the world from freedom, which is nothing. A person also constantly creates himself out of nothing; he is born in this continuous effort of a creative act. Therefore, it is impossible to answer to the question: "What should a person do in a given situation?" - the ethics of personality is not defined, on the contrary, ethics is born in the continuous creative effort of the personality itself. According to Berdyaev, the correlate of personality is God - in his movement towards God, the individual becomes a personality. The attraction of man by God is not violent, because God does not violate human freedom. A man freely answers God’s longing for him: “God longs for his friend, for the subject of his infinite love, waiting for an answer to his divine call” [2, 196]. According to Berdyaev, a spiritual search for a person takes place not only in following a person after God, but also through opposition to God, along the path of following “evil” freedom, as a person learns to distinguish between good and evil. But if, following “evil” freedom, a person freezes in evil, he becomes not free - a slave to his passions, degrades and disintegrates as a person: “Personality is forged in distinguishing between good and evil, in establishing the boundaries of evil” [2, 164]. The necessary openness of a person, his outwardness, to his own another is expressed: in relation to God - the idea of God-manhood, in relation to
another person - the idea of androgyny, in relation to nature - the knowledge of primary reality.

We can conclude that the concept of N.A. Berdyaev’s personality differs from both the concept of human understanding inherent in traditional society and the concept of human understanding in modern times. His understanding of personality contains the traits and personality of modernity (self-will), and the traits of man are pre-modern (man is correlative to God) and is a fusion of various concepts, due to the unique worldview of N.A. Berdyaev. Berdyaev understands the personality dynamically - it is born in the process of creativity, and not sociologically, that is, the personality is not a substance or social relations, but a dynamic process of the individual overcoming the objectified being. Berdyaev reflects on personality initially in the framework of the Christian paradigm, but Jacob Böhme's worldview also influenced his idea of personality.

4 N.A. Berdyaev about the nature of the state

Over the years of his work N.A. Berdyaev has repeatedly turned to thoughts about the nature of the state - this topic really worries him. Berdyaev sees reality in the state, but the reality of a special plan of being - on the one hand, the state does not exist outside of each specific person, but, on the other hand, the power of the state over each person is obvious: "The state is not a person, not a being, not an organism is not an essence (essentia), it does not have its own existence, existence is always in humans" [3, 567]. The state is always functional; it seeks to be totalitarian in its essence and inevitably transgresses the borders allotted for it. For N.A. Berdyaev, the state is always the fallen "kingdom of Caesar", which can tolerate the presence of the "kingdom of God" in itself only if the state receives any benefit. The state’s source of power is always irrational, in its daily existence the state relies on irrational beliefs, forms its own myths: “The state in its implementation of the will to power always needed myths, it could not exist without irrational symbols” [3, 567]. The power of the state, for N.A. Berdyaev, is true, but only because everyone agrees that this power really exists - in the general agreement that the power of the state is real, and not illusory, N.A. Berdyaev sees something hypnotic. According to N.A. Berdyaev, personal freedom is not social, but spiritual in nature, since freedom itself, according to N.A. Berdyaev, is the ontological component of all being, and this is the “fabric” of creation from which God creates the world. Freedom is not created and prey, it is pure nothing. It refers entirely to the existing world, and our knowledge of it is entirely symbolic knowledge. We again see the traditional N.A. Berdyaev dualism: they completely exclude freedom from the objectified world; here is the world of determination, the place of freedom is in the spiritual world. Freedom is neither good nor evil, since it is only a pure possibility of both good and evil (for example, water can both save a person from death and cause him to die). The reason for the emergence of evil is the selfish use of their freedom by the subjects of the created world, since the very possibility of evil is already inherent in the irrationality of freedom.

N.A. Berdyaev sees the relationship between a man and the state not so much in building a free society, but in "affirming the freedom of the human person from the unlimited power of society and the state" [4, 177]. Speaking about the social aspect of freedom, N.A. Berdyaev believes that many of the freedoms proclaimed by modern society - political freedom, economic freedom, social freedom - often turn into denial of ourselves. People, tired of the failure to fulfill promises by the modern state, of the mismatch of life and the stated ideals, simply cease to believe in such freedom: "Freedom was isolated. <...> A formal understanding of freedom led to real lack of freedom" [4, 176]. Considering the relationship between the individual and society, it should be noted that any power
subordination of the individual to any social system is impossible for N.A. Berdyaev, a contradiction to the basic principles of his worldview, which placed the interests and freedom of the individual at the forefront of its philosophy. N.A. Berdyaev could not reconcile himself to the fact that in the "kingdom of Caesar" inevitability was not personal, personal, and, in the opinion of the Russian philosopher, the only one actually existing, but collective. Within the boundaries of Berdyaev’s personalist philosophy, this state of affairs seems almost absurd. The individualism of capitalist consciousness for N.A. Berdyaev does not solve the problem indicated by him, since current collectivism is largely the result of the impersonal nature of capitalism. Collectivism for Berdyaev is a false state of society. The Russian philosopher points to a phenomenon in its essence opposite to collectivism, which he calls communitarianism, and if collectivism is highly antipersonalistic for N.A. Berdyaev, communitarianism, on the contrary, is personalistic. When N.A. Berdyaev speaks of free religious consciousness — he speaks of collegiality, when he speaks of a healthy state of society — he speaks of communitarianism: “Collectivism is always affirmed through violence against the human person. Communitarianism and collegiality always recognize the value of the individual and freedom” [5, 635].

5 The attitude of N.A. Berdyaev to the Soviet state

The views of N.A. Berdyaev of the Soviet state in this article will be given by contrasting the views of another well-known Russian philosopher, I.A. Ilyin, who once noted that communism is organically alien to the Russian spiritual order, and there is a kind of bacillus against which the Russian person does not found immunity: "The disease that plagues Russia today, namely: militant godlessness, anti-Christianity; materialism that denies conscience and honor; terrorist socialism; totalitarian communism; universal love of power, allowing without all means - all this single and terrible ailment is not of Russian, but of West European origin "[6, 21]. From this phrase, we will build on our research. In his historiosophical works N.A. Berdyaev shows that for him, unlike I.A. Ilyin, Russian communism has not only exclusively Western roots - it has support both in Russian history and in the Russian worldview: "Russian Communism <...> there is a deformation of the Russian idea, Russian messianism and universalism, the Russian search for the kingdom of truth, the Russian idea, which took ugly forms in the atmosphere of war and decay "[7, 126]. For N.A. Berdyaev, Russian people were initially dualistic: on the one hand, the breadth of the spaces of Russian lands shaped anarchist features in it, on the other hand, Orthodoxy adopted under Prince Vladimir contributed to the development of ascetic features in it. This dualism of the Russian consciousness, for N.A. Berdyaev, is responsible for the utter anarchy of the Russian people. On the other hand, strong power is understandable to the Russian consciousness, which, in the opinion of the philosopher, was used by Bolshevism: "Bolshevism <...> took advantage of the Russian traditions of governance from above and, instead of unusual democracy, for which there were no skills, proclaimed a dictatorship that was more similar with old tsarism "[7, 115]. After Byzantium adopted the union with the Catholics at the Ferraro-Florentine Cathedral (1438-1445) and the fall of Constantinople (1453), the idea of Moscow as the Third Rome, the capital of the only Orthodox state left in the world, arises and strengthens in the minds of the Russian people - the idea inherently messianic. A characteristic messianic element that is understandable to Russian people, N.A. Berdyaev notes in the views of Russian communism. N.A. Berdyaev shows that the religious messianism, which was originally inherent in Russian culture, made some ideas of Marxism seem to be well-known to the Russian person, becoming for him the prism through which he saw the ideas of communism: "... <,> as it were, the identification of two messianisms, Russian messianism
people and messianism of the proletariat "[7, 118]. The messianism of the Russian consciousness, according to N.A. Berdyaev, manifests itself in the search for truth characteristic of the Russian person, and this property is equally characteristic of both the common people, who searched for the truth on religious paths, and for the intelligentsia, who went into revolutionary activity in search of the truth. The search for truth is the main theme of the great Russian literature of the XIX century - according to N.A. Berdyaev, Russian writers searched in their works "not so much <...> for the perfect products of creativity, but for a perfect life, a perfect truth of life" [7, 64].

The variety of socialism that has developed in Soviet Russia does not arouse particular sympathy among the philosopher: “The tragedy of Russian Bolshevism is played out not in the daytime atmosphere of modern history, but in the night elements of the new Middle Ages” [8, 230]. Speaking about the relationship between the individual and society in Soviet Russia, N.A. Berdyaev notes that in Soviet society, freedom is understood as having more to do with society rather than the individual: "An individual is seen as a brick, necessary for building a communist society, he is only a means" [7, 125]. For the Russian philosopher, the Soviet state of the time of Stalin is certainly totalitarian, but N.A. Berdyaev understands the nature of totalitarianism differently than, say, F. Hayek, for whom socialism and fascism are totalitarianism a priori - through the state supremacy of a planned economy. In his understanding of the nature of totalitarianism, N.A. Berdyaev is closer to H. Arendt. For the Russian philosopher, the marker of totalitarianism is not this or that social system, but rather the atmosphere of horror, diffused in the daily existence of this society. Speaking about Stalinism, N.A. Berdyaev noted those of its characteristic features - the primacy of the public over the personality - which, in his opinion, both fascism and Stalinism had: “It has all the characteristics of fascism: a totalitarian state, state capitalism, nationalism, leaderism and, as basis, - militarized youth" [7, 120]. The people who came into politics after the First World War are people of a new type, looking at the world with different eyes, accustomed to direct action - violence. An extremely tough type of person, affirming the primacy of direct action on the law, is what, according to N.A. Berdyaev, is equally characteristic of both communists and fascists: “This is a world phenomenon that is equally found in communism and fascism” [7, 101]. In Berdyaev’s view, a socialist society does not have to be a totalitarian society. Moreover, becoming totalitarian, socialism perverts its ideals, loses its inherent original truth. The essence of socialism, according to N.A. Berdyaev, is to help a person to realize himself, to be realized. Marx also showed that alienation is of an economic nature: in a capitalist society, the worker is alienated from the meaning of his actions. Understanding of his labor is not required of him - he only needs labor, which the capitalist buys from him. The worker for the capitalist is only a faceless cog, which by definition does not solve anything, and which, if necessary, can be replaced with exactly the same. According to Marx, alienation is an inevitable component of capitalist relations - monotonous mechanized labor is antihuman in nature and reduces the worker, by and large, only to a set of certain functions. N.A. Berdyaev, being a Marxist in his youth, and in many ways accepting him as a certain truth, on the other hand saw in him the danger of the totalitarian structure of society — the subordination of personality to society — and gradually moved away from him. Because of this, both capitalism and communism, at least in the form prevailing in Soviet Russia, as well as fascism, in any of its varieties, were equally unacceptable to N.A. Berdyaev. The Russian philosopher saw a way out of this situation in the construction of such socialism, which prioritizes not so much the interests of the state as the interests of the working man. Otherwise, Berdyaev notes, communism is indistinguishable from state capitalism. Considering industrialization in Soviet Russia, Berdyaev talks about the crucial importance for this process of mythological consciousness, which, when building a new communist
society, is not so much removed from human life as it finds a new subject for its manifestation: “For the industrialization of Russia under the communist regime, a new motivation of labor is needed, a new psychological structure, it is necessary for a new collective person to appear” [7, 119]. Indeed, to build a new society, a new person is needed - educated as this society needs. I would like to especially note this place, because, in our opinion, here N.A. Berdyaev felt for an extremely important common moment in the formation, development and existence of modern societies. From now on, not only economic, but also its ideological state is of paramount importance for modern society. This becomes especially noticeable with the development of a unified state development or, say, the ubiquity of the media and the phenomenon of mass culture - from now on, ideology is a strategic value for modern society. In the twentieth century, ideology was of great importance for the creation of both socialist and fascist states, and even today the importance of ideology for modern capitalist societies should not be underestimated. However, this issue should not be addressed in the framework of this article - it requires its own separate consideration.

6 Received data

The philosophy of Berdyaev is a search for a new paradigm of philosophy, a search for a transition from a classical paradigm to a non-classical, existential one. The philosophy of N. A. Berdyaev is built around the concept of personality. Based on the concept of personality, the Russian philosopher builds his concept of the state. Based on the foregoing, its relations with the Soviet state are also being built.

7 Conclusion

The Berdyaev’s philosophy is the philosophy of the process. The existing world, personality, spirit - all the positive aspects of his philosophy do not exist as frozen substances, but only as a dynamic process that brings into the spiritual movement the frozen substance of the fallen world. Fixation and rationalization of this process is objectification and, therefore, is not the last truth about the world. N. A. Berdyaev, like many philosophers of his time (A. Bergson, E. Husserl, L. Wittgenstein, existentialists) acutely felt the need to change the paradigm of classical philosophy, to an unknown new one - the Russian thinker was at the forefront of this pan-European movement.

The relation of the basic principles of Berdyaev’s philosophy can be defined as follows: freedom is an opportunity in a given world of a non-deterministic process, creativity is a free process in a given world, spirit is the content of a free process in a given world, love is the quality of a free process in a given world, a person is the subject of a free process in the given world. Negative concepts of N.A. Berdyaev’s philosophy are determined by opposing positive concepts: for example, an individual is one who, unlike a person, cannot commit a free act, since it is determined by a fallen world and, therefore, is not free.

The philosophy of N. A. Berdyaev is integral in its foundations: having determined what a person is in the philosophy of the Russian thinker, we can reveal the attitude of N. A. Berdyaev to the institution of the state. Having understood his ideas about the ideal structure of society, we can understand the attitude of N.A. Berdyaev to Soviet Russia. Berdyaev’s philosophy is truly not separated from his life, and the civic position of the philosopher is a natural continuation of his philosophical worldview.
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