

## L.P. KARSAVIN'S HISTORIOSOPHY IN THE LIGHT OF BASIC PROBLEMS OF RUSSIAN NATIONAL SECURITY PROTECTION

*U.A. Shestakov, E.E. Nesmeyanov*

*Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation;*

[shesyur@mail.ru](mailto:shesyur@mail.ru) , [nesmeyanoff.e@yandex.ru](mailto:nesmeyanoff.e@yandex.ru)

It is made an effort to analyze the original reflection effort of the world historical development, represented within historiosophy of an outstanding patriotic philosopher and historian L.P. Karsavin (1882-1952) aiming at justification and further specification of RF security strategy. Having made the conclusion that within the frames of historical philosophy such the Absolute priorities of national security as: balance achievement of society and state interests; axiological consensus acquirement inside the society on the sociocultural identity preservation basis; providing the Russian basic social institutions stability and formulization of the state ideology, find the mighty philosophical foundation, historical substantiation and also take form of logically reasoned definite recommendations according to their realization.

Key words: Karsavin, historiosophy, history, quality, values, interests, institutes, ideology, national, security.

Nowadays demand in safety measures more than ever proclaims about itself in Russia. This demand according to authoritative experts in this problem, "is growing day by day reflecting the process of spreading social risks according to different directions and social being levels" [4, p. 3]. These risks also affect government-and-national sphere, forming necessity in national security supporting. "Vital interests of a personality, society and state" under which in law "On Security" it is understood "total of demand, contentment of which safely provides existence and possibilities of a person, society and state progressive development" are considered to be the most important category for national security scientific research [5, p. 29]. One pays special attention to the circumstance that the leading Russian analysts interpret these interests as the "main determinant and starting point of historical creativity of people" [3, p. 72]. According to this fact apparently appealing to an original effort of world historical development reflection, presented within the frames of historiosophy of an outstanding patriotic philosopher and historian L.P. Karsavin (1882-1952) for the purpose of Justification and further specification of RF security strategy is considered to be rather interesting.

As long as national interests fund national security, mainly absence of their coherence, according to the opinion of analysts of problem is considered to be the "most serious threat of integrity and stability of the state, especially such polyethnic, as Russia" [4, p. 49]. Only interests providing balance of person, society and state will allow achieving Russian federal status development and providing modern Russian society with conflictology decrease.

In this context it is interesting to refer to the interpretation of history subject by L.P. Karsavin. It is understood by philosopher in the quality of individuality, person determined by socially-psychic communication and immanent development [2, p. 13]. The development is interpreted by Leo Platonovich as constant qualitative alteration of a subject without participation of external factors. It overcomes space-temporal disunity of social subjects by negation of social atomic structure and presence of external determinism. Personalities represent certain hierarchy (man – family – generation – social group – people – culture – mankind). One person is not generated by the other, as long as "...all lower personalities individualizing a higher personality are constituted not by it, but by the The Absolute" [2, p. 142]. Postulated by Karsavin the Absolute value of every person arises from that, regardless if it is collective or individual, it takes its place up or below the hierarchy.

The role of lower person according to the higher one consists in that the first one "discloses, individualizes and differentiates" [2, p. 145] the second one turns out to be the definite quality (i.e. socially-psychic manifestation) of all personalities of higher order. That is why the aim of every

person consists in its overcoming of limitation for the sake of higher personality. Approximation to such ideal, according to Karsavin, appears to be for instance “understanding of people as harmonic system of social groups” [2, p. 188]. On the basis of it the scientist determines the estimation of conflict of interest essence among the subjects of history. The philosopher proves that the general “psychic structure” [2, p. 125], “world view” [2, p. 166], constitute social group, equal for all personalities entering the group, but in every group quality is special as any interest. Interests conflict of social groups in the course of which personalities fight with each other, according to Karsavin, fund the highest personality. The fight for the interests realization enriches participants of conflict, as long as, the latest, “consuming” the other historical subjects, begin to be qualified by them and vice versa.

Consequently, Karsavin’s historiosophy, involving the historical method developed by him, where individuality and development became the main categories, represents itself Ariadne’s clew, which allows finding the way out of the labyrinth opposition of person, society, state. Firstly, by absolutization of person’s values, social group and nationally-state community in the quality of overcoming in the process of historical development its space-temporal disunity on the basis of personalities socially-psychic unity; secondly, by understanding of every lower personality as self-valuable in a quality of personification and individualization of a higher one; thirdly, by acknowledgment of historical relativity of interests opposition as manifestation of the higher personality existence in lower one, understanding of interests fight as cross-fertilisation of the lower personalities and potential realization of the higher one.

Also danger can be represented by the absence of the common value orientations system in the Russian society. This danger is preconditioned by the circumstance that according to the authors of the study manual, dedicated to the general problems of social security protection, mainly “the values give the society necessary degree of order and predictability, as far as regulation of human activity is realized through them, they act as guarantee of national social safety, but their alteration in its turn, forms security hazard for society” [4, p. 51]. Presence of sociocultural integrity supporting is proved by a large number of researches of spiritual image of the Russians, in particular by the point of view of an authority in this sphere A.L. Andreev, who confirms that modern society has polar cultural orientations – solidarity and individualism [1, p. 169], which are in state of conflict against each other, besides, the latest in connection with the processes of globalization, is associated with the concept “human values”. That is why achievement of the axiological consensus of different social groups on the basis of patriotic sociocultural potential accounting for sociocultural stability supporting appears to be the top target from the national security point of view.

Karsavin’s historiosophy can give effectual help in problem rationalization and in the search of its solving ways. According to the philosopher cross-fertilisation in the result of historical subjects fight for their interests realization is possible only in case if a person is “Superorganic”. “Organic” personalities are defined by the scientist as realizing official functions of external world research towards higher personalities. The “Superorganic” include the whole person, the whole spiritual and axiological potential. The contact of communities with each other, which had lost it, can lead only to “physical destruction of culture beams and to loss of itself in purely external digestion of its poor remnants” [2, p. 225]. According to the philosopher, consequently, interaction of social segments should mainly occur on cultural basis.

Besides, Karsavin’s historiosophy is built on the fact that mainly culture appears to be the main historical individuality (directly antecedent to humanity and individualizing it ) [2, p. 232]. The main determinative feature of culture is the presence of peculiar “idea”, which is expressed and symbolically perceived through its quality and individualities entering it. This “idea”, being expressed in transformation of the outside world, for Karsavin appears to be strictly spiritual and strictly specific. To the fullest extent it is realized in the period of its originality, actualizing only “related” to its quality of the highest personality [2, p. 240]. The extent of culture originality for philosopher is directly proportional to its farness from outside, material expression. According to

Karsavin “world view”, “soulful-spiritual” structure and “religious moment” have the primary importance [2, p. 255], that are concepts, expressing axiological relation to reality.

The scientist stated that secondary nature in relation to culture and to the notion of people. According to Karsavin culture is individualized either in replacing each other people, or in people who have formed community in the result of confluence. The latest, certainly, is applicable for Russia in the greater degree. Ethnological peculiarities of separate people (which are understood as derivatives from spiritual “tension”) are uniquely appeared to be “less important” for him [2, p. 256], than the general “idea” of culture, uniting them. The acknowledgment of culture individualization possibility in various nations, following from the theory of Karsavin, is considered to be the supposition for achievement of axiological compromise among such great communities as Russian ethnoses on the base of the single sociocultural matrix uniting them.

Finally, it should be noted that according to Leo Platonovich “idea” expressing the main point of every culture manifests in relation to “ideas” of other cultures and to the highest individualization, namely to the Absolute – to “the Absolute welfare, being, beauty” [2, p. 242]. In other words, Karsavin stated that all cultures were interrelated (besides interrelated not only synchronously, but also diachronously – through historical sources) and reflected an the Absolute truth in its particular expression. The aim of every culture is actually “becoming of mankind”, becoming of universal, global culture in specific aspect. This situation presupposes removal of the main contradictions, preventing axiological consensus of Russian society – contradictions between bearers of human values and traditions and also corporate values. According to Karsavin these ones not only accord with the others, but also exist thanks to each other. Moreover, philosopher pays attention to the fact that mainly orthodox culture is oriented not on the confirmation in culture of national or human values, but on the conception of their integrity and interrelation.

Consequently, substantiations of possibility and necessity of Russian sociocultural specificity and achievements on the basis of axiological consensus between generations and bearers of various cultural orientations, based on history philosophy by Karsavin are amounted to postulation: not casual, but regular existing character of integral Russian culture, specifically qualified in its individualizations – people of our country; treatments of patriotic culture as specific, inimitable, the Absolute valuable aspect of humanity, uncovering its potential in the process of interaction and cross-fertilisation of all world cultures (as existing now, so ceasing their “actual” existing); possibilities of Russian culture benefication in combination with other cultures only under the Absolute preservation of its spiritual identity.

Supporting of institutional stability appears to be one more problem of Russian national security. Analysts of the problem state that “recessionary character of institutional problem functioning in the society...appears to be a threat source of society safety as social system” [4, p. 50]. In this context it is necessary to pay attention to the Karsavin’s interpretation of society institutional structure as a secondary thing towards its cultural constituent. External expressions of material and spiritual culture – social, political, economic and spiritual formation of society – in its expressions act as “signs of internal”, “symbols”, “abbreviations” of socially- psychic and “organic personalities”. That is why from his point of view it is wrongfully to speak about political, religious and juridical causes of people’s development, but only about its expressions in these institutional qualities.

It is also necessary to make an accent on distinction, conducted by the philosopher between personalities and qualities. Mainly to the latest Karsavin referred ethnical and legal treatments, attitudes, inclinations and etc., in other words, the fact that appears to be the result of institutional existing. The philosopher stated that these attitudes and inclinations had bases in person’s hierarchy that qualified them. Besides, according to the philosopher the lower the place of such person, the closer it is to a person, than in a bigger measure such psychological states appear to be “compulsive, obligatory and insuperable” for an individual [2, p. 98]. At the same time the philosopher considered that “societies are individualized through their formation in the families” [2, p. 201], but not vice versa. In other words he thought that if the requirements of the institutions (for instance, the

family) were more urgent, and then institutionalization of these institutes occurred at higher national and cultural levels of historical individualities hierarchy.

The meaning and value of this or that personality's quality is determined in the process of historical research according to Karsavin that is manifested in his relation to the highest personality and to the Absolute. Under the latest Karsavin understood alltime and allspace common ideal, peculiar for modernity, but existed in the past differently, and continually filled in the process of historical development of the humanity and expressed in the face of the Christ. Hereof the basic question of the historian, according to Karsavin – this is a question about the value of concerned institutions “for the past, present and for the history in whole” [2, p. 401], that is to say for allunited humanity in its relation to the Absolute. That is why, for instance, “quality of humanity by the Absolute” is expressed in the rule by Karsavin [2, p. 402]. Consequently, for philosopher the notion that we presently call human values is expressed in social institutions.

Therefore, recommendations according to social institution stabilization as a factor of national security supporting, following from the spirit and the letter of Karsavin's historiosophy are determined by the necessity to stabilize social institutions, orienting on maximal and primary strengthening of the nearest to the person (firstly the family), not forgetting about antecedence of spiritual basis, in its turn determining them (in other words about national culture) and admitting them as a specific implementation of the Absolute, human values.

Finally, the most important problem of Russian national security appears to be the absence of uniting political nation ideology, generating demand in it. The formation of such ideology, according to the authoritative problem experts, appears to be the basis “which will let overcome sociocultural opposition, international intensity and a row of ideological character contradictions” [4 p. 70]. In other words, problems cannot be solved without this one.

Philosopher's recommendations can significantly help. According to Karsavin the role of ideology in itself is extremely peculiar. It is uniquely derivative towards “mentality and social relations” personalities and first of all to nation and culture. Their life is expressed in their “will”. However, in virtue of different directions of this will and dependence of its realization from external conditions, according to Karsavin some concretizing, organizing and forming its inception is necessary. Ideology acts in this role. The philosopher brings as an example an ideology of Bolshevik Russia leadership of the period of war communism, paying attention to the circumstance that absence of corresponding formatting of “spontaneous” “popular will” in the situation of nationwide crisis in 1917 led Russia to destruction. Karsavin justifies communist ideology mainly because that preferred the preservation of integral national federal status of separate national groups interests and reconstruction of the old at the cost of Russia destruction from outside. According to Karsavin without ideological rationalization preservation of the main is impossible – unity of culture and federal status in the time of crisis.

However, from the point of view of “mentality and social relations” personality ideal achievement, in other words the most degree of aspiration intensity to The Absolute and implementation of formal resemblance to it [2, p. 343], ideology in its narrow sense according to Karsavin is not enough. It is necessary to create adequate model of such ideal and development of its methods achievement. According to Karsavin's unscientific form of historical knowledge which sphere of interests will be perceiving of the future as a motion to ideal can manage with it. The philosopher considers “philosophical journalism” [2, p. 416], oriented on political aims, connected with axiological population mobilization to be the predecessor of it. Evidently, under it Karsavin practically presupposes the same ideology in modern significance of this word. Karsavin insisted on the fact that it should be based on the history of knowledge and appliance of historical method developed by him in the framework of integrity. According to him, historical research should be directed to the search of “historical idea” of subject in its development, including the following stages: the search of historical facts, in the quality of “moments”, expressed to a sufficient degree, highest personalities and their quality; indication of their presence in typical personalities or specific social motions; cogni-

tion of “necessity” in manifestation of the given “historical feature”; determination of its connection with the past and future [2, p. 420].

According to Karsavin the progress of modern theories, closely connected with ideological doctrine during the ideal determination neglected historical method. From his point of view their weakness involved the fact that they did not admit immanence of empyrean to the process of the Absolute ideal formation, potential possibility of approach to it in any temporary point, but were transcendently-definite, and that is why they were relative and unreal. Instead of it Karsavin offers to refuse from the initial and finishing point of development and formulate, resting on the given historical researches, the basic tendencies of development in the form of potential and more probable possibilities. The scientist thought foundation of national-state ideal to be necessary, firstly not on the basis of fruitless transcendentalism, torn off historical empire, but through the cognition of historical dialectic of culture development in mutual relations with its The Absolute as “centre” from all of its temporal moments and secondly avoiding the concrete fatalism, in the form of unapproachable for history in itself, but based on historical method of potentially possible vector tendencies.

Consequently, the works by L.P. Karsavin representing the peak of patriotic historiosophy thought, present considerable value in terms of basic directions national security substantiation of conception realization. In the framework of his philosophy of such the Absolute priorities of national security as: achievement of personal social and state interest balance; axiological consensus inheriting inside of society on the basis of sociocultural identity preservation; supporting of basic sociocultural institution stability in Russia and production of state ideology, receive the mighty philosophical foundation, historical substantiation, and also take form of logically based definite recommendations for their realization.

#### *References*

1. Andreev A.P. National security as philosophical category // SOPHIA: Almanac: Issue. 1: A.F. Losev: oecumene thoughts. Ufa, 2005.
2. Karsavin L.P. The philosophy of history. M., 2007.
3. Korostylev D.V. Interrelation and interdependence of interests of basic objects of national security // Power. 2008. No 1.
4. Samygin S.I, Vereshchagina A.V., Kolesnikova G.I. Social Security: study guide. M., Rostov-on-Don, 2011.
5. Security Council of Russian Federation: Functions. Structure. Regulatory documents: (collection of support materials). M.: Plus. 74 p.

---

*December, 12, 2015*