

UDC 141

Nikolai Fedorov – founder of the Russian cosmism

Volkov Vladimir Nikolaevich

Full Doctor of Philosophy,
professor of the department of management, socio-cultural activities and tourism,
Academy for Retraining in Arts, Culture and Tourism,
P.O. Box 123007, 5-th Magistral'naya str., No. 5, Moscow, Russia;
e-mail: vnickvo@gmail.com

Abstract

Many studies have been published recently on the teaching of the Russian thinker Nikolai Fedorov, but in the assessment of his creativity is still evidenced by innuendo, disguise, a veil of silence and simply preconception. Over extended periods implicitly formed the tradition of perception of Fedorov as a brilliant visionary, righteous and uncanonized holy man, whose life is easy to fit into the genre of the lives, and ideas are discussed in the twilight of orthodox philosophy or in the framework of scientific prediction, forecasting, futurological project, or both of them together. Who was cosmist Fedorov in reality after all – scientist, philosopher, religious thinker or a charlatan?

Keywords

Space, patrifaction, conciliarity, non-kinship, autotrophy, progress, magic, immortality.

Introduction

Literature about Fedorov traditionally built on hagiographic canon: he lived quietly, wandered, concealed his

origin, studied independently, knew almost by heart all the books in the library of the Rumyantsev Museum, dressed in rags, slept on the trunk for 3-4 hours, ate bread and tea, refused increased salaries,

handed out money to the poor, considered sinful any private property, etc¹. Nevertheless, this holy, a prophet of encyclical resurrection threatens mankind, scolds science, education, rich people, universities, intellectuals, progress, citizenship, legal laws, rights and freedoms, Enlightenment, institute of chartered, literary publicity, branding culture and civilization as a whole and all "the republic of letters" in particular². All this does not prevent him to call criminal offenses "pranks" as "terrible in its consequences, they are in motives quite childish"³.

The originality of the Fedorov's concept

In Russian philosophical thought Fedorov is an unusual figure, his ideas are very different from both the Christian philosophizing (K. Leontiev, V. Soloviev, N. Berdyaev, etc.) and from religious and ethical concepts expressed in the lit-

1 Berdyaev, N.A. (1989), "Religion of resurrection ("The philosophy of common cause" by N.F. Fedorov)", *Collected Works. Vol. 3* ["Religiya voskresheniya ("Filosofiya obshchego dela" N.F. Fedorova)", *Sobranie sochinenii. T. 3*], YMCA-Press, Paris, p. 246.

2 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1*], Progress, Moscow, pp. 43-47.

3 Ibid. P. 103.

erary and artistic form (F. Dostoevsky, L. Tolstoy). So what is this difference? First, Fedorov boundlessly believes in human reason and science and dreams of mastering the full mysteries of life and the victory over death, of a man reaching godlike power. The land itself came in human being to the perception of its fate and this active awareness is a means of salvation: when the mechanism would deteriorate, in a man's face appeared mechanic who will fix everything: "The real true virtue can be found only in the management of the blind forces of nature"⁴. Fedorov is sure that human activities should not be limited outside the Earth planet. He has no doubt that awakened from death, resurrected and transfigured humanity will settle on other planets, explore other worlds and universes.

Secondly, Fedorov has a severe aversion to abstract theorizing and philosophizing. All philosophical thought preceding to his own teachings does not cause him any sympathy, as separated from the "common cause". He scolds all philosophers from Socrates to Kant, from Soloviev and Tolstoy to Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, because they could not reveal the true purpose of human existence, which he opened. Strongly objecting to the abstract theories and laying

4 Ibid. P. 104.

claim to construct a "philosophy of the common cause", he tends to turn the theory into a tool to change the world, which, incidentally, brings him closer to Marx declared that "philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways, but the point is to change it". Fedorov formulates this idea as follows: "Thought and being are not identical, i.e., the idea is not carried out, and it should be carried out. < ... > The world is not given to man for observation, the worldview is not a goal of a human being. Man has always considered possible effects on the world, the way to change it according to his own desires"⁵. The main reference point of Fedorov teachings – not regular, but proper, not present, but desirable and obliged to be. He seeks to "do" metaphysics, to implement transcendental. To abandon the passive contemplation of the world, abstract metaphysics and proceed to determine the values of proper order of things, to the development of the plan of transforming human activity – in this case, according to Fedorov, the meaning of a new radical change in philosophy. However, he essentially refuses to submit to a particular view of the being organization. Only creative activity, universal labor, animated by a great idea of the realist will lead through a radical

transformation of the world to its knowledge. For Fedorov absolute knowledge is possible only in the model created by humanity itself. Definitive knowledge of any given from the outside object is only possible when the object is our creation, arranged, reduced to our law.

Third, Fedorov teachings are designed as religious doctrines. Creator of "common cause" firmly believes in the convention of apocalyptic prophecies – he is convinced in the necessity of universal salvation during immanent resurrection, which unified fraternal humanity reaches "at the behest of God", that mastered the secrets of life and death, the secrets of the "metamorphosis of substance". The founder of Russian cosmism "relies" on the New Testament of Christ and "reveals" its cosmic sense, calling for active transformation of natural, mortal world in a different, non-natural, artificial, immortal, divine type of the being (Kingdom of Heaven). The worst enemies of the doctrine of resurrection are lurked "in parables, metaphors, symbols, allegories", i.e., in metaphorical and cultivated understanding of higher truths about God and human being. According to Fedorov the requirement to resurrection of the dead must be understood directly, literally – this is the great pathos of Orthodox Christianity.

5 Ibid. Pp. 294-295.

Fourth, typical is the Manichean opposition of forces of evil to forces of good for Fedorov concept: to natural birth of people – their artificial recreation, to town – the village, to the West – Russia, to non-fraternity – conciliarity, to Catholicism and Protestantism – Orthodoxy, to scientists – uneducated, to metaphysics – common cause, to science – liturgy, etc. Russia, he said, is opposed to the West, new Judaic culture of Islam maintained by the culture of the new paganish West. Our unlearned concept of the God and its unawareness, for example, is above the west, the scientific, because it is based on feeling, and the God in the West – is a philosophical God, that is not the father. Nevertheless, Fedorov sincerely believes that this option creates the Orthodox religion, which is amenable both to "scientists" and "uneducated". First – due to the fact that Fedorov flirts with advances of science, complements them with "folk wisdom", the second – by incorporating the teachings with traditional superstitions and remnants of ancient cultures, which he regards as "creativity of the masses". According to him, "scientists" scrambled and distorted a clear outlook on life and death, evil and good in the world. "Uneducated" people managed to preserve this clear view, the people deprived of knowledge, but not lost the

feeling and the need for action. In contrast to the individualized philosophizing "scientists" the "unlearned" feel, think, evaluate collectively, relying on a generic sense, the cult of the dead fathers.

Fundamentals of the teaching of Nikolai Fedorov

The notion of "common cause" appeared in the public consciousness of the XIX century not as a result of inspiration to the works of Fedorov, but thanks to literary character Petr Verhovensky – the hero of "The Possessed" by Dostoevsky. Used by Dostoevsky in burlesque sense, the term "common cause" in a few decades quite positively perceived in Russian philosophy – appears the Fedorov's work with promising title "Philosophy of the common cause". However, the title was not invented by Fedorov, but his publishers Kozhevnikov and Peterson. Fedorov himself treated philosophy with great hostility. For instance, he writes: "Not only image-worship makes the distortion of religion; idolatry is also its misrepresentation; philosophy as the product separated from the other republic of letters is the greatest distortion of religion"⁶, "Philosophy is the greatest distortion of religion, it is the product

⁶ Ibid. P. 72.

of class separated from the people who does not want to know its needs, though living at the expense of people, living at the expense of labor of those whom they despise"⁷; "a state of death is the most philosophical concept... resurrection is the most non-philosophical concept: the resurrection collects, restores and revitalizes everything whereas philosophy not only recovery makes only a mental one, i.e., the most abstract, but even the most outer existing world due to contemplative, sedentary, inactive life becomes a representation, a mental fact only, a phantom"⁸. Given the huge Fedorov dislike and contempt to philosophy, we can assume that in all probability he would be very offended if his "doctrine" called philosophy.

To duly appreciate the creativity of the Russian father of cosmism, one should turn to three basic foundations of his teaching: *the resurrection of ancestors, achieving immortality, the regulation of nature on a cosmic scale*. According to Fedorov, the reality of evil associated with the blind forces of nature, with the imperfection of universe and human subject to laws of finiteness and death. The idea of the "Kingdom of God within us" is not feasible because

7 Ibid. P. 206.

8 Ibid. P. 230.

there is an external force, compelling us to do evil, the law of mutual suppression and death. Non-fraternity, non-gentility not only occur as a result of interpersonal or social contradictions: they go to the very root of existence, so that the action of mankind should be aimed at eliminating non-fraternity matter. The main problem of the individual – the insecurity of life and health, so instead of having to fight for a "place under the sun", people should unite in the struggle against the main enemy – death and try to achieve immortality. All the flaws found in culture, industry, science are produced out of indifferent attitude to death, so Fedorov did not perceive a society that is not concerned with the issue of death and immortality. Opposition to evil presupposes the transformation of the world into a harmonious, rational, reasonable, i.e. regulated, controlled, predictable world.

According to Fedorov a mankind has made a number of "treasons" to God: first a man was unfaithful to Heavenly Father for the fulfillment of the will of "wife" (original sin); the next is an abandonment of agriculture, rural areas (i.e., the dust of their ancestors), outgoing from race and tribe for the sake of life in the city, preference of "legal-economic" society instead of a family and

kindred community. Over this treasons the humanity pays for "unrelated relations", wars, loss of life meaning, death. "Unrelated relations", "non-gentility" – are legal and economic relations, class, international discord; consequences of non-kinship – citizenship, statehood instead of "countryhood". Civilization and statehood is shirking of duty to return the life gifted by the fathers. Fedorov is sure that under the "brotherish" state, a hatred, struggle, war could naturally disappear. The desire to preserve syncretic ideal of the Russian traditional patriarchal life leads him to idealize the autocracy, celebration of conciliar ideal of "all estates community", patterns of traditional society, "all estates agricultural community, in which intelligent class takes the position of teachers, for winter period with a manufactory industry would weaken and, finally, destroy competition, speculation, social unrest, revolution, and even foreign wars, because there is a wide application for all of the power that is spent in mutual conflicts"⁹.

The idea of patrofication

Central place in the Fedorov's teachings is occupied by the idea of "resurrection of the fathers", patrofication,

⁹ Ibid. P. 254.

revival of all living on the Earth from the sperm of descendants. First he presented the ideas of universal resurrection in a letter to Dostoevsky, which he has silently nurtured for many years. Started in 1878, it was written up after the death of the recipient (1881) and became his main composition. The project of immanent resurrection addressed directly to the Christians; for unbelievers it is proposed as a project of regulation of nature, which is directly identified with the "common cause", the union of people to resurrect their fathers. We should not forget, although Fedorov uses non-theological concepts such as economics, science, art, history, labor, they represent only temporary, imperfect means of education for the primary purpose of mankind for the "resurrection of the fathers". Some of these phenomena with the improvement of humanity and its inclusion in the performance of "common cause" must become a means of patrofication implementing. That's exactly that reason that in his works the concept of "science", "art", "liturgy" must be understood as synonyms to the concept of patrofication. For instance, the art emerged as an "imaginary" resurrection of the fathers, with the implementation of the basic idea will turn into a "real resurrection of the fathers", i.e. patrofication. These

phenomena itself have no value and even hinder the unification for the main goal, diverting by momentary temptations, "imaginary values".

Attitude to science

Modern science and its realization for Fedorov – such a university absolutely does not suit him: "science is a son or daughter of gentility (patronage) and trade ... science born at leisure and produces luxury"¹⁰. When knowledge is applied to industry, science works to sexual selection, for a woman. When science is working on military applications, then it is of the male. If science is sexless, then there are no feelings to fathers, it is lifeless. In all these three values, the knowledge that comes from us, has no similarity to the Holy Spirit derived from the Father, for in the latter sense, i.e. as pure, it is soulless, dead, not viviparous, and in the first two is influenced by gender, under the influence of blind instinct, because knowledge work for women even when it is of a male. Only when a woman is enlightened, i.e. when she has no need in clothes, only then science will not work for sexual selection, will be cleared of sexual coloration¹¹. To char-

10 Ibid. P. 129.

11 Ibid. P. 100.

acterize the university Fedorov does not regret to speak negative epithets: servant of industrialism, enemy of the throne and altar, enemy of autocracy, orthodoxy and nationalism, calling the fathers, prophets, Christ, God Himself for justice, enemy of all the authorities, arming sons against fathers, apprentices against teachers, students against professors, destroying fraternity, putting hatred above communication, leading to monism, solipsism, leading each of being alone and turning the whole world into a presentation¹². Real science, according to Fedorov, should be combined in astronomy or history, which open people the whole universe as a field of their activity.

Attitude towards arts

Fedorov awards an artistic creativity with derogatory epithets as well. He does not accept contemporary art, which, in his opinion, is limited to the creation of dead similarities of all the past and reproduction of the whole universe in the apparent form. "The art of similarities" as a "dead creation, idol" produces only a "shadow of the fathers", while the resurrection project calls for a transition to the art of reality. Art, as it should be, really recreates the past, the

12 Ibid. P. 398.

works of God and a human being. All art must be united in the temple as an image of the universe, and in the service which is performed in the temple, that is to serve to the patrofication.

Fedorov pinned great hopes on religion, science and art, for they are as "collective forces" are involved in the resurrection project with its specific symbolic means. However, their fundamental flaw, as he argues, is that they remain in the illusory nature in its traditional form, so they need to be transformed and mobilized into the dynamic actions. Liturgy, or a service of all mankind, as well as the temple and the whole community must unite in a single thought, in a general sense, in a common action. Crucial role in the Fedorov project plays a synthesis of the arts. From the fact that architecture, sculpture, painting, music and drama as its specific nature contribute to the recovery of the dead life, should the necessity of combining various arts enhance the effect. If the temple as a similarity of the space has only symbolic meaning, the museum-church should unite all the arts and sciences. Religion (liturgy), synthesis of the arts and science as "collective forces" are designed to ensure the preparation of a real resurrection project on the basis of traces stored in the preferred loci (cemetery, temple, museum).

Is patrofication an Orthodox idea?

Fedorov did not consider himself the founder of the doctrine of patrofication because, in his opinion, it is preserved in its original form in the Gospel texts and religious rituals. In fact, it should be emphasized that the idea of patrofication completely alien and unusual for both philosophical and theological thought. Fedorov project of resurrection of the fathers absolutely opposite to orthodox one, which stands on the position that a person cannot defeat death, but the real purpose of being a Christian cannot be achieved in this life. Moreover, there is no such term as "patrofication" in traditional Christian theology. According to Christianity, the resurrection will occur in the Day of Judgment, by a wonderful will of God, as the last act of the historical drama of humanity. Orthodox theology gives a crucial doctrine of the Last Judgment and the afterlife: Judgment Day will take place simultaneously with the end of the world, and it will immediately precede the resurrection of all the dead and the transformation of all living. This resurrection Fedorov admits, but he believes that it may happen only if a mankind does not implement his proposed project of resurrection of the fathers.

According to him, the resurrection of all the dead on the ground should be done by humanity and can be realized only through the joint efforts of a mankind. Sons and daughters, using knowledge of the nature directed by the unbounded to dead parents, return the life to the last, and become immortal themselves. Thus, Fedorov shifts all the worries, that are attributed to God by the religion, to humanity, God's mission shoulders to a man, replaces the Last Judgement with resurrection of the dead by means of science and technology. He believes that if mankind focuses on salvation from sin and doing the will of God, then there will be no "day of wrath", because the God will not need to judge the sinless.

In fact, Fedorov decrypts a Christian mystery of posthumous God's grace, mechanizes a miracle. He is convinced that there cannot be a hopeless hell, as well as a prepared paradise, for all involved in the original sin of extrusion and devourment, and all are in need of purification. A passage through the true purification and salvation may happen in the process of creation of Paradise, a gradual transformation of human being from the devouring, displacing, deadly creature to self-creating, resurrecting, immortal one. After resurrection all the victims will return to eternal life. New

level of consciousness of the resurrected, including villains, will reveal them all the abyss of their sins, will prejudice the necessity of repentance and reunification into a single being. Patrofication is a real immortality. In the philosopher's believe, a transcendental resurrection will be accomplished only if mankind do not come to "mind of the truth". And it would be a real "resurrection of anger", when a final split of the human race for salvation and eternal damnation may happen.

What are the arguments leads Fedorov in support of his position? It relies on the theological definition of God as an all-merciful spirit, which omnibenevolence cannot admit the eternal punishment of sinners. Patrofication sense is precisely to avoid the wrath of God in the day of the "Last Judgment" not only for this generation but for earlier generations as well, up till Adam. Consequently, Fedorov project of resurrection of the fathers presents a way of resolving the contradiction of the Christian doctrine of the all-merciful God existence to the position of eternal punishment for sins committed during the short life on earth. Actions proposed by Fedorov must save the entire human race from sin, to allow God to manifest both as an all-merciful and as a most just, because righteousness does not allow God to forgive sinners,

and omnibenevolence – not to forgive them.

Ideological sources of Fedorov's teaching

We should not think that Fedorov builds his doctrine from scratch. The roots of his teachings can be seen, for example, in the cult of the dead, typical religion of the ancient Egyptians who believed that consciousness continues to live after physical death. In their view, the human being is composed of not only clearly visible and tangible physical body, but more of several substances not visible to the human eye under normal conditions. The most important of these substances – "ka" and "ba". After the death, human souls behave differently: "ba" ascends to the sun, and "ka" remains with the body. The degree of preservation of the body and "ka" predetermine both welfare of the dead in the afterlife and the possibility of rebirth. That is why the Pharaoh's body carefully embalmed, mummified, and for his soul "ka" created favorable conditions. According to the doctrine of the Egyptian priests every man possessed eternal life force, every man ensured immortality if his ashes were surrounded by proper care. Egyptians associated eternal life

with the preservation of the body (hence the appearance of embalming). They did not divide the earthly and the heavenly, otherworldly worlds. Rather, emphasized the similarity of the underworld with real world, believed that there as well as here. Death was considered a prelude to the afterlife existence. They pinned their hopes on the incorruptibility of the body of a man whose power was indestructible in life. The cult of the dead was the most important characteristic of the Egyptian culture. Art of embalming and mummification, construction of grandiose tombs commemorating the deceased – all served one purpose – to provide a symbolic immortality. In this regard, S.N. Bulgakov said: "one cannot but marvel the proximity of the main and the most intimate motive of Fedorov's religion; a religious love for the deceased fathers, to the essence of the Egyptian religion, which all stems from honoring the dead, and all its cult and ritual appear as sprawling funeral rites. Fedorov religion is like a Christian version of the Egyptian worldview"¹³.

A significant impact had Chinese culture on the outlook of Fedorov, in which the passing to the underworld

¹³ Bulgakov, S.N. (1994), *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations* [*Svet nevechernii: Sozertsaniya i umozreniya*], Respublika, Moscow, p. 312.

actually does not occur. The deceased go from living figuratively. The world is densely populated with "living dead", they move to another state, but do not go into another world – they do not leave us. The ancient Chinese believed that a welfare of their lives depends entirely on the patronage of the dead ancestors. Funeral ceremonies in China had a particular splendor, and decoration of tombs was given deeper meaning. There is no doubt that the worldview of Fedorov was greatly influenced by Confucianism with its terms of true morality rooted in the cult of ancestors, when affinity is equal to morality, on the state as a family and sovereign as a father (it is particularly indicated by S.G. Semenova¹⁴. According to Fedorov, pagan worship to their gods at the same time was a selfless service to their fathers, in its turn, the Christianity has committed itself to replace superstitious devotion to the fathers who've been recognized alive, for a universal resurrection¹⁵. He refers Christian God to as "the God of fathers". *"True religion is one – the cult of ancestors, though worldwide, the cult of all fathers, as one father, in-*

separable from the Triune God, from the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, in which deified the inseparability of the sons and the daughters < ... > no other religions than the cult of ancestors; yet others cults are only a distortion (idolatry) or negation (ideolatry) of the true religion... "¹⁶.

The relationship of body and soul

The problem of the relationship between body and soul is solved by Fedorov in the spirit of Taoism, according to which the human body – a microcosm, like the macrocosm, the universe. Immortality of man involves the creation of an immortal body. It is achieved through assimilation tao – a space and transfer of tao attributes, including eternity, on the human body. Taoism has developed methods to achieve immortality, among which the main emphasis was placed on special exercises resembling yoga and alchemy. It was believed that if a person with food restrictions, yoga, alchemy, elixirs of immortality would try to create favorable conditions for the spirits that live in the body, and they will become the predominant element of the body, then the body was dematerialized and a

14 Fedorov, N.F. (1982), *Works* [Sochineniya], Mysl', Moscow, p. 42.

15 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* [Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1], Progress, Moscow, p. 123.

16 Ibid. Pp. 205-206.

human being became immortal. In this regard, the viewpoint of the famous orientalist E.A. Torchinov is of a particular importance, he says: "For medieval Europeans the elixirs of immortality were not needed for the Christian religion, since it promised him a bodily resurrection and immortality in his "coming future"... Taoists do not possess a similar doctrine, and alchemy itself originated in China in the context of Taoist searches of immortality"¹⁷. Not accidentally Fedorov schemes to achieve immortality are strikingly reminiscent to social Taoist alchemy.

Conciliarity

In Fedorov's teaching we can find a peculiar idea of conciliarity. He rebukes the Slavophiles for what they did not answer the main question: what is the purpose of a conciliar unity of people? According to Fedorov, an accumulation of Christian and non-Christian people around the Russian people based on the remembrance of the ancestors, appears as the first step leading to the execution of "supramorality" – an obligation of the deceased ancestors resurrection. A

17 Torchinov, E.A. (2004), *Taoist practices [Daoskie praktiki]*, Azbuka-klassika, Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie, St. Petersburg, p. 161.

neglect of this obligation will inevitably lead to degeneration and extinction, and therefore the question is as follows – resurrection or extinction. Commemoration itself, or the cult of ancestors is a primitive expression of a resurrection obligation: that's why the path leading to the actual execution of this duty easily reconciles all these people and makes them real family both internally and externally related by the common cause of resurrection. Conciliar spirit is permeated in the main idea of Fedorov – the idea of universal kinship as a model and project of global kinship when all realize themselves as brothers, feeling themselves the sons of the deceased. Until now, consciousness, mind, morality were localized on the earth planet; through the resurrection of all generations that lived on the earth, a consciousness will spread to all the worlds of the universe. But a further spread of the influence of sentient beings out of our land is possible only in combination of religion and science. Although the resurrection of all ancestors may seem the ultimate goal of a common cause, it is only a means to achieve this ultimate goal – the unification of the entire human race into a single one, brotherhood and fatherland related by blood. Original model of such unity and brotherhood appears an inseparable consub-

stantial Christian Trinity. Consequently, in order to unite all need to recognize the Trinity, but to recognize all need to unite.

Was Fedorov a humanist?

"Humanism" – a word that is not accepted by Fedorov¹⁸, even science is of his interest only as a possible way for the implementation of the project, these ideas are really reminiscent of the "humanist activism", although in the form, which is rightly pointed by G. Florovsky¹⁹. S. Bulgakov notes that the teaching of Fedorov is developed in line with the Enlightenment humanism: "In essence, this doctrine is the last word in modern European humanism (although Fedorov shunned the latter). Within his grandiosity the utopias of Mechnikov, Fourier, Marx and others seem to be poor-spirited and infirm"²⁰. And, nevertheless, there is

the most important and fundamental difference between the ideas of Fedorov and humanists ideas of the Enlightenment. The point is that Fedorov is far from the idea of social progress and the idea of the individual, he is only interested in the "common cause". Moreover, Fedorov does not accept the Christian idea of personal salvation as well, considering it deeply immoral. He believes that "must ... *live not for oneself and not for others, but with everyone and for everyone*"²¹. This statement is not genuinely humanist, an apparent humanism and secular nature of this assertion disappear upon closer examination, for "with everyone", according to Fedorov, means the association in the name of the "common cause", and "for everyone" – for the resurrection of the ancestors. In the Fedorov teaching one would not find anything about the human person, because it is generated by the same hateful progress. Quoting N.I. Kareev, he points out: "The purpose of the progress – a developed and developing person, or the greatest measure of freedom available to a person", i.e. not the communication... but the separation is the goal of progress. Therefore, the lowest degree of fraternity is precisely

18 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1 [Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1]*, Progress, Moscow, p. 98.

19 Florovsky, G.V. (2009), *The ways of Russian theology [Puti russkogo bogosloviya]*, In-t rus. tsivilizatsii, Moscow, pp. 327, 330.

20 Bulgakov, S.N. (1994), *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations [Svet nevechernii: Sozertsaniya i umozreniya]*, Respublika, Moscow, p. 314.

21 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1 [Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1]*, Progress, Moscow, p. 126.

an expression of the highest progress"²². G. Florovsky quite rightly points out that "Fedorov is of a little interest in the fate of a single individual or an organism itself. In the resurrected world he is interested not so much in fullness of persons as the fullness of generations – materialization or restoration of the integrity of generation... The doctrine of human person is not developed in Fedorov's teaching. The individual remains and must be only an organ of generation. Therefore, among human feelings Fedorov puts above all the devotion and consanguinity..."²³.

Fedorov is firmly convinced that his teaching is based on the Christian religion: as evidenced by one of its main goals – the resurrection of the dead, and the means of its implementation – the society must take religious education, be occupied in religious and practical activities. Numerous educational measures are provided: the return of the sons to the graves of fathers (inverse return from the city to village), the construction of numerous temples, learning the sacred history and science in museums-temples, that equipped with astronomical towers, the invocation of the human race into the

²² Ibid. P. 52.

²³ Florovsky, G.V. (2009), *The ways of Russian theology [Puti russkogo bogosloviya]*, In-t rus. tsivilizatsii, Moscow, p. 325.

naturalistic force within universal military obligation, termination of the class struggle, reconciliation of believers with unbelievers in a "common cause". All these activities should be carried out under the supervision of the king and the Orthodox Church.

Hope for a good king and a strong state

Fedorov writes that over the centuries the Russian state have collected the lands and peoples, to protect them from decay. This gathering was necessary for the sake of their ancestors and for ancestors, connecting all living for the resurrection of all the deceased. In the implementation of the Fedorov's project an important place is given to the king: an autocrat takes the lead in "common cause" as a patriarchal head of the state, professing familial moral principle of dispensation. The king will be an autocrat, a ruler, a sovereign of the blind forces of the matter, the lord of the external, material world and the liberator of legal and economic law. Russian autocrat – ruler and controller of all periods, the administrator of the deceased ancestors, bringing up humanity to adulthood. Autocrat – the deputy of all fathers, the representative of all kinds, he is selected

by fathers, whom he should resurrect, and therefore cannot be removed by children. N. Berdyaev believes that "the basis of the theory of autocracy of Fedorov implies religious materialism, materialization and naturalization of the Holy Trinity, materialization and naturalization of the human spirit. The fiction of autocracy, spreading upon the celestial spaces and resurrection of the dead, does not involve anything real, has no connection with history and with the concise life. <...> Fedorov's autocracy is just a grand utopia (totally illusionist)"²⁴.

Christian means peasant

Regulation of nature in the Fedorov's project is not connected with city, but with the village, not with industry, but with the land. The humanity must be prepared in a proper way to implement the "patrofication". Training should begin in Russia, as it is an agricultural country, autocratic, orthodox and peasant. Fedorov professes countryside, peasant religion, he seriously believes that "as nomads

by nature – the Mohammedans, so the townspeople by nature are gentiles, and only farmers are natural Christians"²⁵. It follows that Russia is a Christian country, because it is a peasant country. Thus, Fedorov attaches Christianity to agriculture and the agricultural way of life, and Christian is identified as a peasant.

Fedorov sees an important advantage of Russia in its social backwardness, in the imperfection of personal outset, in endangered and decaying remnants of Russian life, associated with Russian paganism, with the land community, patriarchal authority, etc. Rural noble "land labor", giving birth to "daily bread" and artisanal handmade household production, not alienated from the land of the village, not leading away from the generation, in particular from the graves of the ancestors – all of that Fedorov opposes to capitalist production. The purpose of the peasant and handicraft labor, in his opinion, is the maintenance of life, salvation from death, the aim of capitalist production – luxury, comfort, whimsy, wealth. Scientists "in favor of women's whim, having created and supported a manufacturing industry, this root of non-kinship, invent ever new means of its ex-

24 Berdyaev, N.A. (1989), "Religion of resurrection ("The philosophy of common cause" by N.F. Fedorov)", *Collected Works. Vol. 3* ["Religiya voskresheniya ("Filosofiya obshchego dela" N.F. Fedorova)", *Sobranie sochinenii. T. 3*], YMCA-Press, Paris, p. 268.

25 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1*], Progress, Moscow, p. 175.

pressing, i.e. invent weapons of destruction to protect manufactory generated by women's whim"²⁶. Primarily "prodigal sons", those who had left rural communities, should be back. Landowners and farmers will be engaged in agriculture; landlords will regulate agriculture, control atmospheric phenomena, etc. They attract peasants to a conscious participation in farming, become natural science teachers in their area. And in the implementation of the space project the principal value acquire "such layers, mankind groups, which under the old form of life were in contempt; peasants-ploughmen have the greatest value in heavenly matters: for bankers and manufacturers there is no place in the world and heavenly activities"²⁷. As it recalls the words of the Internationale: "We will destroy *this* world of violence – he who was nothing will become everything!"

Since for Fedorov the city is incompatible with Christianity – the city's development is disastrous for the Christian religion – to that extent it is necessary to go from the city to the village. In addition to rural residents Fedorov holds hopes of natural regulation on the army, which in his project not only being pulled down, but is transformed into

²⁶ Ibid. P. 40.

²⁷ Ibid. Pp. 262-263.

a fighting force with the elements of nature and nature management. He is convinced that general conscription should become a mandatory duty for everyone to participate in active struggle with the unconscious forces of nature. All this is suspiciously similar to the alignment of all new disciplinary spaces and practices, control of everything using Bentham's Panopticon, a policy of active military involvement in space exploration, harvesting, forest fire fighting, patrolling in cities etc. in our very recent history!

Replacement of natural birth by artificial recreation

The community envisaged by Fedorov is only the first step of a proper society. He considers, while nature is not completely controlled by man, as there is a birth and people have children, while there is a care of children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren, till then there won't be full knowledge and truth in agriculture. Fedorov is not satisfied with a natural human birth – he prefers to solve the problem of artificial recreation of people arguing this approach upon the need to fulfill a moral duty to the "fathers": "... It is necessary to achieve such a state, < ... > to get rid of any impure desires, i.e. not only be born, but also to become an

unborn, i.e., rebuilding itself from those from whom was born, and recreate oneself as a being, which is aware and controlled by the will"²⁸; "... natural reproduction in Christianity corresponds to chastity in a negative sense, i.e. denial of birth, but in a positive – universal resurrection, i.e. reproduction from that redundancy, which is spent on giving birth, ... of formerly living generations..."²⁹; "We must first recognize that any public rearrangements cannot improve the destiny of man; ... the evil in the birth and the associated inextricable death"³⁰, "inner regulation... will give love to the parents in advantage over sexual feeling and lust, and even completely replace them, turning the begetting force into recreating, i.e. replacing child-bearing onto patrifaction..."³¹.

Resurrection techniques, which offers Fedorov, are diverse: "replacement of death into resurrection", a conversion of "the unconscious process of birth into universal resurrection", "picking up the scattered particles" for the recreation of corpses by means of certain vibrations that the sons of men will detect by "sensitive hearing", recreation of the dead

fathers out of the children's sperm, the management of all the molecules and atoms of the world in order to gather the scattered, decomposed together, i.e. to accumulate the bodies of the fathers. Not accidentally Fedorov emphasizes the importance of heredity, the need for careful study of oneself and its ancestors. Resurrection is conceived in associated akin row, son revives father like out of "himself", his father – revives his own father and so on. At the limit the task is to recreate the fathers, grandfathers, great-grandfathers and so on up to the first man from the sperm of living men. In other words, means the possibility of the ancestor resurrection upon the hereditary information that he transferred on to descendants. Accordingly, it is supposed that those who live now recreate themselves as immortal independently, in their own will. The creature obtained by means of social alchemy, being material, has no difference to the spirit, it is like an angel. However, from this doctrine it is quite impossible to understand who must recreate those dead who have no children, those who were childless. And it should be noted that the Fedorov's approach to humanity as a generic being is intrinsically opposed to his idea of patrifaction, for an approval of individual immortality is the cessation of immortality of the generation in subse-

28 Ibid. P. 280.

29 Ibid. P. 181.

30 Ibid. P. 283.

31 Ibid. P. 407.

quent generations. Even if to regenerate all the people who lived on earth, they would still be negligible in amount compared to the scale of the universe, which, according to Fedorov, they have to learn and even convert.

Throughout the entire doctrine of resurrection one may observe an explicit dislike of inartificial, natural, organic and a drive for supernatural, unnatural, miraculous, preference of made – to the born, artificial – to the natural. Particularly, G. Florovsky draws attention: "the unraveling of death Fedorov is looking for in some ways of bioengineering. And it is typically that he opposes organic process to technical, the natural force of birth – to the human labor and settlement. Fedorov sees and recognizes no meaning, no purpose, no beauty in the nature. The world is a chaos and the element. That is why it has no world. Sense in the world is introduced only by labor – and not the creativity. Life outburst is opposed to the labor project by Fedorov – some kind of cosmic perennial... For Fedorov human being is, above all, a technician, almost a mechanic of nature, manager and distributor. And the highest course of action for him – the regulation..."³². Indeed,

32 Florovsky, G.V. (2009), *The ways of Russian theology [Puti russkogo bogosloviya]*, In-t rus. tsivilizatsii, Moscow, p. 325.

even the Earth wants Fedorov to turn into a kind of spaceship, managed by human consciousness and will. "The question on the motion of the earth then will be resolved when humanity will become servants instead of indolent passengers, the crew ... or no one knows what kind power of that driven ship – the globe. When the issue is resolved, then for the first time a star will appear through the heavens, or a planet controlled by the will and consciousness"³³.

The Fedorov's concept is characterized by a kind of sexism. Woman, wife, mother, are essentially not represented in his teaching, and Fedorov refers to the birth with a squeamish modesty and disgust: "An essential, distinctive feature of a person is appeared in two senses – the sense of death and shame of birth"³⁴, "The question of power, forcing the two to connect themselves into one body for transition to the third creature by means of a birth, is the question of death; this is an exclusive cleaving unto wife, inducing to forget fathers, brings political and civil hostility in the world..."³⁵. Aversion to procreation and the need to strengthen communication

33 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1 [Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1]*, Progress, Moscow, p. 262.

34 Ibid. P. 277.

35 Ibid. P. 43.

with parents forces the founder of patrifaction to dispute the position of the official theology, explaining the marriage as a sacrament. He puts forward a philosophical precursor of cloning – the idea of "universal resurrection" and final termination of pregnancies (pregnant woman seemed to him ugly). Fedorov came to the conclusion that the industry, the technology are doomed to the service of sexual selection, and it shows a deep humiliation and shame of the human mind, on the human assimilation to animals, the moral decline of the city. If peasants have the cult of the fathers, the townspeople therefore have the cult of women in general and the cult of sexual desire in all its various manifestations. Entire urban culture is adoration, idolization, i.e. the cult of woman³⁶. One should abandon the urban cult of things and women of this "grandeur of corruption" and turn one's eyes to the village, to ashes of the fathers. Placing the center of gravity outside the city, people will put the initiative onto the movement of the city to the village.

The idea of the nature regulation and control of the universe

Teaching about the nature regulation is rooted in the dogmas of ortho-

³⁶ Ibid. P. 250.

doxy, according to which the atonement of sin by Christ extends to the "material world". However, the founder of Russian cosmism places emphasis of the universal significance: he writes on salvation in the spiritualization of all the universes, about managing not only the weather and harvest, but the force of gravity and the world, attracting us to the ground. Person, having carried out the project, is not the owner, but the executor of the will of God, "co-owner of the universe". People made some semblance of angels, they can live in all the "surroundings" and attend ancestors settled on other planets. Fedorov's scheme allows immortality finally solve the demographic problem – the problem will simply disappear, cease to exist. In this regard, he writes: "Transforming an unconscious process of birth, as well as power, into action, into the universal resurrection, mankind through recreated generation makes all the worlds livelihood. Only in this way can be resolved the Malthus equation, the contrast between reproduction and livelihood"³⁷. Therefore, immortal human angels will live on stable population size on Earth and in space: nobody dies, nobody is born.

Fedorov's philosophy strangely and fancifully intertwine the faith with

³⁷ Ibid. P. 277.

human reason and hope with miracle, unexpected transformation. Fedorov does not accept the progress in its usual sense. More precisely, on the one hand, it comes from the ideal of scientific progress, on the other – he does not only accepts progress, but the word itself becomes hateful to him. "Natural progress" is rejected by Fedorov on moral grounds, understanding by such progress "the superiority of younger upon older and living upon the dead, an apprentice upon the teacher, a student upon the professor". This "supposed superiority" undermines the concept of patrifaction as a human objective. Natural and social progress have aspirations for the bad infinity, in which each new generation considers previous only as a pedestal for their own elevation. "The ideal of progress (on the notion of scientists) is to give everyone both being involved in the production of objects of sensual pleasure and in their consumption. Whereas the aim of true progress can and should only be the involvement of everyone in business or in labor, the cognition of a blind force, bearing hunger, pestilence and death, to convert it to the life-giving"³⁸.

Fedorov recognizes not the progress of abstract knowledge but practical progress of knowledge and action, and

38 Ibid. Pp. 55-56.

calls to go from apparent knowledge to those what it should be. He thinks on the resurrection of humanity as a collective thing that opposes the goal of "natural progression". Ashes of ancestors are collected for the purpose of creation of a new perfect world from broken pieces. This activity is understood as a collection of separate parts of the victim. Fathers are victims in the sense that they are absorbed by sons. Birth is an adoption, taking the life of the fathers, i.e. depriving fathers' lives. Hence, the original definition of death: death is the passage through the birth of one or two creatures into the third, the birth of children is also the death of their mother³⁹. A sin of unaffected cannibalism, which is characteristic of primitive society, continues in "hidden cannibalism" of the current time, which is still living at the expense of their ancestors, which is extracted from the ashes of food and clothing. Sons' contempt for fathers, expressed in the idea of progress, simply means replacing physical spiritual murder. The present progress of mankind, according to Fedorov, is in the resurrection: a mankind does not increase due to births but for the resurrection of the dead. In this way one is able to perform a moral duty before the fathers and to ensure the re-

39 Ibid. P. 35.

production of the population. Note, that calling to perform a duty before the dead ancestors, Fedorov somehow ignores the moral duty to the unborn and those who already have no chance to be born.

According to Fedorov God acts through a man, by the will of man. This thesis – one of the axioms of his doctrine. Thus, Fedorov writes: "It is impossible not to notice that the Lord, having created a man, commanded him to possess the earth and everything on it"⁴⁰. "Then God said: Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth"⁴¹. But further on: "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth"⁴². It is easy to notice that in some cases Fedorov holds God's commandments, in others – deliberately ignores, does not notice them.

40 Ibid. P. 39.

41 "The First Book of Moses, called Genesis (Holy Bible)" ["Bibliya, Pervaya kniga Moiseeva. Bytie"], available at: <http://biblia.org.ua/bibliya/byt.html>

42 Ibid.

Vulgar materialism

According to the dogmatic of orthodoxy, God created everything not only in time, but eventually, being in eternity. Beginning of the world – is the beginning of time, time acts as a factor of change. Hence Fedorov learned the idea that the implementation of his project will lead to the disappearance of time – time is minimized to a point, evolving in space. Just walking in the direction "reverse" to the natural course of events, devouring time, the humanity will find a way to tremendous spiritual growth. Purpose and a final state of history are represented for Fedorov as a "complete victory over space and time" and "consistent ubiquitous", i.e. simultaneous coexistence of all time series (generations). In the Fedorov's teaching mutually exclusive cultural mechanisms are eclectically combined: he develops a utopian project, which is usually accompanied by displacement of the cultural past, in the name of the memory that will resurrect fathers. Therefore, his thought is differentiated in a strange mixture of archaic cult of ancestors and pseudo-fiction, Slavophile conservatism and interests of the most advanced technology, simultaneous aspiration of the past and the future and rejection of the present.

According to Fedorov, a person must recapture his body from the inside, to cognize oneself and the world in order to be able to produce oneself from the most fundamental principles, on which human being decomposes. And this ability to "reproduce oneself" implies a respective power over every human body, over the matter at all, "knowledge and control" of all the molecules and atoms of the external world" – since the whole world is dust of ancestors. For Fedorov the question is only specifically about the collection and combination of particles, on the folding of the decomposed. He wants to rebuild a cosmic organism, alter to cosmic mechanism, fully subservient to the will and mind of a man, and expects that the world will come to life and rise to become immortal from such treatment and rationalization. These ideas cannot be called scientific, they come from the most archaic forms of religion, they clearly present magic. It is known that Fedorov highly valued a magical period in the development of human consciousness, calling to turn it in future from an imaginary power over the nature into a real one. In his opinion, science is a pragmatic transformation of a magic. No wonder that epistemology in his concept should become "gnoseourgia" in future.

Although S.G. Semenova insists that "Fedorov persistently developed just a moment of transfiguring in the resurrection process"⁴³, in fact, his views on the bodily-material resurrection are badly conformed with a spiritual resurrection and transfiguring. Fedorov literally, naturalistically understood the resurrection, following vulgar materialists he saw a kind of substance in the thought. In his opinion, "... the body – the car, and ... consciousness refers to it as bile to the liver; collect the car – and consciousness will return to it!"⁴⁴ Fedorov did not deny his proximity to Büchner in this matter, recognizing that he understands the resurrection in this case in the most simple, vulgar meaning: "As soon as we were able to bring ... ashes in such a state, that it made a thought, we would be immortal < ... > the mechanism may be an instrument of the mind"⁴⁵.

Fedorov combines a naturalistic approach to the resurrection with a unique voluntarism, tracting to miracle, mysticism. Having noted that the resurrection is not something mystical, Fedorov immediately admits: "Nevertheless,

43 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1 [Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1]*, Progress, Moscow, p. 22.

44 Ibid. P. 258.

45 Ibid. P. 194.

we believe in the resurrection, which is understood as a miracle, as incomprehensible act of deity"⁴⁶. Thus, for Fedorov magical ideas not only coexist with the natural science, but also exceed it. It is known that the magic implies acts, rites and ceremonies connected with the belief in the existence of supernatural powers and the ability to influence them, to impose their will, using them to influence the surrounding reality. "Liturgy", "worship", "common cause", "regulation of nature", "patrofication", "resurrection of the fathers" – all these synonyms refer to nothing more than expressly magical character that will change the sinful nature of mankind towards the original divine essence: "A man and world are pure only at its source, in its childhood: the childhood is a return to the beginning. A filial love, brotherly love, later transforms into a sexual love, and only when sexual love is replaced by the resurrection, when the recovery will replace the old birth for a new, only then the whole world will be clean"⁴⁷. Consequently, we are talking about the fantastic, supernatural movement back to the first principle, to God.

In fact, Fedorov requires a radical change of life from a man and mankind,

46 Ibid. P. 294.

47 Ibid. P. 82.

religious subordination literally in all social life, turning it into an unceasing daily, partly desacralized liturgy: "The union of nations shall come in a common cause, in the liturgy which prepares all meals (food issue) for healing body and soul of everyone (health issue), and that liturgy of all mankind will be a prayer passing into the action; mental memory, turning into reality; a throne of this liturgy will be the whole earth, as the ashes of the deceased, "the powers of heaven" – light and heat – will be apparently (and not mysteriously) used to transform the dust into the body and blood of the dead"⁴⁸.

Cemetery – the spiritual center of humanity

According to Fedorov, if religion is the cult of the ancestors, or an overall prayer of all the living about all the dead, then for the time being there is no religion, because the churches do not have cemeteries, and in cemeteries, in these holy places, prevails an utter desolation. Church, according to Fedorov, is a society of not yet dead, having a universal resurrection as its object, the goal of the already dead. To avoid further depletion of graves and oblivion of fathers, we need

48 Ibid. P. 265.

to create a cult of cemeteries. To look at the ground as a home, and not as a cemetery – it means to cleave unto wife and forget the fathers, and all the land turned into a comfortable abode, i.e. it means to look at it as an earthly, and not as a celestial body. Fedorov said, that the center of spiritual life of a mankind should be transferred to the cemeteries, which should be the place of the cult of the dead, meetings, funeral feasts, temples, schools and museums⁴⁹. How should it happen?

Cosmist Fedorov teaches that museums with schools and astronomical towers should be built at cemeteries, on the graves – to conduct funeral feasts, pictures on the crosses should comprise a museum iconostasis, which replaces the portrait gallery. In the field of philology he became attracted to necrology, i.e. the list of the dead, who is remembered in prayer. Synodic is the prototype of such historical genres like a textbook, memorials, genealogy, hagiography, etc. Despite the fact that the synodic – only a verbal, nominal resurrection, it is considered an unconditional prerequisite for a common cause. In extended, figurative sense the cemetery is also a synodic, written on the ground. Fedorov offers to equip tombstones with portraits of the

49 Ibid. Pp. 72-73.

dead and collect these portraits in portrait or face synodic, which will serve as the identification of the external appearance of the dead. Together with skulls collected from the graves they constitute the material basis for resurrection⁵⁰.

M. Epstein drew attention to the fact that in such a mundane profession as a librarian at the reference room of the Rumyantsev Museum, Fedorov cared about saving and collecting all the letters that have ever brought a human hand, and the particular importance attached to the library card-annotation. "Predicting destruction, annihilation, loss of books, cards cannot be a means of saving them from such death, but they are more likely than books to survive the destructive era; if books die, cards remain and enable to erect from forgetfulness that work, to which they are included, to return it to life"⁵¹. Hence, a very special bibliographic question in the interpretation of Fedorov internally connected with the idea of the resurrection of the world: a card is a grain or a trace of the book, whereby one can recover it⁵².

50 Ibid. P. 320.

51 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 3 [Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 3]*, Progress, Moscow, p. 228.

52 Epshtein, M. (2000), "A figure of iteration: philosopher Nikolai Fedorov and his

To move schools to the graves of the fathers, to their common monument, the museum – means to recreate schools, turn away from the town to the field, to the village. Temples outside cemeteries – an expression of obsequiousness wishing to forget the death: Easter and liturgy have the sense only at cemeteries. Consequently, the cemetery church should become the first out of the last, such a position of cemetery churches will be the beginning of the religion reintegration. Temple, originally created in the cemetery, is "the art image of generations coexistence"⁵³. The cemetery is a vast field with many tables-graves that invite consociations to the feast⁵⁴. Fedorov's representations that coffins "are the true feast tables to the living"⁵⁵, apparently, have their origin in ancient cult of the dead, where the coffin was the place of meal and a table for food.

literary prototypes" ["Figura povtora: filosof Nikolai Fedorov i ego literaturnye prototipy"], *Voprosy literatury*, No. 6, pp. 114-124.

53 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1*], Progress, Moscow, p. 300.

54 Ibid. P. 74.

55 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 3* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 3*], Progress, Moscow, p. 472.

Evaluation and critique of the teaching of Nikolai Fedorov

Since Fedorov considered his teaching as a project requiring practical implementation, trying to attract L. Tolstoy and V. Soloviev to its implementation. When they refused from such activities, he sincerely felt aggravated and cursed them. We must admit that at first Soloviev enthusiastically adopted the Fedorov's project", "Your project I either accept unconditionally and like a shot... <...> ... since the advent of Christianity your "project" is the first forward movement of the human spirit on the way of Christ"⁵⁶. However, some aspects of the idea of resurrection of the fathers have initially seemed to him very doubtful. Soloviev met with skepticism the idea of a literal recreation of the fathers. It turns out that children, he says ironically, are forced to create (recreate) their fathers. Thus, Fedorov opposes resurrection to procreation and puts the cart ahead the horse. "A simple physical resurrection of the dead in itself cannot be the goal. To resurrect people in the state in which they seek to devour each other, to raise humanity at the stage of cannibal-

56 Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 4* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 4*], Progress, Moscow, p. 629.

ism would be absolutely impossible and undesirable", –he wrote to Fedorov⁵⁷. But it turns out, that Nikolai Fedorov even had no doubt that a "transfiguring" would happen simultaneously with patrifaction. According to him, the idea of bodily resurrection followed by "transfiguring" is recorded in the catechism and other religious books. Nevertheless, he unreservedly sure that it is a matter of human being, not God. According to his teaching, transfigured people will be not so much people as angels, and, at first glance, this idea is quite consistent with a canonical orthodoxy. However, it seems to me, that G. Florovsky is absolutely right when he notes that "his "projects" do not contain otherworldliness, only a direct insensibility of transfiguring"⁵⁸; "in his strange religious and technical project an economy, technology, magic, erotic, art combined in a charming and creepy synthesis"⁵⁹. In other words, the whole symbolic depth of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of Fedorov reduced to a vulgar materialist, positivist ideas on universal control and regulation.

57 Ibid. P. 630.

58 Florovsky, G.V. (2009), *The ways of Russian theology* [*Puti russkogo bogosloviya*], In-t rus. tsivilizatsii, Moscow, p. 323.

59 Ibid. P. 326.

Vladimir Solovyov considered the resurrection as a final link in the world evolution, as an inner necessity of its completion, although being hesitant about the extent of participation of humanity itself. He thought it as a creative act of God's will, or as a resurrection by forces of a humankind under the united, possessed powers of the nature (which seems undeniable influence of Fedorov's ideas). Our literature has repeatedly suggested, including Fedorov, that Solovyov caught Fedorov's ideas in his scheme of theandric process, but did not have the courage to develop them fully and was forced to present them half-heartedly, in a camouflaged form. Thus, in a letter to V.A. Kozhevnikov Fedorov wrote: "For the people of our time the most terrible thing is to be funny, fear of being ridiculous when there is insufficient certainty of truth, of course, holds Solovyov from an explicit acknowledgment of the resurrection honor. And if he decided to tell the whole truth without fear, then, if it originally triggered laughter, the laughter soon be passed, and a serious discussion of truth, which certainly would be initiated, if Solovyov said, would facilitate an early transition from thinking only to the case of resurrection itself"⁶⁰.

60 Fedorov, N.F. (1982), *Works* [*Sochineniya*], Mysl', Moscow, p. 644.

However, it must be noted that the teachings of Fedorov and Solovyov quite unlike: if Fedorov dreamed of "regulation" of natural forces on how to defeat nature, make her obey human being, then for Solovyov such victory would eliminate the life of nature "in a global solidarity"; the elements should not "be conquered", but "make persuaded", enlightening from the inside, and it is not the task of engineering, but of a free consent. "Driving force of the Fedorov's "project" – a moral power of filial love, filial duty to the dead fathers, while denying any positive sense upon the energy of sex. For Solovyov the power of love is also deeply moral, because it means the destruction of selfishness, shifting the center of personality with one's "I" on the other. But Fedorov hopes for creative power of filial feelings are not conclusive for him, he refuses to see a relative prototype of saving love. He imposes the task of saving on sexual love, strength, by Soloviev sense of the world, on its top – a mystical, not just a moral or natural. The perfect union of the pair restores a holistic image of a man-androgyne, who, having overcome an inferiority of gender separate existence, thus becomes immortal. And as we have to understand Solovyov, yet from such immortals couples all the plangorous creatures, all fragmented by

"physical selfishness", succumbed to the law of death earthly nature should wait for deliverance. Thus, many of the critical points of naturalistic technicist intuition of Fedorov confronts artistic and mystical intuition of Solovyov"⁶¹. Since the late 1880s Solovyov's attitude to Fedorov and his teaching changed dramatically. From his letters to brother Michael on 16/28 December 1888 it is followed that an internal gap occurred between Solovyov and Fedorov: "Do you remember a ridiculous incident with N.F. Fedorov? I hope you will not suspect me in any bad feelings towards this "Fool for Sunday". But his cantankerous act by its suddenness turned all my particular vision of a man and made the old relationship *really* impossible"⁶².

In our literature about the father of Russian cosmism undoubtedly exaggerated the influence of Fedorov on Lev Tolstoy who, respecting and appreciat-

61 Gal'tseva, R., Rodnyanskaya, I. (1991), "The genuine concern of the artist (Positive aesthetics of Vladimir Solovyov and a view at creative writing)", *Philosophy of art and literary criticism* ["Real'noe delo khudozhnika (Polozhitel'naya estetika Vladimira Solov'eva i vzglyad na literaturnoe tvorchestvo)", *Filosofiya iskusstva i literaturnaya kritika*], Moscow, p. 18.

62 Solov'ev, V.S., Radlov, E.L. (1970), *Collected works. Letters and appendix. Vol. 4 [Sobr. soch. Pis'ma i prilozhenie. T. 4]*, St. Petersburg, p. 118.

ing Fedorov, nevertheless, did not accept his doctrine. In 1889 in his diary Tolstoy makes the following record: "... I met Nikolai Fedorovich and talked with him. In his < ... > life and books is not what we have, but that what he wants. And intonations of confidence are amazing. Always these intonations are inversely with the truth"⁶³.

Nikolai Fedorov's desire to revive the dead from the graves by force of human knowledge and skill, picking up scattered ashes of the fathers in all the universe produces, at least, ambivalent impression on those readers who are experienced in philosophy and religion. "Solovyev had an opportunity to ask whether it would be "a revival of corpses"? Fedorov undoubtedly has some taste of necromancy" – says Florovsky, emphasizing original death theology of Fedorov, his fascination with death. "It remains unclear who dies and who is resurrected – a body or a person?.. About afterlife of the deceased Fedorov barely mentions. He says more about their graves, about their sepulchral dust"⁶⁴.

Also fear of blasphemous "substitution" expressed N. Berdyaev: "Fedorov's project requires that human life would be centered on cemeteries, near the ashes of the fathers... It's hard to say whether Fedorov believed in the immortality of the soul. When he speaks of the death and resurrection, he always has in mind the body, bodily death and bodily resurrection. He even does not bring up the question of the fate of the soul and spirit"⁶⁵; "An appreciation of human activity in the resurrection brings Fedorov to terrible words about the need to start applying action of telluride-solar and psycho-physiological forces "on the corpses in terms of the research and perhaps even revival, and whether it will be the first step towards resurrection. But Fedorov does not want to recognize, that he takes the path of a *magical* impact on nature... There is a deviation and failure in Fedorov's brilliant boldness, though he is a victim of passive Christian consciousness, which has not revealed creativity yet. Fedorov starves for an active human creativity in the resurrection of the dead, in the victory over the death, i.e. in the

63 Tolstoy, L.N. (1928-1958), *Collected works: in 90 vols. Vol. 50 [Sobr. soch.: V 90 tt. T. 50]*, Moscow, Leningrad, p. 23.

64 Florovsky, G.V. (2009), *The ways of Russian theology [Puti russkogo bogosloviya]*, In-t rus. tsivilizatsii, Moscow, pp. 324, 326.

65 Berdyaev, N.A. (1989), "Religion of resurrection ("The philosophy of common cause" by N.F. Fedorov)", *Collected Works. Vol. 3 ["Religiya voskresheniya ("Filosofiya obshchego dela" N.F. Fedorova)]*, *Sobranie sochinenii. T. 3*], YMCA-Press, Paris, pp. 294, 296.

matter of atonement. But only Christ can raise the dead, for the resurrection one primarily needs a redeeming grace of Christ. And human creativity cannot be a reclamation of the deadly consequences of sin. "Common cause" of Fedorov is not creative, but conservative. Human activity is going not to the art of a new being, but to the restoration of an old life, to fight evil, not the creation of new life"⁶⁶.

In the work "Religion of resurrection (The Philosophy of the Common Cause of N.F. Fedorov)" N. Berdyaev notes that the Achilles heel of Fedorov is a completely naive religious materialism. He connects unnatural religious materialism and scientific materialism. At times it seems that Fedorov recognizes neither the spirit nor the other world, but only this world chained to the physical corporeality. "If Fedorov has been more oriented to the spiritual life, he couldn't have seen a single and comprehensive purpose of life in the resurrection of the fathers. There are inherently valued life of the person, its individual fate, its spiritual life – the creatively positive life"⁶⁷.

66 Berdyaev, N.A. (1994), *Philosophy of creativity, culture and arts: In 2 vols. Vol. 1 [Filosofiya tvorchestva, kul'tury i iskusstva: V 2-kh tt. T. 1]*, Iskusstvo, Moscow, p. 323.

67 Berdyaev, N.A. (1989), "Religion of resurrection ("The philosophy of common cause" by N.F. Fedorov)", *Collected*

Nikolai Fedorov calls for exceptional human activity, he believes that a person can control the universe. But does Fedorov recognize human creativity? – asks Berdyaev. "Resurrection of the dead ancestors in itself is not a creative work – it's too drawn back, not forward. Creative task of life cannot be limited by resurrection, i.e. reconstitution of the deceased being. In its turn, Fedorov believed that we cannot create, we should recreate a world that created not by ourselves, the highest level of control is not a creation, but rather a recreation; a man is a controller, clerk, recreator, but not the Creator, not the Author"⁶⁸.

Sergei Bulgakov in the "Unfading light" gave a thorough analysis of the views of Russian cosmism father, he noted that the resurrection of the dead for Fedorov discontinued to be theurgic, but became entirely household-magic. Bulgakov says, that suppose, that thanks to "the nature regulation" the sons managed to collect the atoms from the decomposed bodies of the dead fathers from planetary space and to warm up life in the recreated bodies. Assume that these bodies would constitute an exact replica-

Works. Vol. 3 ["Religiya voskresheniya ("Filosofiya obshchego dela" N.F. Fedorova)", Sobranie sochinenii. T. 3], YMCA-Press, Paris, p. 297.

68 Ibid. P. 300.

tion of the body of the dead and possess the consciousness of communication and even identity with their counterparts who lived previously. Resurrection is supposed not only as a complete similarity, but the identity as well: not two identical replication of the same model, but the recovery of the same, single, only temporarily interrupted life. This is the essence of the Fedorov's "project". According to Fedorov by recreating bodies of the fathers their departed souls will be called to a new life as well. Only to the body is subject to resurrection, and the soul returns to it by virtue of a natural necessity, as soon as it is revived. The upshot is a kind of materialism and spiritualism compound, which corresponds to a purely mechanical conception both the death and resurrection. According to this view, the soul, yet its body not revived, is in a state of some anabiosis, a pure potentiality. However, it is precluded that the soul, having passed through the gates of death, generally cannot return to the body, moribund and destroyed by death, and to revive it, for it had lost the ability to revive the body, and not only the body lapsed to be alive; that's why the resurrection of the fathers by sons is impossible. "In other words, the death, which Fedorov generally adhered to see only a kind of chance and misunderstanding or

a pedagogical method, is an act too far rolling beyond this world to be able to cope with it alone only by the "regulation of nature", by physical resurrection of the body, no matter how they were sophisticated, even involving the vitality of human sperm in aid of reverse birth or resurrection of the fathers by sons (with the corresponding indications in the Fedorov's teaching). The soul can return only into transfigured resurrected body, and there is no earthly reason to sew tottering ramshackle "leather chasuble" of the deadly body from scraps"⁶⁹.

According to Bulgakov, Fedorov takes the present state of life as the only possible at all, and only wants to expand the power of a person through the "natural regulation" directed toward the goals of resurrection. But at the same time he thinks precisely about the resurrection of this flesh and on this earth, otherwise it would be difficult to understand his thought (although he expresses indignation meeting such understanding in the letter of V. Solovyov). Resurrection is essentially equivalent to an indefinite prolongation of human life by death suspension. Characteristically, that in Fedorov's constructions as if totally the experience

⁶⁹ Bulgakov, S.N. (1994), *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations* [*Svet nevechernii: Sozertsaniya i umozreniya*], Respublika, Moscow, p. 311.

of the afterlife and its importance are not taken into account, all the changes undergone by the soul apart from the body, its growth in this mysterious and unknown condition. Immortality is not only the absence of death or just its elimination, something negative, it is a positive force associated with the spirituality of the body in which the spirit fully penetrates and takes possession of the flesh; thereby the matter, the source of death and mortality are being sublated. Fedorov after all is tending to scientific immortality, taking it as an absence of death, or an indefinite lifespan. He wants a win over the death only as a moment of mortal life, and not on mortality as its overall quality. All the time Fedorov thinks about the revival of the corpse that being initially decomposed, but once again recreated by means of science, not the spiritual resurrection of the body, glorified and transfigured. Therefore, the resurrection of the fathers, according to Fedorov's project, even if it was feasible, is far distant from the resurrection of the dead that is so much desired by the Christian faith, it is in a different angle from it.

Bulgakov is convinced that in dealing with the "project" of resurrection Fedorov falls into explicit monophysitism unilaterally pushing the human element as a substituting and preemptive to the divine

force. He wants a human being, exercising the will of God in creation, to possibly go without God and apart from God, with an abruption of theandric indivisible and unmerged unity. Since the God to him is a transcendental norm, law, design, example, and people should do their human forces. "Economic magician, illuminated by the will to adelphopoiesis and resurrection of the fathers, feels himself as a theurgist and does not want another theurgy. The resurrection of the dead delivered as an ultimate goal for a thrifty will, is generally a false task, because it places in the prism of temporality those things that are beyond the time, at least this time of our aeon"⁷⁰. That flesh that is available for the impact of economic labor would not rise in its present form, it is separated from the resurrection by the death threshold and "change", that is equivalent for people who did not experience death. This "change", which is essentially a new creative act of God over a man, cannot make produce an economic labor, and therefore Fedorov's "project", no matter how far gone the "regulation of nature", is unrealizable by natural and human forces. "Generally speaking, it is unclear whether there is any place for metahistory of the "human future life" in visions of N.F. Fedorov, which is separated by the onto-

70 Ibid. P. 313.

logical catastrophe from the current aeon. According to Fedorov, historical humanity should not leave anything to the Son of Man but a good example, and for him Christian revelation of the Holy Trinity is narrowed down to the commandments of the resurrection, which divine image of the Holy Trinity is given in the life as a divine family to the glory of the world kindered. This evolutionary monism, though begins with the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jesus, in fact abolishes a living faith in the crucified God. It relinquishes only a threatening perspective of a forcible miraculous resurrection of the dead at the end of this century, which awaits humanity in the case of non-performance of the "common cause". At this historical failure people will be resurrected by God itself – many on judgment and condemnation. But humanity is already admonished about this failure, it must do on their own", concludes Bulgakov⁷¹.

N.O. Lossky in his "History of Russian Philosophy" noted that Fedorov called his conceived resurrection as an immanent and condemned the pursuit of otherworldly, transcendent being. His ideal was to implement the kingdom of God in this world. He tried to combine religious metaphysics with a naturalistic realism. Apparently, Fedorov implied the

71 Ibid. P. 314.

resurrection of a human being in the untransfigured body, which would still need food. Hence, the question arises about the settlement of other planets. All this is achieved through advanced science and technology. From this perspective, Fedorov's teaching akin to the doctrines of contemporary naturalists who consider possible extension of life by improving the art of medicine, improve hygiene and living conditions etc. Lossky reveals the main difference between Fedorov's teaching and Christian doctrine: "The basis of Christian doctrine is the belief that moral evil – is a pride and selfishness – all being initially. All other forms of evil – the imperfection of the body, blindness of natural forces, human hostility – are only the *consequences* of the original evil. Therefore, the redemption of evil can only be achieved through the elimination of its main reasons – the separation from God. Fedorov believes the issue solved when he says that every person fighting for the preservation of his life and creating a discord with other people. In fact it is on the contrary, the discord between people, discord between man and nature creates a struggle for existence"⁷². In general, according to

72 Lossky, N.O. (1991), *History of Russian philosophy [Istoriya russkoi filosofii]*, Vysshaya shkola, Moscow, p. 110.

Lossky, philosophical works of Fedorov create an impression as talented but immature. They are set out not quite systematically and consistently due to a lack of learning and excessive interest in one issue.

From this we can conclude that testing an explicit personal involvement to "dead souls", showing particular interest in the tombs and cemeteries, Fedorov was not concerned about the eternal life of the soul but the magic of reviving corpses and therefore inevitably slipping into a primitive naturalism, vulgar materialism. Demetaphorization is at the core of his thought, i.e. literal understanding of the metaphor of the resurrection of the fathers. Hence the desire to build a paradise not only on earth, dreamed by the Bolsheviks, but also in the universe. In this context are interesting the reflections on the social utopias like Fedorov of the famous philosopher Merab Mamardashvili. He definitely identified the essence of such views, having noted that Fedorov directly and clearly understood what Christianity understands in the symbolic and metaphorical meaning. And it is a characteristic of any utopia, including Bolshevism. "Bolshevism is generally originated from materializing absolutes. That is from the assumption that the absolute concepts are such con-

cepts, which must first be implemented... The kingdom of God is an absolute concept. Therefore, we need to implement it on the earth. Based on the fact that all the concepts that we use, in principle, are amenable to real implementation... Such a thing could develop in Russia... simply because of the lack of tradition of an abstract culture. Including the lack of a such within Christianity, in Russian Orthodoxy. And in a society – that this mania to touch absolutes. To touch – then I will believe in them, or let's realize them, with their absoluteness... Because Christianity speaks of the resurrection not in a vivid truest sense of the word. It speaks of the very special things about which we can only speak the language, but understanding its abstract symbolism, some sort of allegory. Not a literary allegory but a spiritual one. And understanding this culture is identically to the possession of the culture... All social utopias grew of a lack of culture, i.e. of attempts to visual understanding that defies an intuitive understanding..."⁷³.

Bulgakov drew his attention onto the relation of Fedorov's teachings with the utopia of Marx: "Fedorov's "project", even understood in its broadest and un-

73 Mamardashvili, M.K. (1992), *How I understand the philosophy* [*Kak ya ponimayu filosofiyu*], Moscow, pp. 325-327.

certain sense as a general idea of human participation in the resurrection of the dead, retains its essential features, distinguishes by its economism and magicism. That faith in the economy, which is evident in today's economism, and particularly in "economic materialism" gets here the most radical expression... Fedorov's teaching was exactly what Marxism dimly dreamed of that, what constituted its unconscious, but intimate motive"⁷⁴. And even Berdyaev notes that "during the Soviet era in Russia was a Fedorov movement. And, oddly enough, there was some contact between the teachings of Fedorov and communism, despite its very hostile attitude towards Marxism. But Fedorov's hostility to capitalism was even greater than of the Marxists"⁷⁵.

Utopian social engineering has been developed both by the cosmist Fedorov and the Bolsheviki, which is characterized by some utopian social goal, and then rational means for its im-

plementation are selected. The ideal of "humanization" of reality, understood as its rationalization, in principle, allows full control over the nature and social situations. In its turn, on the one hand, it leads to understanding the nature and the society as a mere resource of human activity, to the idea of its infinite alteration, conquest, and on the other hand, to the orientation on design and construction of social processes, and perhaps a man himself, to technocratic illusions. Such an understanding of man's liberation from external dependency identified this exemption with mastery, control and administration upon external processes. Totalitarian apparatus that emerged in our country owes its origin primarily to the idea of possibility and need for sound management of social processes, creating "transparent" social relations, i.e. their humanization and rationalization.

The relationship between Bolshevism and Fedorov's utopia has deep roots, they are implied in the inescapable desire to subordinate to the control and administration not only people, but also the nature of the whole world, the whole universe; to transform a natural living organism into a giant machine subject to the will of a man, who became the God; not only overmaster death and become immortal, but to achieve miraculous

74 Bulgakov, S.N. (1994), *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations* [*Svet nevechernii: Sozertsaniya i umozreniya*], Respublika, Moscow, p. 315.

75 Berdyaev, N.A. (1990), "Russian idea. Main problems of the Russian thought of the XIX century and early XX century", *About Russia and Russian philosophical culture* ["Russkaya ideya. Osnovnye problemy russkoi mysli XIX veka i nachala XX veka", *O Rossii i russkoi filosofskoi kul'ture*], Nauka, Moscow, p. 229.

transformation of human nature, to make a person comprehensively and harmoniously developed by means of magic and social alchemy; to build a paradise not only on earth, but export it to infinity, to the universe. Does we need God for these acts of a man? Very doubtful. In modern Russia teachings like Fedorov's are becoming ideological basis of all modern philosophies of common cause, of all "national-patriotic" ideologies claiming anti-Western essence of Russia, using stamps on the original collectivism of the "Russian soul", Russian conciliarity, ideocracy, state and leader cult.

The influence of Fedorov's ideas upon his contemporaries and descendants

Programming ideas of Fedorov were continued in the works of Vladimir Mayakovsky, N. Zabolotsky, A. Platonov, but they are most fully reflected in the teachings of K. Tsiolkovsky, who gave scientific completeness and transparency to the theory of the "common cause", and the conclusions of this theory became more apparent, frank, and therefore more frightening. For Tsiolkovsky reunion is appeared as a great achievement humanity, which result would be the transformation of the Earth, the implementation

of the elements regulation, the use of solar energy, improvement of plant and animal forms, until the mastery of time and space. But the life on our planet and the entire universe will be managed by a single brain of "gods of various degrees" which constitute numerous celestials. A highly organized existence in space foredooms earthlings to the need of self-development: since each of them, or rather their brain atoms are given a chance to get into the planetary Mind. Endowing a prerogative of immortality to the smallest particles of matter, Tsiolkovsky does not want to understand those who oppose the perspective of atomic immortality, who would rather meet again their beloved and relatives in a blissful space, to save the identity of its own personality in the new existence. In his perfect world everything related to personality as though atrophied: a wealth of interpersonal, family relations, emotional beginning – compassion, memory, friendship and, most importantly, love. Not a single person with the infinity of its internal creative development, but the space as a whole becomes an embodiment of the supreme "divine" reality.

Tsiolkovsky comes from the fact that a supreme intelligence reigns in the Space, which bestows joy and bliss. A person must apply to the same kind of

autotrophic creature isolated from the outside world, devoid of eliminative organs, his life will be maintained only by a beam of light. The personality transforms into the biological "perpetuum mobile", definitively best suited for an immortal cosmic destiny. Tsiolkovsky not only introduces marginal radicalism in the idea of immortality, but also an engineering calculation. And if in the doctrine of Fedorov the forthcoming "crystal palace" will be converted into the temple-museum, then the entire Space of Tsiolkovsky, colonized by mind, will be the highest abode of a common humanity, "as if mankind turns into one powerful being under the control of their president"⁷⁶.

It is clear that "religious – technical" project of Fedorov and "scientific religion" of Tsiolkovsky are only the variants of social utopias, nothing more. However, in the philosophy of "Russian cosmism" not everything harmless – some ideas can be found quite strange, not to say extravagant: for instance, in the "philosophy of flying" of A. Sukhovo-Kobylin our "mammal-like" wild ancestors, "imperfect" race get into the category of outgoing to the dust; N. Umov agrees with the inevitability of extinction

of some people-automats, who was not able to climb to the crest of evolution; Tsiolkovsky insists on "artificial selection", leading to the creation of "creatures without passion, but with a high intellect" and puts the task of "preventive" destruction of imperfect forms of plants and animals. Space path to "eternal bliss" of a rootless and forgetful "citizen of the universe" is based on the principle of "kill the suffering". In our opinion, such an activity directed toward a single goal of the control over the whole Universe by means of powerful supraindividual intellect, even based on the universal love of humanity, cannot lack most distressing and tragic consequences for people.

Can the Fedorov's teaching become Russian national idea?

In recent years, national philosophical literature in relation to the ideas of Fedorov have acquired sweetly-enthusiastic assessment, and above all they are typical with reference to S.G. Semenova, a famous explorer of his works, who suggests that *the doctrine of the "common cause" can become a nation-wide Russian idea*, since it corresponds to its weal. S.G. Semenova indicates that even in the middle of the last century has been proved an amazing pattern of evolution

76 Tsiolkovsky, K.E. (2001), *Philosophy of space [Kosmicheskaya filosofiya]*, URSS, Moscow, p. 350.

of living creatures, called "cephalization" (headization): permanent, complexity of the nervous system in a polar vector (i.e. without reversion), the growth of the brain. According to Vernadsky, such an "empirical fact" indicates on an internal program of evolution, which lead it to create a more complex, more intelligent forms. Human being – is yet a crown of cephalization, but this deep pattern cannot stop at him, furthermore, according to Fedorov, it is designed to become conscious. This is a new, active-creative stage of evolution, when a person has to take its helm in hands and lead it in that direction, which is dictated by the evolutionary law of increasing growth of the spirit in the womb of the matter, the most profound moral sense, a religious imperative.

S.G. Semenova is convinced that Russia with its ineradicable psychic logic, designated by Russian religious thinkers as "all or nothing", being today almost at the bottom of national despair, tempting by "nothing", just might mount to this "everything". In Russia in genteel history such "all" has been imagined by the communist idea. Russians now are only to be asked a rhetorical question: could Russian socialism radically be cleansed of atheism and incorporate metaphysical tasks set in the active

Christianity of Fedorov in due course, in a peaceful evolution, if the Soviet empire has not collapsed? According to Semenova, the Soviet system had already established valuable formal prerequisites for possible ideocracy for its filling with advanced, solid ideal. She believes that Fedorov's teaching as new national idea has a chance to become the main direction of the development of Russian civilization. "Among the vast amount of works for the dispensation of the new economy, material and cultural national wealth preservation, among the struggles of parties and interests, attitudes and orientations we cannot forget that main value, those overarching goals of global, planetary, ontological order, many of which were formulated by Fedorov, and they precisely must give the necessary identity and stability in the being of our national existence, to become our word to the world", – writes S.G. Semenova⁷⁷.

Thus, the philosophy of the common cause of Fedorov pretends to turn into "our word to the world", in a national idea, designed to unite all Russians first, and then all the humanity in the resurrec-

77 Semenova, S.G. (1995), "Philosophy of resurrection of N.F. Fedorov", *N.F. Fedorov. Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* ["Filosofiya voskresheniya N.F. Fedorova", *Fedorov N.F. Sobr. soch.: V 4 tt. T. 1*], Moscow, p. 33.

tion of the ancestors, the regulation of nature, the achievement of immortality. S.G. Semenova, as a follower and theoretical successor of Fedorov, not simply acting as an apologist and adherer of his teaching – she offers Russia another utopian version of "Russian idea", but now in the ideological package of the "philosophy of the common cause". She believes that Russia has always been fixed on the late times and dates, to the world of unfading "rustic paradise" of the Kitezh City, so it is quite of its depth to implement the Fedorov's paradise project in intergalactic space. The consideration here is probably upon the fact that the Russian people are maximalists, if it really should fight, then not with the stratification of society into rich and poor, not with alcoholism, drug addiction and prostitution, not with the shallowing of rivers, draining wetlands, pollution of the environment, not with the improvement of their material and spiritual well-being, improvement of living standards. Where is the good of being distracted by trivia? Let the Russian peasant will fight with the death!

S.G. Semenova insists that Florovsky was the first who made an attempt in print to take away Fedorov from the Orthodox thought, from Christianity in general, and there is only a one follower of Florovsky that being the "destroyer of

Fedorov" – N.K. Gavryushin⁷⁸. However, the situation is far otherwise: L.N. Tolstoy, V.S. Soloviev, N.A. Berdyaev, S.N. Bulgakov, N.O. Lossky were against the Fedorov's teaching; moreover, they opposed not just certain provisions of his teaching, but adduced serious arguments of scientific and religious insolvency of Fedorov's teaching generally, indicated on utopianism and whimsicality of his project.

Conclusion

What conclusions can be drawn from the above? If thinker proposes a conceptual system, especially claiming to address the global issues of human existence, hence, at least it should not be controversial in its own grounds. Since the teaching of Fedorov not only in conflict with reality, but also he proposes to change the reality itself, to create a new reality, then the logical basis of this teaching should be irreproachable. However, it is obvious that the philosophy of the "common cause" does not hang together. The concept of the Russian cosmism father is incondite, eclectic, contradictory and utopian. "The philosophy of the common

⁷⁸ Semenova, S.G. (1994), *Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven [Tainy tsarstviya nebesnogo]*, Shkola-Press, Moscow, pp. 340-341.

cause" – a social utopia, here revealed a prophetic type of utopian consciousness. Fedorov believes in his doctrine of the New Passover, in technical possibilities of its implementation. The traditional idea "regulation of nature" for utopia, as well as an idea of "immanent resurrection", are justified by natural science and religion. However, upon closer inspection, the Fedorov's "theory" is not related to the competent Orthodoxy, nor, especially, to the real science, if not to mix science with magic and sorcery, astronomy with astrology, chemistry with alchemy. According to Berdyaev, positive scientific resurrection of the dead is a genre of "utopian dreamery", "Fedorov's "project" in that form in which he develops it, completely unacceptable: it is a utopia and fantasy, born by bad naturalism and materialism in religion, by mixing different plans"⁷⁹. Fedorov's teaching is a vulgarization of Christian dogma, because it defines Christianity as "the union of living for the resurrection of the dead"⁸⁰, and Fedorov's

technology of resurrection has no relation to the New Testament Apocalypse and built on vulgar materialist views.

The father of the Russian cosmism solves the problem of death too easily. It is known that for the Russian mentality death is perceived according to the formula – "The outgoing loses, the remaining wins", that indicates on the essence of infantile-adolescent relationship to this event. In accordance with this mentality Fedorov is inclined to transform the meaning of death, to present it not as a necessity, but as an accident, to oppose an opportunity to prevent the inevitable final end all. Death as an existential problem, Fedorov is not interested in personal problem, as well as not interested in the individual itself – he solves this problem from the standpoint of conciliarity, the "common cause". But life on earth, transmittable into infinity, becomes meaningless: in a bad space-time infinity an eternal life chronotope does not range, because it doesn't have the main thing – the sense. Immortal half-humans, half-angels in a fully above controlled society will fly to each other on a visit from planet to planet, from one galaxy to another. Immortality is achieved, but what is it? Indeed, there is no progress in the eternity and infinity, nor Fedorov refers to progress skeptically. The goal

79 Berdyaev, N.A. (1989), "Religion of resurrection ("The philosophy of common cause" by N.F. Fedorov)", *Collected Works. Vol. 3* ["Religiya voskresheniya ("Filosofiya obshchego dela" N.F. Fedorova)", *Sobranie sochinenii. T. 3*], YMCA-Press, Paris, p. 301.

80 Fedorov, N.F. (1995), *Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt. T. 1*], Progress, Moscow, p. 138.

is achieved, but what it solves? And this sad result indicates certain taboos which are based on a ban to handle religious symbols.

Fedorov treats all natural, in-artificial and all chaotic, spontaneous with animosity. This feeling imbued his practical recommendations and fantastic projects. But complete harmony, absolute regulation is an absolute rest, complete stagnation and, ultimately, death, since the control in his "transfigured macrocosm" must be completely transparent, therefore, any contradictions would disappear and arduous determinism would dominate, natural organism would become a huge artificial mechanism. If we assume basic practicability of Fedorov's project, it will lead not just to elimination of the "non-kinship" existence, i.e. contradictions, but eliminate the carriers of these contradictions themselves. The autotrophy idea, a radical change of a human being, who could live in all environments and control them, now enjoys considerable popularity among a number of scientists and philosophers. They are not satisfied with the modern "imperfect man", they are eager to turn it into something like an angel, therefore they enthusiastically and tirelessly advocate autotrophy. Come to think of it, this idea is preter-

human. This posthuman being is no longer an earthly man. According to V.A. Kutyrev, "an ecological pessimism is mainly connected with the finiteness of the Earth. Nature puts limits to growth. People want to overcome this obstacle by an access into the Space. Fashion on the "Russian Cosmism". We tend to forget the main thing: human limits. Space here will not help. As humans, we cannot overcome them. "Either we will remain as we are, or we would fail to be" – so said one Patriarch of Rome on the proposal to change the symbol of faith. The same can be answered to the enthusiasts of autotrophy, immortality and to other technicians. All things have their nature and measure"⁸¹.

And indeed, the superman inevitably will destroy the nature, as a spirit, elements, living in its naturalness and unpredictability, and itself as a human being, as a personality, with all its advantages, extravagances and imperfections. Therefore, about the full and literal implementation of the "theory" of the father of the Russian cosmism, the theory claiming now to be the new "Russian idea", even his most ardent adherents prefer to keep quiet.

81 Kutyrev, V.A. (2012), *The Mortido time* [*Vremya Mortido*], Aleteiya, St. Petersburg, p. 157.

References

1. Barsht, K. (1989), "Teach me how to love: on the question of N.F. Fedorov and F.M. Dostoevsky" ["Nauchite menya lyubvi: K voprosu o N.F. Fedorove i F.M. Dostoevskom"], *Prostor*, No. 7, pp. 159-167.
2. Berdyaev, N.A. (1989), "Religion of resurrection ("The philosophy of common cause" by N.F. Fedorov)", *Collected Works. Vol. 3* ["Religiya voskresheniya ("Filosofiya obshchego dela" N.F. Fedorova)", *Sobranie sochinenii. T. 3*], YMCA-Press, Paris, pp. 242-301.
3. Berdyaev, N.A. (1990), "Russian idea. Main problems of the Russian thought of the XIX century and early XX century", *About Russia and Russian philosophical culture* ["Russkaya ideya. Osnovnye problemy russkoi mysli XIX veka i nachala XX veka", *O Rossii i russkoi filosofskoi kul'ture*], Nauka, Moscow, pp. 43-271.
4. Berdyaev, N.A. (1994), *Philosophy of creativity, culture and arts: In 2 vols. Vol. 1* [*Filosofiya tvorchestva, kul'tury i iskusstva: V 2-kh tt. T. 1*], Iskusstvo, Moscow, 470 p.
5. Berdyaev, N.A. (1994), *Philosophy of creativity, culture and arts: In 2 vols. Vol. 2* [*Filosofiya tvorchestva, kul'tury i iskusstva: V 2-kh tt. T. 2*], Iskusstvo, Moscow, 368 p.
6. Bulgakov, S.N. (1993), *Works: in 2 vols. Vol. 2* [*Sochineniya: V 2-kh tt. T. 2*], Nauka, Moscow, 752 p.
7. Bulgakov, S.N. (1994), *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations* [*Svet nevechernii: Sozertsaniya i umozreniya*], Respublika, Moscow, 415 p.
8. Demichev, A.V. (1997), *Philosophical and cultural foundations of modern thanatology: dissertation* [*Filosofskie i kul'turologicheskie osnovaniya sovremennoi tanatologii: dis. ... d. filos. n.*], St. Petersburg, 280 p.
9. Dudenkov, V.N. (1998), *Philosophy of cosmism in Russia in the late XIX-XX centuries* [*Filosofiya kosmizma v Rossii rubezha XIX-XX vekov*], St. Petersburg, 277 p.
10. Epshtein, M. (2000), "A figure of iteration: philosopher Nikolai Fedorov and his literary prototypes" ["Figura povtora: filosof Nikolai Fedorov i ego literaturnye prototipy"], *Voprosy literatury*, No. 6, pp. 114-124.
11. Fedorov, N.F. (1982), *Works* [*Sochineniya*], Mysl', Moscow, 711 p.
12. Fedorov, N.F. (1995-1999), *Collected works: In 4 vols.* [*Sobranie sochinenii: V 4-kh tt.*], Progress, Moscow.

13. Florovsky, G.V. (2009), *The ways of Russian theology* [*Puti russkogo bogosloviya*], In-t rus. tsivilizatsii, Moscow, 848 p.
14. Frolov, I. (1989), "Spirits and illusions of "eternal life" and "universal resurrection" ["Prizraki i illyuzii "vechnoi zhizni" i "vseobshchego voskresheniya"]", *Sovetskaya kul'tura*, No. 94, pp. 451-453.
15. Gal'tseva, R., Rodnyanskaya, I. (1991), "The genuine concern of the artist (Positive aesthetics of Vladimir Solovyov and a view at creative writing)", *Philosophy of art and literary criticism* ["Real'noe delo khudozhnika (Polozhitel'naya estetika Vladimira Solov'eva i vzglyad na literaturnoe tvorchestvo)", *Filosofiya iskusstva i literaturnaya kritika*], Moscow, pp. 8-29.
16. Il'in, V.N. (1929), "About religious and philosophical worldview of N.F. Fedorov", *Eurasian collected volume. Book VI* ["O religioznom i filosofskom mirovozzrenii N.F. Fedorova", *Evraziiskii sbornik. Kn. VI*], Prague, pp. 694-702.
17. Kogan, L.A. (1990), "Philosophy of N.F. Fedorov" ["Filosofiya N.F. Fedorova"], *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 11, pp. 74-84.
18. Kutyrev, V.A. (2012), *The Mortido time* [*Vremya Mortido*], Aleteiya, St. Petersburg, 336 p.
19. Lossky, N.O. (1991), *History of Russian philosophy* [*Istoriya russkoi filosofii*], Vysshaya shkola, Moscow, 559 p.
20. L'vov, V. (1974), "Mysterious old man. Tale-Chronicle" ["Zagadochnyi starik. Povest'-khronika"], *Neva*, No. 5, pp. 65-122.
21. Mamardashvili, M.K. (1992), *How I understand the philosophy* [*Kak ya ponimayu filosofiyu*], Moscow, 408 p.
22. Semenova, S.G. (1977), "Nikolai Fedorovich Fedorov (life and teaching)" ["Nikolai Fedorovich Fedorov (zhizn' i uchenie)"], *Prometei*, Vol. 11, pp. 86-105.
23. Semenova, S.G. (1982), "Fedorov and his philosophical heritage", *N.F. Fedorov* ["Fedorov i ego filosofskoe nasledie", *N.F. Fedorov*], Mysl', Moscow, pp. 5-50.
24. Semenova, S.G. (1990), *Nikolai Fedorov: the creativity of life* [*Nikolai Fedorov: tvorchestvo zhizni*], Sov. pisatel', Moscow, 383 p.
25. Semenova, S.G. (1993), "Russian cosmism", *Russian cosmism: the anthology of philosophical thought* ["Russkii kosmizm", *Russkii kosmizm: Antologiya filosofskoi mysli*], Moscow, pp. 3-33.

26. Semenova, S.G. (1994), *Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven* [*Tainy tsarstviya nebesnogo*], Shkola-Press, Moscow, 416 p.
27. Semenova, S.G. (1995), "Philosophy of resurrection of N.F. Fedorov", *N.F. Fedorov. Collected works: In 4 vols. Vol. 1* ["Filosofiya voskresheniya N.F. Fedorova", *Fedorov N.F. Sobr. soch.: V 4 tt. T. 1*], Moscow, pp. 5-53.
28. Skatov, N. (1978), "A dispute between two utopians" ["Spor dvukh utopistov"], *Zvezda*, No. 8, pp. 172-186.
29. Solov'ev, V.S., Radlov, E.L. (1970), *Collected works. Letters and appendix. Vol. 4* [*Sobr. soch. Pis'ma i prilozhenie. T. 4*], St. Petersburg, 665 p.
30. "The First Book of Moses, called Genesis (Holy Bible)" ["Bibliya, Pervaya kniga Moiseeva. Bytie"], available at: <http://biblia.org.ua/bibliya/byt.html>
31. *The idea of the death in Russian mentality* [*Ideya smerti v rossiiskom mentalitete*], St. Petersburg, 1999, 303 p.
32. *The philosophy of immortality and resurrection: on the materials of the VII Fedorov readings. 8-10 December 1995. Issue 1* [*Filosofiya bessmertiya i voskresheniya: Po materialam VII Fedorovskikh chtenii. 8-10 dekabrya 1995. Vyp. 1*], Moscow, 1996, 272 p.
33. Tolstoy, I.L. (1969), *My recollections* [*Moi vospominaniya*], Khudozhestvennaya literatura, Moscow, 456 p.
34. Tolstoy, L.N. (1928-1958), *Collected works: in 90 vols.* [*Sobr. soch.: V 90 tt.*], Moscow, Leningrad.
35. Torchinov, E.A. (2004), *Taoist practices* [*Daosskie praktiki*], Azbuka-klassika, Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie, St. Petersburg, 256 p.
36. Tsiolkovsky, K.E. (2001), *Philosophy of space* [*Kosmicheskaya filosofiya*], URSS, Moscow, 480 p.

Николай Фёдоров – основоположник русского космизма

Волков Владимир Николаевич

Доктор философских наук,
профессор кафедры управления,

социально-культурной деятельности и туризма,
Академия переподготовки работников искусства, культуры и туризма,
123007, Россия, Москва, ул. 5-я Магистральная, 5;
e-mail: vnickvo@gmail.com

Аннотация

Об учении русского мыслителя Николая Фёдорова в последние годы опубликовано немало исследований, однако в оценке его творчества до сих пор присутствует недосказанность, утаивание, замалчивание и просто предвзятость. На протяжении длительного времени в нашей "федориане" подспудно формировалась традиция восприятия его как гениального провидца, праведника и неканонизированного святого, жизнь которого легко укладывается в жанр жития, а идеи рассматриваются либо в русле православной философии, либо в русле научного предвидения, прогнозирования, футурологического проекта, либо и того и другого вместе. Кем же был космист Фёдоров на самом деле – учёным, философом, религиозным мыслителем или шарлатаном?

Ключевые слова

Космос, патрофикация, соборность, неродственность, автотрофность, прогресс, магия, бессмертие.

Библиография

1. Баршт К. научите меня любви: к вопросу о Н.Ф. Федорове и Ф.М. Достоевском // Простор. – 1989. – № 7. – С. 159-167.
2. Бердяев Н.А. Религия воскрешения ("Философия общего дела" Н.Ф. Федорова) // Собрание сочинений. Т. 3. – Париж: YMCA-Press, 1989. – С. 242-301.
3. Бердяев Н.А. Русская идея. Основные проблемы русской мысли XIX века и начала XX века // О России и русской философской культуре. – М.: Наука, 1990. – С. 43-271.
4. Бердяев Н.А. Философия творчества, культуры и искусства: В 2-х тт. – М.: Искусство, 1994. – Т. 1. – 470 с.

5. Бердяев Н.А. Философия творчества, культуры и искусства: В 2-х тт. – М.: Искусство, 1994. – Т. 2. – 368 с.
6. Библия, Первая книга Моисеева. Бытие. [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://biblia.org.ua/bibliya/byt.html>
7. Булгаков С.Н. Свет невечерний: Созерцания и умозрения. – М.: Республика, 1994. – 415 с.
8. Булгаков С.Н. Сочинения: В 2-х тт. – М.: Наука, 1993. – Т. 2. – 752 с.
9. Гальцева Р., Роднянская И. Реальное дело художника (Положительная эстетика Владимира Соловьёва и взгляд на литературное творчество) // Соловьёв В.С. Философия искусства и литературная критика. – М., 1991. – С. 8-29.
10. Демичев А.В. Философские и культурологические основания современной танатологии: дисс. ... д. филос. н. – СПб., 1997. – 280 с.
11. Дуденков В.Н. Философия космизма в России рубежа XIX-XX веков. – СПб., 1998. – 277 с.
12. Идея смерти в российском менталитете. – СПб., 1999. – 303 с.
13. Ильин В.Н. О религиозном и философском мировоззрении Н.Ф. Федорова // Евразийский сборник. – Прага, 1929. – Кн. VI. – С. 694-702.
14. Коган Л.А. философия Н.Ф. Федорова // Вопросы философии. – 1990. – № 11. – С. 74-84.
15. Кутырёв В.А. Время Mortido. – СПб.: Алетейя, 2012. – 336 с.
16. Лосский Н.О. История русской философии. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 559 с.
17. Львов В. Загадочный старик. Повесть-хроника // Нева. –1974. – № 5. – С. 65-122.
18. Мамардашвили М.К. Как я понимаю философию. – М., 1992. – 408 с.
19. Семёнова С.Г. Николай Фёдоров: творчество жизни. – М.: Сов. писатель, 1990. – 383 с.
20. Семёнова С.Г. Фёдоров и его философское наследие // Н.Ф. Федоров. – М.: Мысль, 1982. – С. 5-50.
21. Семёнова С.Г. Философия воскрешения Н. Ф. Федорова // Фёдоров Н.Ф. Собр. соч.: В 4 тт. – М., 1995. – Т. 1. – С. 5-53.
22. Семёнова С.Г. Николай Федорович Федоров (жизнь и учение) // Прометей. – 1977. – Т. 11. – С. 86-105.

23. Семёнова С.Г. Русский космизм // Русский космизм: Антология философской мысли. – М., 1993. – С. 3-33.
24. Семёнова С.Г. Тайны царствия небесного. – М.: Школа-Пресс, 1994. – 416 с.
25. Скатов Н. Спор двух утопистов // Звезда. – 1978. – № 8. – С. 172-186.
26. Соловьёв В.С. Собр. соч. Письма и приложение / Под ред. Э.Л. Радлова. Фото-принтное издание. – СПб., 1970. – Т. 4. – 665 с.
27. Толстой И.Л. Мои воспоминания. – М.: Художественная литература, 1969. – 456 с.
28. Толстой Л.Н. Собр. соч.: В 90 тт. – М.-Л., 1928-1958.
29. Торчинов Е.А. Даосские практики. – СПб.: Азбука-классика; Петербургское Востоковедение, 2004. – 256 с.
30. Фёдоров Н.Ф. Собрание сочинений: В 4-х тт. – М.: Прогресс, 1995-1999.
31. Фёдоров Н.Ф. Сочинения. – М.: Мысль, 1982. – 711 с.
32. Философия бессмертия и воскрешения: По материалам VII Фёдоровских чтений. 8-10 декабря 1995. – М., 1996. – Вып. 1. – 272 с.
33. Флоровский Г.В. Пути русского богословия. – М.: Ин-т рус. цивилизации, 2009. – 848 с.
34. Фролов И. призраки и иллюзии "вечной жизни" и "всеобщего воскрешения" // Советская культура. – 1989. – № 94. – С. 451-453.
35. Циолковский К.Э. Космическая философия. – М.: УРСС, 2001. – 480 с.
36. Эпштейн М. Фигура повтора: философ Николай Фёдоров и его литературные прототипы // Вопросы литературы. – 2000. – № 6. – С. 114-124.