



UDC 167:14

TO THE QUESTION OF FINDING THE COMMON SLAVIC ROOTS OF "RUSSIAN COSMISM": AN INVITATION TO A DIALOGUE**P. G. Makukhin***Candidate of Philosophical Sciences,
assistant professor,
Omsk State Technical University, Omsk, Russia*

Summary. The article scrutinizes basic approaches of the solution of the problems, primarily, the circle of writers, members of the "Russian cosmism" and, secondly, the basic ideas that unite these philosophers, scientists, religious thinkers and cultural figures. On the basis of analysis of Russian discussions of the last three decades on this issue we have the main among those ideas are the followings: Ontological and epistemological aspects of the unity; co-evolution, co-evolution of man and nature; consideration of any issues through the prism of moral values, in search for the "truth" (truth-justice). As the roots of these ideas, we believe the inherent Russian and wider Slavic peasant "cosmic feeling", based on which we invite to a dialogue the writers from the Czech Republic, with a view to finding common Slavic roots of "Russian cosmism".

Keywords: Russian cosmism; Russian-Slavic civilization; natural sciences; religious and philosophical and poetic and artistic directions of cosmism; the Unity; co-evolution.

The fact that Russian culture has developed as a culture of the state of imperial type, manifested, firstly, it incorporated the congenial ideas from other cultural areas, and, on the other hand, was intended to achieve its widest possible range of different cultures. (In connection with the pertinent words of Fyodor Dostoyevsky, expressing both of these aspects: the Russian "friendly, with a total love in our soul took the genius of other nations, all together" [5, p. 147], and "to become a real Russian, become completely Russian, maybe it means ... to become the brother of all people, a universal man" [5, p. 147]. *For all that, the closest, comprehensible and urgent Russian culture is conformably, philosophy as a cultural identity of the Slavic peoples.* We stand in solidarity with the philosopher and Scientist-Encyclopaedist Nikolay Danilevsky, heir of Slavophiles and the founder of civilized approach to historical development (its "Russia and Europe" was written in half a century before the "Decline of the West" of Oswald Spengler – in 1869 and 1918 respectively) in relation to the fact that legitimately use the term "*Russian-Slavic civilization*".

Correspondingly, we have reason to believe that the philosophical ideas expressed, in particular, representatives of the "Russian cosmism" *are important and interesting, for the Czech readers as well.* In this regard, these significant words of Ph. D. Y. V. Oleynikov and A. A. Onosov, which they precede their in-depth study of the course "Anthroposphere Project of Socio-Natural Evolution" (1999): "an appeal to the spiritual heritage of thinkers cosmists, on the one hand, their philosophical quests "*truth*", on the other – the precise definition of the scientific trends of socio-natural process" [7, p. 2]. On the "scientific accuracy" of ideas of "Russian cosmism" we will mention that the thought of "*in search for the truth*" – a concept that connects truth and morality expresses a *feature inherent in precisely the Slavic culture.* No less significant are the words of Doctor of Philosophy, Academician E. S. Troitsky, composed of the annotations to his collection of "Russian idea, Slavic cosmism ..." (2000), "is a powerful and original, the whole patriotic ideological current generated *Russian-Slavic civilization* and contradictory forms integrates



the idea of Russian traditional national values and archetypes with the latest discoveries and information technologies with modern concepts ... “universal humanity” (Dostoyevsky)” [8, p. 4]. In other words, “Russian Cosmism contains spiritual and patriotic, scientific potential, unfortunately, it is poorly demanded” [8, p. 4]. As we see, in this passage, firstly it has been recorded association with the particular philosophical traditional spiritual values and scientific discoveries and technologies. Secondly, *this is considered to be as an expression of Russian and wider Slavic tradition*. Agreeing with E. S. Troitsky on both counts, adding that the roots of the “Russian cosmism” can be regarded as inherent in Russian and wider Slavic peasant as a “cosmic sense”. It is about their sense of complicity throughout the universe, the perception of all of its activities – even economic, such as plowing the land or building houses – as a *co-participation in the life of the Universe*. Regarding the latter concepts we present the following profound observation of one of the first post-Soviet Russian researchers of cosmism, Ph.D. F. I. Girenok. He refers to the historian of the 19th century. A. P. Shchapov drew attention to the fact that the Russian word «вселенная» has no analog in other languages as opposed to the word «космос». In this case Shchapov sees evidence of the low level of abstract thinking of the Russian people: «космос» rather abstract term, «вселенная» is too anthropomorphic ...” (op. At [4, p. 10]), because associated with the image of “the Russian peasant engaged common affairs” – namely, “the moving in the House” (op. at [4, p. 10]). In contrast, A. P. Shchapov, himself F. I. Girenok appreciates the uniqueness of the Russian word “вселенная”, “Russian cosmism therefore called Russian (unlike all other cosmism) that space it appears in the original sense of the word “universe” etc. as a house, which still have to settle”, [4, p. 10], with “not alone, but the whole world” [4, p. 10].

Briefly describe the modern relevance of the ideas of “Russian cosmism” for representatives of the “Slavic world”, we give a brief definition of the most authoritative Russian philosophical publications. (Who will speak for us in the role of “the thread of Ariadne” not allowed “to get lost” in the “space” of intense debate, ongoing for more than three decades around the issues of authors belonging to this trend, and the basic ideas that unite these philosophers, scientists and figures of Culture). In the article “Cosmism” in fundamental “New Philosophical Encyclopedia” (2010), belonging to above-mentioned F. I. Girenok (which is another argument in favor of its authority in this area) indicated that cosmism as an independent religious-philosophical and natural-scientific trend established namely in Russia [3, p. 314]. In it stand the natural sciences, religious and philosophical and poetic and artistic direction. The first is represented by N. A. Umov, D. I. Vernadsky, K. E. Tsiolkovsky, N. G. Kholodny, A. L. Chizhevsky; the second – N. F. Fyodorov, V. I. Solovyov; and third – V. F. Odoyevskiy, A. V. Sukhovo-Kobylin, N. Zabolotsky, A. Platonov, and others. In addition, F. I. Girenok identifies the following two tendencies within the “Russian cosmism”: organic (from “organism”) and projectic (from “Project”); the first is represented by V. I. Vernadsky, and the second, respectively, by N. F. Fyodorov and K. E. Tsiolkovsky [3, p. 314]. Besides, indicated in touch with the authors of these concepts sophiological concepts of P. A. Florensky and S. N. Bulgakov [3, p. 315] In another urgent source for our theme is an Encyclopedia of Russian Philosophy (1995) Ph.D. A. I. Aleshin agreeing to the above release in Russian cosmism three directions, and the two trends, and with the specified range of authors, while critical of the idea of the existence of Russian cosmism as a unique, self-identical currents. In particular, according to him, for the above-mentioned authors cosmism “is available as



a common theme and objectives, while the interpretation of this theme very different and in some respects even opposite. Anyway, cosmism as a principle that does not unite them” [1, p. 277]. In other words, the name of “Russian cosmism” “hides not the single, solid and philosophical developed tradition” [1, p. 282], but only a “characteristic cultural mood” [1, p. 282] (remember, this approach to further consider its radical version). With respect to the natural science direction of said trend is critical as well, “and the language of science, and scientific data become a means of giving a Utopia (... cosmic philosophy) likelihood” [1, p. 280] (as we see, it contradicts the assessment of high scientific value ideas of the Russian cosmism given Y. S. Troitsky). Turning to the same position as one of the first and most authoritative researchers considered trend, S. G. Semenova, we see that it ranks as cosmism Russian philosophers and scientists such as N. Fyodorov, A. V. Sukhovo-Kobylin, N. A. Umov, V. F. Odojevskiy, Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, Vernadsky, A. L. Chizhevsky V. N. Muravyev, A. K. Gorsky, N. A. Setnitsky, N. G. Kholodny, V. F. Kuprevich, A. K. Maneyev. Separately, she allocates the representatives of “Russian religious revival” ideologically close “pathos ideas of Russian cosmism”: V. A. Solovyev, P. A. Florensky, S. N. Bulgakov, N. A. Berdyayev. The list is given of the anthology of “Russian cosmism” (1993), which became a milestone in understanding this phenomenon (Making, in particular, refer to this tendency of the author of this article), composed by S. G. Semenova, together with A. G. Gacheva and other authoritative researcher of the movement [9]. The presence of all above authors’ ideas that enable them to carry Russian cosmism, S. G. Semenova and A. G. Gacheva is justified excerpts from primary sources, but the expansion of the list of thinkers to include in the pleiad of Russian cosmism, gives grounds for the criticism that we have seen in A. Aleshin. The radical version of it can

be found from Russian authors (N. K. Gavryushin) and foreign (M. Hagemaster) as well. The essence of this criticism clearly expressed in the following words of respectively: “as are available to the works of Russian “cosmists” increasingly apparent is fundamentally incompatible their ideological positions” [2, p. 105], Russian cosmism is a “pure invention of the late Soviet time” [6, p. 61]. As it is a single school “there was not: Vernadsky absolutely no idea about Fyodorov, Tsiolkovsky did not know anything about Vernadsky, but they were all united in some kind of artificially “some typically Russian philosophy of the 21st century” [6, p. 61]. The fact that between these cosmists took place the exchange of ideas, it would be possible to prove by referring to the history of philosophy and science. But the more important area of proving the existence of Russian (Slavic) cosmism we believe the selection of those ideas, firstly, inherent in all these philosophers, religious thinkers, scientists and people of art. Secondly, these ideas are peculiar to all-Russian (Slavic) culture. (Which is indirectly confirmed even critical characteristics of Russian cosmism – revealing, for example, the words of M. Hagemaster that supporters see the current “consider the concept of cosmism as an original creation of the Russian mind, the most important element of the “Russian idea” [11, p. 41], and “... the concept has its roots in a purely Russian archetype of “unity” [11, p. 41]. The question discussed thoroughly in [13]). Among these ideas, first, let’s call that, which we mentioned at the beginning of the article: Russian cosmism concerned with world outlook quests, that is a system of “universe – a man” in their essential interdependence and what the human place, the human role in this entirely. In connection with the last one cannot forget the central fancies all Russian philosophy – “The Unity”, which, as the S. S. Horuzhy, means “the principle of the inner form of the perfect unity of the set, according to which all



the elements of such a set identical to each other and identical to the whole, however, do not merge into indistinguishable and continuous unity and form a special polyphonic system" [12, p. 102]. Since the "deepest" philosophy of the unity was V. S. Solovyov, to turn to the laconic words of him: "I call true or positive of the unity is one in which there is not one at the expense of, or damage to them, and for the benefit of all. False, negative of the unity suppresses or absorbs its constituent elements and itself, therefore, in vain; true unity preserves and strengthens its members, carried out in them as the fullness of existence"[10, p. 63]. Earlier we talked about the ontological aspect of the unity. **Secondly**, the most important idea of Russian cosmism will call the epistemological aspect of the unity, i. e., striving for synthesis, the interaction of philosophical, scientific, religious and artistic knowledge. (On the one hand, in many respects allowed Russian cosmism anticipate a number of ideas of modern science; but on the other, has led to criticism of the scientific part of his legacy, which is analyzed in [14]). **Thirdly**, for all of Russian cosmists one of the central was the idea of co-evolution, i. e. co-evolution of man and nature, in which man is given both active and adaptive role. That is, on the one hand, we have an active an idea of evolution as a fundamentally new stage in the development of the universe in which humanity will consciously manage the socio-natural development based on the synthesis of reason and morality, a moral duty. On the other hand, Russian cosmism denied the excretion of person outside the world picture, as well as mechanistic version of the latter, which contributed to the change in the pragmatic-consumerist attitude towards the nature responsibility. There are more private ideas inherent in Russian cosmism, for example, that was pointed in "firstly" connected with belief in human space mission, and with the presence of the sense of establishing a cosmic whole,

and paradoxical identity "Microcosm" and "macrocosm" (i. e. man and the universe), etc. Also pointed in the points, "firstly" and "secondly" is associated with the development of system-synergetic ideas in terms of which the Russian cosmism beat Western European science. But the main thing – all of these items are inextricably linked to moral values, "permeated" by them, in connection with which the beginning of this article and talked about "in search for the truth" (meaning "truth-justice"), as one of the main orientations of the Russian cosmism. Accordingly, we believe it is possible to invite a dialogue authors from the Czech Republic, as an example of their culture – and philosophy as its identity – to contribute to find a common Slavic roots of "Russian cosmism."

Bibliography

1. Алешин А. И. Космизм русский // Русская философия. Малый энциклопедический словарь. – М. : Наука, 1995. – С. 274–282.
2. Гаврюшин Н. К. А был ли «русский космизм»? // Вопросы истории естествознания и техники. – 1993. – № 3. – С. 104–105.
3. Гиренок Ф. И. Космизм // Новая философская энциклопедия: В 4 т. Т. 2. – М. : Мысль, 2010. – С. 314–315.
4. Гиренок Ф. И. Русские космисты. – М. : Знание, 1990. – 61 с.
5. Достоевский Ф. М. Пушкин (очерк). Произнесено 8 июня в заседании Общества любителей российской словесности // Полное собрание сочинений: В 30 т. Т. 26. Ленинград: Наука, 1984. – С. 136–149.
6. Интервью с М. Хагемайстером. О восприятии неприятного... // Вопросы философии. – 1995. – № 11. – С. 58–66.
7. Олейников Ю. В., Оносов А. А. Ноосферный проект социоприродной эволюции. – М. : ИФ РАН, 1999. – 210 с.
8. Русская идея, славянский космизм и станция «Мир» : сборник статей / под ред. Е. С. Троицкого – М. : АКИРН, 2000. – 310 с.
9. Русский космизм: антология философской мысли / составители С. Г. Семенова, А. Г. Гачева. – М. : Педагогика-Пресс, 1993. – 368 с.
10. Соловьев В. С. Первый шаг к положительной эстетике // Литературная критика. – М. : Современник, 1990. – С. 59–66.



11. Харемейстер М. Русский космизм анахронизм или «философия будущего» // Россия и современный мир. – 1994. – № 3. – С. 40–45.
12. Хоружий С. С. Всеединства философия // Русская философия. Малый энциклопедический словарь. – М. : Наука, 1995. – С. 102–110.
13. Makuhin P. G. On Necessity of Consideration of the Issue «Did Russian Cosmism Exist?» in the Context of the Issue «Did Russian Philosophy Exist as a Whole?» // IntellectualArchive. – 2015. – № 1 (vol. 4). – Pp. 11–16.
14. Makuhin P. G. On the Issue of Causes for Critical Assessments of a Scientific Heritage of Russian Cosmism: Importance of the Principle of «Open Rationality» // IntellectualArchive. – 2014. – № 4 (vol. 3). – Pp. 29–38.
6. Intervyu s M. Hagemaysterom. O vospriyatii nepriyatnogo... // Voprosyi filosofii. – 1995. – № 11. – S. 58–66.
7. Oleynikov Yu. V., Onosov A. A. Noosferniy proekt sotsioprirodnoy evolyutsii. – M. : IF RAN, 1999. – 210 s.
8. Russkaya ideya, slavyanskiy kosmizm i stantsiya «Mir» : sbornik statey / pod red. E. S. Troitskogo – M. : AKIRN, 2000. – 310 s.
9. Russkiy kosmizm: antologiya filosofskoy myisli / sostaviteli S. G. Semenova, A. G. Gacheva. – M. : Pedagogika-Press, 1993. – 368 s.
10. Solovev V. S. Perviy shag k polozhitelnoy estetike // Literaturnaya kritika. – M. : Sovremennik, 1990. – S. 59–66.
11. Hagemeyster M. Russkiy kosmizm anahronizm ili «filosofiya buduschego» // Rossiya i sovremenniy mir. – 1994. – № 3. – S. 40–45.
13. Makuhin P. G. On Necessity of Consideration of the Issue «Did Russian Cosmism Exist?» in the Context of the Issue «Did Russian Philosophy Exist as a Whole?» // IntellectualArchive. – 2015. – № 1 (vol. 4). – Rr. 11–16.
12. Horuzhiy S. S. Vseedinstva filosofiya // Russkaya filosofiya. Malyiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar. – M. : Nauka, 1995. – S. 102–110.
14. Makuhin P. G. On the Issue of Causes for Critical Assessments of a Scientific Heritage of Russian Cosmism: Importance of the Principle of «Open Rationality» // Intellectual Archive. – 2014. – № 4 (vol. 3). – Pp. 29–38.

Bibliography

1. Aleshin A. I. Kosmizm russkiy // Russkaya filosofiya. Malyiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar. – M. : Nauka, 1995. – S. 274–282.
2. Gavryushin N. K. Abylli «russkiy kosmizm»? // Voprosyi istorii estestvoznaniya i tehniki. – 1993. – № 3. – S. 104–105.
3. Girenok F. I. Kosmizm // Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya: V 4 t. T. 2. – M. : Myisl, 2010. – S. 314–315.
4. Girenok F. I. Russkie kosmistyi. – M. : Znanie, 1990. – 61 s.
5. Dostoevskiy F. M. Pushkin (ocherk). Proizneseno 8 iyunya v zasedanii Obschestva lyubiteley rossiyskoy slovesnosti // Polnoe sobranie sochineniy: V 30 t. T. 26. Leningrad: Nauka, 1984. – S. 136–149.

© Makukhin P. G., 2015