



БФУ имени
И. Канта



5100

Международная научная конференция

“Нет права на восстание”

Кант и проблема революции

в политической философии XVIII-XXI вв.

9 – 10 ноября 2017 г., Калининград



Балтийский федеральный университет
имени И. Канта
Институт гуманитарных наук
Академия Кантиана

Международная научная конференция

“НЕТ ПРАВА НА ВОССТАНИЕ”
Кант и проблема революции
в политической философии XVIII – XXI вв.

9 – 10 ноября 2017 г., Калининград

Программа конференции
Тезисы докладов

Калининград
2017

ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННЫЙ КОМИТЕТ

Председатель

Нина Дмитриева, д. филос. н., профессор
научный директор Академии Кантиана

Состав

Валентин Балановский, к. филос. н.
исполнительный директор Академии Кантиана

Андрей Зильбер
младший научный сотрудник Академии Кантиана

Леонид Корнилаев, к. филос. н.
младший научный сотрудник Академии Кантиана

Сергей Луговой, к. филос. н.
старший научный сотрудник Академии Кантиана

Вадим Чалый, к. филос. н.
старший научный сотрудник Академии Кантиана

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Chairperson

Prof. Dr. Nina Dmitrieva
Scientific Director of the Academia Kantiana

Members

Dr. Valentin Balanovskiy
Executive Director of the Academia Kantiana

Dr. Leonid Kornilayev
Scientific Associate of the Academia Kantiana

Dr. Sergey Lugovoy
Scientific Associate of the Academia Kantiana

Dr. Vadim Chaly
Scientific Associate of the Academia Kantiana

Andrey Zilber
Scientific Associate of the Academia Kantiana

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Программа конференции (русская версия).....	6
Программа конференции (английская версия).....	8
ТЕЗИСЫ ДОКЛАДОВ	
<i>Рейдар Маликс (Осло): Кант и теории революции XVIII века.....</i>	10
<i>Вадим Чалый (Калининград): Моральный радикализм Канта против политического консерватизма Канта: бунтовать нельзя подчиняться.....</i>	11
<i>Алексей Круглов (Москва): Кант как немецкий теоретик французской революции: возникновение догмы в марксистско-ленинской философии</i>	12
<i>Антонино Фальдута (Галле): Эрхард, Фихте и Шиллер о праве народа на революцию.....</i>	13
<i>Петр Резвых (Москва): Шеллинг и революция: государство как средство</i>	15
<i>Андрей Майданский (Белгород): Феноменология труда и фuries революции (об идеализме политической теории Маркса).....</i>	17
<i>Хайнер Клемме (Галле): Карл Шмитт или Кант? Размышления о праве, государстве и революции.....</i>	18
<i>Алексей Козырев (Москва): Революция и религия: опыт русской интеллигенции.....</i>	19
<i>Андрей Тесля (Калининград): «Революция» и «апокалипсис» Розанова: между обновлением и концом.....</i>	21
<i>Борис Межуев (Москва): Позднее славянофильство и всемирная революция.....</i>	23
<i>Тамаш Краус (Будапешт): Разработка Лениным концепции государства, демократии и революции.....</i>	24
<i>Татьяна Румянцева (Минск): Александр Богданов о революции в России и путях построения социализма.....</i>	26
<i>Джузеппе Коспито (Павия): Проблема революции у Грамши: между Кантом и Марксом.....</i>	28
<i>Флориан Гроссер (Беркли): Кант о политическом изменении в пределах разума: революция, реформа и «грядущая демократия».....</i>	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Conference Program (Russian).....	6
Conference Program (English).....	8
ABSTRACTS	
<i>Reidar Maliks (Oslo): Kant and eighteenth century theories of revolution.....</i>	10
<i>Vadim Chaly (Kaliningrad): Kant's moral radicalism vs. Kant's political conservatism: refrain not to revolt is right</i>	11
<i>Aleksey Krouglov (Moscow): Kant as a German theoretician of the French revolution: the dogma origin in Marxist-Leninist philosophy</i>	12
<i>Antonino Falduto (Halle): Erhard, Fichte, and Schiller on the people's right to a revolution</i>	13
<i>Petr Rezvykh (Moscow): Schelling and the revolution: the state as a means.....</i>	15
<i>Andrey Maidansky (Belgorod): Phenomenology of labour and the fury of revolution (about the idealism of Marx's political theory).....</i>	17
<i>Heiner F. Klemme (Halle): Carl Schmitt or Kant? An attempt on right, state and revolution.....</i>	18
<i>Aleksey Kozyrev (Moscow): Revolution and religion: the case of Russian intelligentsia.....</i>	19
<i>Andrey Teslya (Kaliningrad): Rosanov's 'revolution' and 'apocalypse': Between a renewal and the end.....</i>	21
<i>Boris V. Mezhuiev (Moscow): Late slavophilism and world revolution.....</i>	23
<i>Tamas Krausz (Budapest): Lenin's conceptualization of state, democracy and revolution.....</i>	24
<i>Tatyana Rumyantseva (Minsk): Aleksandr Bogdanov on the revolution in Russia and alternative paths to socialism.....</i>	26
<i>Giuseppe Cospito (Pavia): The issue of revolution in Gramsci (between Kant and Marx).....</i>	28
<i>Florian Grosser (Berkeley): Kant on political change within the boundaries of reason: revolution, reform, and the 'democracy-to-come'.....</i>	29

ПРОГРАММА КОНФЕРЕНЦИИ

ЧЕТВЕРГ, 9 НОЯБРЯ

09:00 – 09:30 *Регистрация*

09:30 – 09:45 *Открытие конференции:*
Андрей Клемешев, ректор
Татьяна Цвигун, директор Института гуманитарных наук
Нина Дмитриева, научный директор Академии Кантиана

Модератор: *Хайнер Клемме*

09:45 – 10:45 *Рейдар Маликс (Осло)*: Кант и теории революции XVIII века

10:45 – 11:45 *Вадим Чалый (Калининград)*: Моральный радикализм Канта против политического консерватизма Канта: бунтовать нельзя подчиняться

11:45 – 12:00 *Кофе-пауза*

12:00 – 13:00 *Алексей Круглов (Москва)*: Кант как немецкий теоретик французской революции: возникновение догмы в марксистско-ленинской философии

13:00 – 14:00 *Обед*

Модератор: *Вадим Чалый*

14:00 – 15:00 *Антонино Фальдуто (Галле)*: Эрхард, Фихте и Шиллер о праве народа на революцию

15:00 – 16:00 *Петр Резвых (Москва)*: Шеллинг и революция: государство как средство

16:00 – 16:15 *Кофе-пауза*

16:15 – 17:15 *Андрей Майданский (Белгород)*: Феноменология труда и фурия революции (об идеализме политической теории Маркса)

17:15 – 18:15 *Хайнер Клемме (Галле)*: Карл Шмитт или Кант? Размышления о праве, государстве и революции

19:00 – 21:00 *Ужин*

ПЯТНИЦА, 10 НОЯБРЯ

Модератор: *Валентин Балановский*

09:30 – 10:30 *Алексей Козырев (Москва)*: Революция и религия: опыт русской интеллигенции

10:30 – 11:30 *Андрей Тесля (Калининград)*: «Революция» и «апокалипсис» Розанова: между обновлением и концом

11:30 – 11:45 *Кофе-пауза*

11:45 – 12:45 *Борис Межуев (Москва)*: Позднее славянофильство и всемирная революция

12:45 – 14:00 *Обед*

Модератор: *Нина Дмитриева*

14:00 – 15:00 *Тамаш Краус (Будапешт)*: Разработка Лениным концепции государства, демократии и революции

15:00 – 16:00 *Татьяна Румянцева (Минск)*: Александр Богданов о революции в России и путях построения социализма

16:00 – 16:15 *Кофе-пауза*

16:15 – 17:15 *Джузеппе Коспито (Павия)*: Проблема революции у Грамши: между Кантом и Марксом

17:15 – 18:15 *Флориан Гроссер (Беркли)*: Кант о политическом изменении в пределах разума: революция, реформа и «грядущая демократия»

18:15 – 18:30 *Заккрытие конференции*

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9

09:00 – 09:30 *Registration*

09:30 – 09:45 *Opening ceremony:*
Andrey Klemeshev, Rector
Tatyana Tsvigun, Director of the Institute for Humanities
Nina Dmitrieva, Scientific Director of the Academia Kantiana

Moderator: *Heiner Klemme*

09:45 – 10:45 *Reidar Maliks (Oslo)*: Kant and 18th century theories of revolution

10:45 – 11:45 *Vadim Chaly (Kaliningrad)*: Kant's moral radicalism vs. Kant's political conservatism: refrain not to revolt is right

11:45 – 12:00 *Coffee break*

12:00 – 13:00 *Aleksey Krouglov (Moscow)*: Kant as a German theoretician of the French revolution: the dogma origin in Marxist-Leninist philosophy

13:00 – 14:00 *Lunch*

Moderator: *Vadim Chaly*

14:00 – 15:00 *Antonino Falduto (Halle)*: Erhard, Fichte, and Schiller on the people's right to a revolution

15:00 – 16:00 *Petr Rezvykh (Moscow)*: Schelling and the revolution: the state as a means

16:00 – 16:15 *Coffee break*

16:15 – 17:15 *Andrey Maidansky (Belgorod)*: Phenomenology of labour and the fury of revolution (about the idealism of Marx's political theory)

17:15 – 18:15 *Heiner F. Klemme (Halle)*: Carl Schmitt or Kant? An attempt on right, state and revolution

19:00 – 21:00 *Dinner*

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 10

Moderator: *Valentin Balanovskiy*

09:30 – 10:30 *Aleksey Kozyrev (Moscow)*: Revolution and religion: the case of Russian intelligentsia

10:30 – 11:30 *Andrey Teslya (Kaliningrad)*: Rosanov's 'revolution' and 'apocalypse': Between a renewal and the end

11:30 – 11:45 *Coffee break*

11:45 – 12:45 *Boris Mezhuev (Moscow)*: Late slavophilism and world revolution

12:45 – 14:00 *Lunch*

Moderator: *Nina Dmitrieva*

14:00 – 15:00 *Tamás Krausz (Budapest)*: Lenin's conceptualization of state, democracy and revolution

15:00 – 16:00 *Tatyana Rumyantseva (Minsk)*: Aleksandr Bogdanov on the revolution in Russia and alternative paths to socialism

16:00 – 16:15 *Coffee break*

16:15 – 17:15 *Giuseppe Cospito (Pavia)*: The issue of revolution in Gramsci (between Kant and Marx)

17:15 – 18:15 *Florian Grosser (Berkeley)*: Kant on political change within the boundaries of reason: revolution, reform, and the 'democracy-to-come'

18:15 – 18:30 *Closing ceremony*

ABSTRACTS

Reidar Maliks

KANT AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURY THEORIES OF REVOLUTION

The paper explores the problem of how anyone can be entitled unilaterally to overturn a government. It pursues this question through a contextual study of Kant's discussion of a right of resistance and revolution. The paper takes issue with Philip Pettit's claim in a recent paper that the German republican tradition of the eighteenth century, where Kant was the foremost author, lacked a "contestatory citizenship. It analyses Kant's answer to the question of just and unjust resistance in the context of earlier German theories of resistance and revolution (including Achenwall, Nettelbladt, and Scheidenmantel) as well as critics and defenders of Kant during the 1790s (including Erhard, Tieffrunk, Jakob, Rehberg, Eberhard, and Garve). It shows that there was a sophisticated discussion of resistance and related phenomena in Germany in the 18th century, and that Kant's theory of resistance can be understood as an original alternative to proto-utilitarian and republican defenses of resistance. Kant rejected a right of resistance because a legal system cannot justify private persons in being judges about right or wrong. Yet, he did not deny citizens the right to contest government by protesting in the public sphere. A wider implication of the paper is therefore that "contestatory citizenship" does not have to involve a justification for resisting the law. There are meaningful ways of resisting, which do not involve unilaterally challenging or overturning public legal authority.

DR. REIDAR MALIKS is Associate Professor of Philosophy at Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas, University of Oslo in Norway. Previously, he was a Preceptor at Columbia University (2005-6 and 2007-8), a Lecturer at Harvard University (2008-9), a Junior Research Fellow at Oriel College, University of Oxford (2009-11), and an ERC postdoctoral fellow at the University of Oslo. He received his Ph.D. in 2008 from Columbia University. He studied at New School for Social Research (New York), Norwegian University of Science and Technology (Trondheim), and Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg. His area of specialization is the history of political thought (particularly Kant) and contemporary theories of human rights. He is currently writing a short book entitled *Kant and the French Revolution* (under contract with Cambridge University Press).

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. *Moral and Political Conceptions of Human Rights: Implications for Theory and Practice*, co-edited with Johan Karlsson Schaffer. Cambridge

University Press, 2017.

2. Reidar Maliks, *Kant's Politics in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

3. *Kantian Theory and Human Rights*. Co-edited with Andreas Føllesdal; New York: Routledge, 2014.

4. Reidar Maliks, 'Revolutionary Epigones: Kant and his Radical Followers' in *History of Political Thought*, Vol. 33: 4 (2012): 647-671.

5. Reidar Maliks, 'Acting Through Others: Kant and the Exercise View of Representation', in *Public Reason*, Vol. 1:1 (2009): 9-26.

Vadim Chaly

KANT ON RATIONALITY AND THE RIGHT TO REVOLT

Kant's philosophy is severely strained in the junction of the moral and the political. "Pure moral metaphysics" prescribes inner moral rebirth by a revolution in the disposition of the human being (e.g. RG 6:47), whereas empirical political philosophy demands obedience to any acting authority (e.g. MS 6:371, TP 8:298-303, etc.). Contemporary literature recognizes two lines in Kant's arguments against revolution that could be called pure, or formal, and empirical, or prudential.

Kant's formal reasoning seems questionable in two respects (in addition to those already specified in the literature). First, there appears to be a logical paradox in his granting the extra-legal status to a sovereign, who is also at the same time an "animal", "needing a master" (laG, 8:23). This paradox, it seems, resembles Russell's paradox, and Kant's solution resembles straightforward type theory, exempting the sovereign as the law-giver from any (self-referential) legal obligation and placing her in meta-position. Whereas this solution could work in traditional "vertical" (e.g. feudal) political ontology with sovereign as being of another "type" and God as the ultimate "master", it fails against modern "horizontal" ontology of equality, such as Kant's own. This undermines the formal argument for unconditional obedience. Second, Kant's principlism here also seems to lead to counterintuitive results, as I hope to show with a small thought experiment over a "nation of Kantians": power in a nation of Kantians, closely approaching the ideal political order, is suddenly usurped by a devil, who by means of legal action and without any resistance brings the nation to a disaster.

Kant's remaining arguments are merely prudential, and hence empirical and probabilistic. They turn on the philosophy of human evil and dangers of the state of nature. In order for them to work the reader has to share Kant's bleak anthropological assumptions and be averse to risk, both of which aren't necessarily the case. Positive rational estimation of the outcome of a revolution against unjust authority seems enough to sanction it.

This leads to the conclusion that Kant's critique of revolution is too weak to

withstand the overwhelming power of his own pure moral philosophy, armed with ideals of human autonomy, dignity, and enlightenment. His reputation of a “terrorist” (Heine) and “theorist of revolution” (Marx) seems not ungrounded.

DR. VADIM CHALY graduated from Kaliningrad State University with Cand. Phil. degree in Philosophy in 2004. His research initially focused on analytic interpretations of Kant's epistemology, gradually shifting towards moral and political philosophy. His grants and scholarships included Zeit-Stiftung Kant-Stipendium to support graduate research at University of Oxford, Fulbright scholarship at Columbia University, and three research grants by Russian Foundation for Humanities. He teaches History of Philosophy, Philosophy of Science, and several seminars at Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, heading the Department of Philosophy there from 2012 till 2016. He is a member of the editorial boards of *Kantovskij Sbornik* and *Con-Textos Kantianos*.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Chaly V. 'Denying Liberty in Order to Make Room for Freedom: Liberalism, Conservatism, and Kant's Political Philosophy', in: *Contemporary Studies in Kantian Philosophy*, 2017, pp. 55-66.
2. Чалый В. Порядок и революция в политической философии Канта [Order and Revolution in Kant's Political Philosophy] // Философия. Журнал Высшей школы экономики. 2017. № 2. С. 40-60.
3. Chaly V. 'Rationality in Machiavelli and in Kant', in: *Con-Textos Kantianos*, 2016, no. 4, pp. 89-97.
4. Chaly V. 'An Interpretation of Rawls' "Kantian Interpretation"', in: *Con-Textos Kantianos*, 2015, no. 1, pp. 142-155.

Aleksey Krouglov

KANT AS A GERMAN THEORETICIAN OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION: THE DOGMA ORIGIN IN MARXIST-LENINIST PHILOSOPHY

The 100th anniversary of the October revolution urges us to think about various ways and styles of Kant's philosophy justification and grounding in different streams of Marxism in Russia. In the period of dogmatic canon development, some scholars (A.M. Deborin and his adherents) treated Kant's position towards the French revolution as a basement for his name preserving in the list of respectable Marxism predecessors. Other Marxists (V.M. Shuljatikov, Yu. O. Martov) took the opposite point of view. They subverted Kant's philosophy, as it evinced class interests of the bourgeoisie. There was also a middle position (G.V. Plekhanov, L.I. Aksel'rod), in which the interests of the bourgeoisie in Kant's philosophy were understood as a version of a historically progressive fight against feudalism.

All scholars judged not from Kant's texts but from K. Marx and F. Engels's evaluations of Kant's attitude to the French revolution, and sometimes these evaluations were awfully bad translated into Russian. I will show how the dogma that Kant was a “German theoretician of the French revolution” was born.

PROF. DR. ALEXEI KROUGLOV, Department of Philosophy, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow. Ph.D. in Philosophy, 1999, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow. Habilitation in Philosophy, 2005, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow. Research interests: Kant, Transcendental Philosophy, Enlightenment, Russian Philosophy. Visiting Fellowships: DAAD (1998-1999), Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (2001-2003). Visiting Professor at the University of Luxembourg (2007) and the University of Trier (2015-2016).

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Tolstoj, L.N. *Gedanken Immanuel Kants. Anhand der Originalvorlagen aus dem Russischen zurückübertragen*, eingeleitet und hrsg. von A.N. Krouglov, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 2016.
2. Круглов А.Н. Кант и кантовская философия в русской художественной литературе [Kant and Kantian Philosophy in Russian Fiction]. Москва, 2012.
3. Круглов А.Н. Философия Канта в России в конце XVIII – первой половине XIX веков [Kant's Philosophy in Russia at the End of 18th Century and in the First Half of the 19th Century]. Москва, 2009.
4. Круглов А.Н. Тетенс, Кант и дискуссия о метафизике в Германии второй половины XVIII века [Tetens, Kant and Debates on Metaphysics in Germany in the Second Half of the 18th Century]. Москва, 2008.

Antonino Falduto

ERHARD, FICHTE, AND SCHILLER ON THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO A REVOLUTION

In my paper, I aim to analyse the different reactions to the French Revolution in the German philosophical discussion at the end of the Eighteenth Century. In doing so, I want to show how influential thinkers, who were inspired by the reading of Kant's texts, tried to approach the problem of the sustainability of a revolution in the context of practical philosophy and, in particular, in the context of a philosophy of right. I suggest that particular works by Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Johann Benjamin Erhard, and Friedrich Schiller are most relevant to understand properly the debate on the French Revolution in Germany at the end of the Eighteenth Century. Through the reference to these texts, I want to give a first impression of how variegated the intellectual responses to the

events in the revolutionary France were. Furthermore, I want to illustrate the way in which some of the most important actors of the German intellectual discussion at the end of the century tried to deal with the topic of revolution from a speculative perspective.

In order to shed some light on this constellation, I will refer to Fichte's *Zurückforderung der Denkfreiheit von den Fürsten Europas, die sie bisher unterdrückten* (1793, Reclamation of the Freedom of Thought from the Princes of Europe, who have hitherto Suppressed it) and to his *Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums über die französische Revolution* (1793, Contribution to the Rectification of the Public's Judgment of the French Revolution).

Furthermore, I will take into consideration Johann Benjamin Erhard's work *Über das Recht des Volkes zu einer Revolution* (1795, On the Right of the People to Revolution), and, finally, I will briefly refer to Friedrich Schiller's *Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen* (1795, Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man).

The comparative analysis of these works will show how the principles of the French revolutionaries (even though perhaps not their practices) have been defended. This analysis will also outline some different democratic views concerning the legitimation of state authority and, most importantly, the faith of the three authors in liberty and their aversion against deterministic views whatsoever, according to which also absolutism, in particular, has to be taken as necessary.

DR. ANTONINO FALDUTO is Assistant Professor (wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter) at the Institute of Philosophy of the Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg in Germany. He received his Ph.D. in Philosophy (International Double-Degree) from the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (Germany) and the Università degli Studi di Torino (Italy). He studied in Pavia (Italy), at Trinity College Dublin (Ireland), in Konstanz (Germany), Göttingen (Germany), Turin (Italy) and Mainz (Germany). His areas of specialization are the History of Philosophy (in particular Kant, Scottish Enlightenment, German Enlightenment, German Idealism, Italian Philosophy), Practical and Political Philosophy, and Philosophical Anthropology. In his current research project, he analyses the link between freedom and necessity in the Post-Kantian discussion (in particular in the works by Reinhold, Fichte, and Schiller).

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Antonino Falduto, *The Faculties of the Human Mind and the Case of Moral Feeling in Kant's Philosophy*, *Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte*, Berlin/Boston 2014 (Second Edition, Paperback: 2016).

2. *Metaphysik – Ästhetik – Ethik. Beiträge zur Interpretation der Philosophie Kants*, edited by Antonino Falduto, Caroline Kolisang, Gabriel Rivero, Würzburg 2012.

3. Antonino Falduto, "Adam Smith's Moral Decision-Making Process", in: *The Adam Smith Review* (Routledge), volume 12 (2018), forthcoming.

4. Antonino Falduto, "Freedom and Obligation: The Moral Debate between Kant and Hegel (1781-1807)", in: Robert A. Hanna et al. (eds.), *Critical Paths outside the Critiques*, Cambridge 2017, pp. 171-179.

Petr Rezvykh

SCHELLING AND THE REVOLUTION: THE STATE AS A MEANS

1. At first glance, Schelling's position on the revolution is inconsistent. In his youth and later years, Schelling approved of the French revolution, whereas his reaction to the German revolutions of 1830 and 1848 was sharply critical. Schelling's criticism of revolutions, which he voiced in his mature and senior years, is often interpreted as a symptom of political conformism. This study is an attempt to elucidate the philosophical sources of Schelling's attitude to the revolution and prove that they are rooted in an original reception of Kant's concepts.

2. From the very beginning, all Schelling's statements on different aspects of political philosophy demonstrated the belief that the state is an incomplete transient institution that has to be overcome in the course of history. 'The Oldest Systematic Programme of German Idealism' (1796) stated the need to transcend the limits of the state. The thesis stemmed from the understanding of the state as an external mechanism that treats individuals as a mere means. The conceptual framework for such an understanding was Kant's doctrine of aesthetic and teleological purposiveness, which was counterposed to the principle of mechanism. To transcend the state does not mean to destroy it from without but to create conditions for internal cohesion that will make external coercion superfluous. It is crucial to create a 'mythology of the reason' that will overcome the opposition between sensibility and reason. In this sense, 'The Oldest Systematic Programme' was not a precursor of anarchism but a continuation of F. Schiller's programme for aesthetic education – a programme based on Kant's doctrine of intelligible and empirical character.

3. Schelling's works of the 1810-20s are based explicitly on Kant's concept of two characters. Thus, the state was defined as a necessary consequence of radical evil manifested in the implementation of finite freedom – a falling-away from the absolute source. In the *Philosophical Inquiries into the Essence of Human Freedom* (1809), Schelling defined evil as the overturning of the rigid hierarchy of elements in the human. In the *Stuttgart Private Lectures* (1810), this definition was applied to the problem of the state. The state was considered as a side effect of the falling-away – as an external substitute for the lost internal spiritual unity. Within the concept, the aspiration to overcome the state externally, i.e. through revolutionary destruction, was interpreted as the reproduction and entrenching of the irreconcilable contradiction lying at the heart of any state.

4. In the 1930s-50s, Schelling was developing further the concept of the

state within the programme for the philosophy of mythology and philosophy of revelation. Initially, the concept was outlined in the Stuttgart Lectures. Schelling focused on a peculiar interpretation of the concept of law, which wed Kant's doctrine of the categorical imperative and the concept of radical evil from the Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason. The state was considered as the functioning of law amidst materialised evil. In this sense, the state is a means and an obstacle, a negative condition for internal freedom. Schelling counterposes to the revolutionary ideas of violent changes in political power the concept of imposing restrictions on the state. This presentation will demonstrate that such an understanding of the state explains Schelling's reaction to the revolutionary events of 1830 and 1848, which is known from his public speeches and diary entries, as well as his political recommendations put forward in the correspondence with Maximilian II of Bavaria.

DR. PETR REZVYKH is Leading Researcher at Poletayev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities, School of Philosophy, Faculty of the Humanities, Higher School of Economics, Moscow. He received his Ph.D. in Philosophy from Lomonosov Moscow State University (Russia), thesis: *The Problem of Creation in the late Philosophy of F.W.J. Schelling*. Since 2004 he cooperates with the Committee for the edition of the works of Schelling in Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities (since 2008 – visiting researcher of the Committee). Since 2014 he is a member of the editorial board of the journal *Schelling-Studien. Internationale Zeitschrift zur klassischen deutschen Philosophie*.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Ziche P., Rezvykh P.V. Sygkepleriazein. Schelling und die Kepler-Rezeption im 19. Jahrhundert. Stuttgart : Fromann-Holzboog, 2013.
2. Rezvykh P. Absolute Affirmation and Conditions of Meaning: Logical-Ontological Paradoxes of F.W.J. Schelling's "Identity Philosophy" // Russian Studies in Philosophy. 2011. No. 4. P. 41-64.
3. Резвых П.В. Ф.В.Й. Шеллинг в диалоге с российскими интеллектуалами. Приложение. Из переписки Ф.В.Й. Шеллинга и А.И. Тургенева (подготовка текста, пер. с нем. и примеч. П. Резвых) [F.W.J. Schelling in the dialogue with Russian intellectuals. The application of correspondence of F.W.J. Schelling and A.I. Turgenev. Publication, translate from the German P.V. Rezvykh] // Новое литературное обозрение [New Literary Observer]. 2008. № 91. С. 186-195.

Andrey Maidansky

PHENOMENOLOGY OF LABOUR AND THE FURY OF REVOLUTION (ABOUT THE IDEALISM OF MARX'S POLITICAL THEORY)

As is known, Marx became a revolutionary earlier than a materialist. His theory of revolution is rooted in the German idealistic philosophy. And Marx himself is perfectly aware of this, calling Kant's philosophy the "German theory of the French revolution." As the Reformation began in the brain of the monk, so now the revolution begins in the brain of the philosopher, young Marx wrote. He considered proletariat as an inert social matter, a "passive element" which must be set in motion by the philosopher's "lightning of thought". Thus, the idea of proletarian revolution, which became Marx's whole lifework, was the brainchild of idealistic philosophy. And all his future teaching will be inspired by this idea: he will attempt to transplant it into the soil of materialistic understanding of history and to give it an economic proof.

Marx reads Phenomenology of Spirit as the phenomenology of alienated labour (the absolute idealist Hegel was the first who "grasped the essence of labour", but only in the alienated form of "abstractly spiritual labour"). And Marx's own "science of history" depicts the process of overcoming this alienation – the emancipation of labour. Just as the Spirit in Hegel's Phenomenology, so Labour strives for freedom, for actualisation of all its creative potential. On the way to this goal, Labour necessarily alienates itself and experiences the total self-loss. Finally, science is the highest phenomenon both of Spirit (in Hegel) and of Labour (as *allgemeine Arbeit*, in Marx).

Human labour is, actually, the only character of Capital. In the eyes of Marx, all other economic categories are modes, or phenomena, of labour. How can the division of labour, and its effect – the mutual alienation of people, be removed? And what is the role of political revolution in this "natural historical process"? In the course of answering these questions, Marx's materialistic principles were deformed, and his thought returned in a roundabout way to the conception of determination of the material by the ideal, viz. the determination of economy by "ideology" (for Marx himself classified politics as a superstructural "ideological form"). Another example of such sliding into idealism is the dichotomy of a "kingdom of necessity" and a "kingdom of freedom" in describing the communist society in the third volume of Capital.

PROF. DR. ANDREY MAIDANSKY, Department of Philosophy, Belgorod National Research University. He received 1993 his Ph.D. in Philosophy from Lomonosov Moscow State University. His areas of specialization are the History of Philosophy (in particular Spinoza, Hegel, Marx, Russian Marxism), Theory of Knowledge and Methodology of History. He got Kone Foundation grant (Finland, 2010). He was visiting researcher at the Collegium for Advanced Studies (2010) and Aleksanteri Institute (2011-2012) of University of Helsinki. He worked as a Visiting scholar at the University of Turin (2017). He is a member of organizing

Committee of annual international conference *Ilienkov-Readings* (Moscow) and a member of the editorial board of the book series *Spinoziana* (Mimesis, Milano – Udine). He is a visiting editor of three issues of journal *Logos*, dedicated to the philosophy of Spinoza (with L. Vinciguerra), Evald Ilyenkov, and the historical theory of Marx, as well as of the issue of *Studies in East European Thought* dedicated to the legacy of M. Lifshitz (with V. Oittinen).

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Спиноза: pro et contra. Вступ. статья, сост., коммент. А.Д. Майданского [Spinoza: pro et contra. Introductory article, compilation und comments of A. Maidansky]. СПб., ПХГА, 2012.
2. Maidansky, A. "The Logic of Marx's Theory of History: Reforming Formations", in *Russian Studies in Philosophy*, 2012, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 44-82.
3. *The Practical Essence of Man*. Ed. by Andrey Maidansky & Vesa Oittinen. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
4. Maidansky, A. "Reality of the Ideal, in *Dialectics of the Ideal: Evald Ilyenkov and Creative Soviet Marxism*. Ed. by Alex Levant & Vesa Oittinen. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
5. Майданский А.Д. "Principium coexistentiae, или История одного сновидения магистра Иммануила Канта" [Principium coexistentiae, or The history of one magister I. Kant's dream] // *Вопросы философии* [Problems of Philosophy], 2005, № 10, с. 167-174.

Heiner Klemme

CARL SCHMITT ODER KANT? EIN VERSUCH ÜBER RECHT, STAAT UND REVOLUTION

This paper discusses the concepts of law, state and revolution from the perspective of both Carl Schmitt and Immanuel Kant. Starting with Schmitt's claim that the "German Revolution" of 1933 was a rightful one, I introduce the concept of a negative revolution in order to show that in terms of Kant the Hitler-regime had no legal foundation at all. In addition, I argue that although Kant denies that we have a legal right of resistance against the state, he does not claim that we have to obey state power under all conditions. This applies to three different scenarios: First, if the state (or the ruler) demands me to use other persons like things, to use them for the mere sake of its (or his) power of choice (Willkür), I have the duty to disobey. No public law can demand from me to perform actions that contradict the presupposition of the validity of law, namely the existence of human beings as persons, i.e. as ends in themselves. If the purpose of a law is the destruction of personhood (or moral subjectivity), it contradicts right reason. Second, the foundation of all state power is law. But as we know today, there can be state power without law. From the perspective

of Kant, the Hitler-regime of 1933-45 was not a public state but a natural state. It was (to put it in terms of Carl Schmitt) a rule of the political, not a rule of law. Third, Kant claims that we do not have the permission to follow public law if it directly contradicts the moral law. In a nutshell, the Nazi-regime constituted a form of 'political unity' unlawful in itself.

PROF. DR. HEINER KLEMME, Institute of Philosophy, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (Germany). Professor for the History of Philosophy at the University of Halle-Wittenberg, Head of the "Immanuel-Kant-Forum" and President of the "Christian-Wolff-Gesellschaft für die Philosophie der Aufklärung". Co-Editor of *Kant-Studien* and *Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* (Walter de Gruyter). Co-Editor of *The Bloomsbury Dictionary of 18th Century German Philosophers* (Bloomsbury, 2016). Editor: *Kant und die Zukunft der europäischen Aufklärung* (Walter de Gruyter, 2009). Autor: *Kants Philosophie des Subjekts* (Meiner Verlag, 1996), Kants "*Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*." *Ein systematischer Kommentar* (Reclam Verlag 2017).

Aleksey Kozyrev

REVOLUTION AND RELIGION: THE CASE OF RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA

The attempts to legitimise the revolution from a Christian perspective and to present it as a work of Christ have been made more than once. The meek and self-sacrificing Christ – who resisted the temptation of becoming the "King of the Jews" and chose to be crucified – is being turned into His opposite – a lonely rebel challenging the Empire. The words from the Gospel – "I came not to send peace, but a sword" – are interpreted in such a way that Christ becomes an ideologist of social protest and "the rebel" and Christianity turns into religion of social revolution.

The intelligentsia of the time was faced with the temptation to "creation of idols". They were seeking religious justification, the mystical meaning, and religious goals of revolution (D. Merezhkovsky) and elevating revolutionary terror to a cardinal Christian virtue (V. Svetsitsky) and even to holiness. Later, S. Frank would describe in the sobering coldness of exile the destruction of these idols.

During the first Russian revolution, members of Russia's religious community did not escape the temptation of religious consecration of terror although they would soon fall victim to the triumphant Bolshevik revolution. In 1905, V. Svetsitsky and V. Ern established the Christian Fellowship of Struggle – a semi-underground organisation that called for resorting to terror and breaking household and economic traditions for the sake of the spirit of Christian freedom. Later, they founded the movement of the "Christians of the Calvary". In effect, the movement was committed to reformational ideas. It also used the name of and some concepts developed by Dostoevsky. These organisations believed

the social revolution and self-sacrifice for the sake of revolution to be the path to religious salvation and atonement. In 1906, student V.Sventsitsky and P.Struve, the editor of the Polar Star, were prosecuted for publishing "An open letter of a believer to the Orthodox Church". The publication was interpreted as a criminal call for the army to defy the authorities. However, the charges were dropped after a rousing speech in court. V.Sventsitsky wrote the proclamation prayer "Lay to rest with the saints", in which he did not make a distinction between the victims of the revolution and terrorists, calling all of them "saints".

In Doctor Zhivago, B.Pasternak recalled the summer of 1917. He wrote about the pervading scent of revolution, which was perceived as 'God sent from Heaven'. An acute feeling of freedom that was yet to be embodied and ubiquitous talk of equality and election instilled religious fervour. N.Berdyayev's words about Christianity being the religion of freedom seemed to have come true. A premonition of new gods or the second coming of the New Testament God translated into one of the crucial motifs of revolution – the search for the "invisible city", which, although differently manifested, was present in the faith of commoners and intelligentsia alike. The expectations of the "kingdom of freedom" amalgamated with the apocalyptical visions of the end of history and the loosening of the knots of history. The exultant acceptance of the February revolution was shared by members of religious and philosophical intelligentsia, although later many of them would find themselves in exile and change their attitudes to the revolution. The burial of the victims of revolution in Petrograd on March 23 was followed by the Orthodox Easter, which fell on April 2. This coincidence was perceived as a noble oath promising that no blood would be spilt (V. Rozanov) and it caused religious euphoria over the loosening of the centuries-old knots of history. Although euphoria was soon replaced by social depression and disappointment, the revolution would continue to be described in religious metaphors. These include S. Frank "idols of the revolution", N.Berdyayev's "spirits of the Russian revolution", S. Bulgakov's "feast of the gods", V. Rozanov's "apocalypse of our time", A. Blok's Christ walking in front of the revolutionary crowd, V. Bryusov's proletariat as a creator of new culture.

DR. ALEKSEY KOZYREV is Associate Professor at the Department of History of Russian Philosophy and the Deputy Dean for Science at the Faculty of Philosophy of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Chairman of the International Research Council of Academia Kantiana, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad. He received 1997 his Ph.D. in Philosophy from Lomonosov Moscow State University, thesis: *Gnostic influence in the philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov*. He was research fellow at Université de Genève (1992), École des Hautes Études en Sciences Humaines and L'Institut orthodoxe St-Serge (Paris, 1997). He is a member of the editorial board of the Complete academic collection of works and letters of Vladimir Solovyov, editor-in-chief of the Journal of modern philosophy Socrat, deputy chief editor of journal *Solovyovskiy issledovaniya [Solovyov Studies]*, a member of the editorial boards of other Russian philosophical journals. He is a member of the Synodal biblical-theological Commission of the Russian Orthodox Church.

He is a head supervisor of the Russian President grant *The social status of a scientist and the scientometric evaluation of the research activities*.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Козырев А.П. *Соловьев и гностики [Solovyov and the Gnostics]*. М.: Савин С.А, 2007. 543 с.
2. Козырев А.П., Климов А.Е. Материалы к «Споры о Софии» [Materials for "The Dispute about Sophia"] // Записки русской академической группы в США. The Association of Russian-American Scholars in the U.S.A. Т. 39. Нью-Йорк, 2016. С. 19–375.
3. Kozyrev A. Weisheit // Handwörterbuch Theologische Anthropologie. Römisch-katholisch – Russisch-orthodox. Freiburg im Br.: Herder, 2013. S. 610–617.
4. Kozyrev A. Father Sergei Bulgakov's Sophiology: Philosopheme or Theologeme? // Philosophical Theology and the Christian Tradition: Russian and Western Perspectives. Washington, 2012. P. 161–177.
5. Козырев А.П. Философия [в России] [Philosophy in Russia] // Большая Российская энциклопедия [Great Russian Encyclopedia]. Россия. М.: БРЭ, 2004. С. 592–602.

Andrey Teslya

ROSANOV'S 'REVOLUTION' AND 'APOCALYPSE': BETWEEN A RENEWAL AND THE END

Vasily Rozanov (1856 – 1919) – with the exception of a series of experiments in the 1890s – never engaged in political journalism. Few of his major texts attempt at a theoretical understanding of politics. One of them is the voluminous 1895 article 'On the implicit meaning of the Russian monarchy' (Rozanov reprinted it in 1912).

When analysing Rosanov's position, it is necessary to consider not only the immediate meaning of judgements contained in the text but also the context, in which Rosanov places these judgements. The interest and difficulty of analysing Rosanov's texts lie in the fact that his writings follow the logic of a work of art and employ a series of extratextual means. Remember the function of photographs included in the Fallen Leaves, which was investigated by Viktor Shklovsky in the early 1920s. The above is particularly relevant to analysing Rosanov's judgements about the 'revolution' and the changes in his judgements. Rosanov's texts of 1905 – 1906 reveal 'preoccupation' with and 'submission to the lyrical element' of revolution. However, the 1910 reprint titled When the Authorities Went Away is a complex 'gesture' that incorporates several layers. These include (1) fidelity to 'artistic representations' and the veracity of the 'captured mood'; (2) a monument to a time that is gone and evidence

that reveals the power of preoccupation with revolution from a different political perspective and from a distance of time; (3) this evidence does not 'justify' such preoccupation but rather declares it a challenge of modernity.

Rosanov's 1905 understanding of a revolution is organic. A revolution is the embodiment of an honest and vital impulse. However, in *The Apocalypse of Our Time* (1918), Rosanov proclaims the disappearance of the very subject of 'revolution'. In this sense, the events of 1917 are not a manifestation of the social, which exists as a certain order (thus, it is always benevolent). On the contrary, they are the destruction of order at the fundamental level that determines the identities of social and political subjects. This is reflected in the title of the *Apocalypse of Our Time*, which suggest the end of 'this time' and the beginning of a new time – a new reality and new subjects. In this sense, the events of 1917 are the opposite of the 'revolution' of 1905.

DR. ANDREY TESLYA is Senior Researcher at the Academia Kantiana, Institute for Humanities, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad. He received his Ph.D. in Philosophy from the Far Eastern State Transport University (Russia, Khabarovsk). His areas of specialization are the History of Russian social thought in second half of 19. Century, nationalist intellectual movement in the Russian Empire, political thought of Slavophiles. He got three grants of Russian President (2011-2012, 2013-2014, 2015-2016) and the cooperative grant of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation and Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) (2016-2017). He received the book award *The legacy of Russian thought* (2015).

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Тесля А. «Последний из "отцов"»: Биография Ивана Аксакова [The latest of «Fathers»: the Biography of Ivan Aksakov]. СПб.: Владимир Даль, 2015. – 799 с.

2. Тесля А. Первый русский национализм... и другие [The first russian nationalism ... and others]. М.: Европа, 2014. – 280 с.; 2-е изд., стереотипное. М.: КДУ, Европа, 2016. – 280 с.

3. Книжная серия: «Перекрестья русской мысли с Андреем Теслей» [Book series *The crossroads of Russian thought with Andrey Teslya*] (изд-во РИПОЛ-классик):

а. Герцен А.И. Наши и не наши [Herzen A.I. Ours and not ours]. М.: РИПОЛ-классик, 2017.

б. Чаадаев П.Я. Философические письма к даме [Chaadayev P.Y. Philosophical Letters addressed to a Lady]. М.: РИПОЛ-классик, 2017.

Boris V. Mezhev

LATE SLAVOPHILISM AND WORLD REVOLUTION

Russia's entry into the war with Germany and Austro-Hungary in August 1914 was accompanied with a set of assertions by many Russian Religious thinkers that with this war Russia led the liberation war of people. Vladimir Ern wrote that «the times are slavophilic» and Prince Eugénie Trubetskoi wrote of the perspective to capture Tsargrad as a «final result of common liberation movement of people».

Really, the entry into this war marked the final assertion of the break of autocratic Russia with the conservative powers of Europe and her transformation into the revolutionary force on the continent. This turnabout has become the result of all the complex history of Slavophile thought with her adoption of the National Revolution as a political tool of Russia.

Slavophilism gradually adopted an idea of Revolution. General A.A. Kireev, in the polemics with reactionary views by K.N. Leontiev, came to partial justification of phenomenon of Revolution and to the recognition of the justice of Revolution as a world liberation movement.

The paradoxical acceptance by the conservatives of the Revolution is important for understanding all the course of Russian public mind of three last centuries. Russia, as Pan-Slavism had undermined assurance of her official circles in the validity of only reactionary, only Conservative Foreign Politics, very briefly defined herself as «revolutionary» force on the continent – at first at her European, then at her Asiatic part. M. Voloshin had a foundation to write in his famous verses of North-East about «the explosions of Revolution in czars» because the Revolution not just but gradually and consequently captured and mutated Petersburg's Empire.

Voloshin expressed the same idea and in prosaic language in his famous essay «Poetry and Revolution» in which he spoke that «The Scythians» by Alexander Blok «was infiltrated by the spirit of Russian Bolshevism but not as party line, social-democratic Bolshevism but much more deep pure Russian state of mind in which there are mixed both Slavophilism, the praising of our own Barbarism in contrast to decaying West, and pure Russian anti-statism that brings together each grandee of Old Regime with contemporary demagogue...». This almost all-national belief in world revolution, which Russia had to bring into Europe, united patriotic enthusiasts in both parts of political field.

DR. BORIS MEZHUEV – Associate Professor at the Department of History of Russian Philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Member of the International Research Council of Academia Kantiana, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad. He received 1997 his Ph.D. in Philosophy from Lomonosov Moscow State University, thesis: *The Russian Sources of V.S. Soloviev's philosophy. (Socio-cultural Context of the 1870-90-s)*. He was research fellow at Texas A&M University

(1998-1999). He is a member of the editorial board of the Complete academic collection of works and letters by Vladimir Solovyov, a chief of editorial board of Politicheskii conservatism web-site (Russkaya idea), member of editorial board of journals *Solovyovskiy issledovaniya* [Solovyov Studies], *Polis* (Politicheskii issledovaniya), *Tetrad po konservatizmu*.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Межуев Б.В. Политическая критика Вадима Цымбурского. [The Political Critique by Vadim Tsybursky] М., Европа, 2012.
2. Межуев Б.В. Перестройка-2: опыт повторения. [«Perestroika-2: the Experience of Repetition»] М., Весь мир, 2014.
3. Mezhuiev B. Democracy in Russia: a value approach to legitimacy, in Power and Legitimacy – Challenges from Russia. Edited by Per-Arne Bodin, Stefan Hedlund and Elena Namli. Routledge, London and New York, 2012 p. 102-117. (Routledge contemporary Russian and Eastern Europe series; 39).
4. Межуев Б.В. Революция – в сторону от Равенства и Свободы (по поводу книги Б. Капустина) [Revolution – Toward from Equality and Freedom (about books by Boris Kapustin)] // Логос, 2012, № 4 (88), с. 239-252.
5. Межуев Б.В. Как Вл. Соловьев не стал Эдмундом Гуссерлем (Размышления над книгой Т. Неметом) [How Vladimir Solovyov has not become Edmund Husserl (Reflections on the book by T. Nemeth)] // Вопросы философии, 1916, № 7, с. 139-147.

Tamás Krausz

LENIN'S CONCEPTUALIZATION OF STATE, DEMOCRACY AND REVOLUTION

The State and Revolution did not arise from nothing; it was an organic part and consequence of Lenin's previous theoretical work and an organic product of the development of the contemporary European labor movement.

The significance of the book in contemporary world history is that it became the philosophy of the October Revolution. It started from the Marxist assumption that it is possible to abolish class rule, and create a society "beyond capital", which Lenin describes as the system of self-governance and Communism.

The revolution as a process is presented through its component immediate objective (seizing power) and end goal (voluntary association of free communities) at once, with political revolution shown as the initial momentum in social revolution on the other hand, Lenin assumes the "demise of the state" as the process of "eliminating social classes."

The fundamental message of the work is that a society, where the concepts of democracy and freedom do not start from politics, can function even without the tutelage of the capitalist class and its state power, the bureaucratic state

machine. In his critique of the bourgeois state and bourgeois democracy Lenin starts from the assumption that the democracy-concept of liberalism narrows the interpretation of this concept to political and legal relations. The political practice of a bourgeois democracy enables only the political management of capitalism, and consequently, this democracy will only enable the rule of various fractions of the ruling classes. Lenin, however, extends the concept of democracy and freedom to the social and economic relations. In his theoretical critique he describes bourgeois democracy and "liberal freedom" as the "freedom of commodification and corruption". At the same time, Lenin also criticizes the anarchists because he argues that the stateless society, "socialism as the first phase of Communism" cannot be introduced from above. A longer transitional phase is needed (the dictatorship of the proletariat), where bourgeois law and many elements of a market economy are preserved until social development creates the cultural conditions of a direct democracy (workers' democracy, social-economic democracy).

The historical impact of the work lies in the fact that it simultaneously poses a theoretical and empirical alternative to the capitalist mode of production and the rule of the oppressive state bureaucracy. It is for this reason that The State and Revolution became a "handbook" of revolutionaries in the 20th century. While Marx's theory of state had been re-interpreted and largely distorted (or at best forgotten) in the course of the development of social democracy, Lenin's theory of state was subordinated to the legitimating ideology of "Marxism-Leninism" for 70 years. After the collapse of the Soviet Union it is worth re-reading this little volume and attempt to answer the question of what we can learn from the book under the conditions of a completely different historical era.

PROF. DR. TAMÁS KRAUSZ, Department of East European Studies, Institute of History, Faculty of Humanities, Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest, Hungary). He received his Ph.D. in History (1981), thesis: *Debates within the Party and history as science: Debates about "the specificity of the Russian historical development", with a focus on the 1920s*. With the thesis *Szovjet thermidor: A sztálini fordulat szellemi előzményei 1917-1928* [Soviet thermidor: The intellectual roots of the Stalinist turn 1917-1928], he received the title of the Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1996). His research work has mainly focused on various aspects of the history of the Soviet Union with a stress on Marxist intellectual history. His works have been published in various languages, including Russian, Portuguese and Japanese. He was a visiting fellow at the Hoover Institute, Stanford in 1987 and he is a frequent visiting researcher in Moscow. He is a co-editor of the *Eszmélet. A quarterly journal for social critique and culture* (Budapest). He is honoured with the *Deutscher Memorial Prize* (2015) for the book *Reconstructing Lenin: An Intellectual Biography*, and with the *Order of Friendship* (Russia, 2013).

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Krausz, T. *Deutscher, Lenin and the East-European Perspectives: On*

the History of the Theory of Socialism, in: Historical Materialism. 2017. Vol. 25, no. 2, p. 3-28.

2. Краус Т. Ленин. Социально-теоретическая реконструкция. Москва, 2011. [In English: Krausz, T. Reconstructing Lenin: An Intellectual Biography, New York: Monthly Review Press, 2015].

3. Krausz, T. *The Soviet and Hungarian Holocausts: A Comparative Essay*, New York: East European Monographs, 2006.

4. Краус Т. Советский термидор: Духовные предпосылки сталинского поворота (1917-1928), Budapest: Magyar Részisztikai Intézet [Венгерский институт русистики], 1997.

Tatyana Rumyantseva

ALEKSANDR BOGDANOV ON THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA AND ALTERNATIVE PATHS TO SOCIALISM

The disputes around the Russian revolution of 1917 makes it urgent to address the spiritual heritage of thinkers who have become important persons in the history of its accomplishment, comprehension and the search for ways to build socialism. Bogdanov belongs to such figures, who proposed a number of alternative to official ideas: about Russia's unpreparedness for the socialist revolution, the true essence of the October Revolution, the disability of the Russian proletariat to fulfill the role of the subject in this revolution, about the "military communism" as a policy that is the result of militarization and economic disruption, etc. Moreover, it was he who, in the context of his science of tectology ("universal organizational science"), pointed out the ways of forming fundamentally new social structures and developed a conceptual-categorical apparatus for comprehending the laws of movement and society renewal. Even before 1917, Bogdanov reconsiders ideas about the ways of accomplishing the revolution and the transition to socialism, calls for abandoning the idea of class struggle and refraining from the concept of "dictatorship of the proletariat" because of the inadmissibility of changing the world by violence in the industrial era. In contrast to the Bolshevik-Leninists, he believed that victory in the revolution was achieved not so much by the seizure of power by the proletariat as by its "cultural maturing" in a bourgeois-democratic construction and by the alliance of all members of society on the basis of collective cooperation. He did not accept the Lenin's idea of "transformation the imperialist war into a civil war" and called "unjustifiable maximalism" the course proclaimed in the April theses for the socialist revolution in Russia. If the main things for Lenin were the search for "the weakest link in the chain of imperialism", the reliance on the idea of class struggle and the desire not to miss the moment to start a revolution in order to demolish the tsarist monarchy, Bogdanov could not abandon the ideal model of socialism and its values. Accepting the October Revolution, he stressed, however, its accidental and premature (thanks to the war) character. Describing the nature of this revolution, he noted a significant

change in its driving forces compared with the revolution of 1905, qualifying it as a non-socialist, "soldier-communist in the main." It was he who first used the term "military communism", investing in it a broader theoretical meaning, without linking this policy only with a brief historical period.

From the first days of the Soviet power, Bogdanov sought to show the "useful utility" of his tectology for the construction of a new society, the essence of which he saw as a radical change in people's relationship to nature and to each other, which should be entirely determined by the norms of scientific expediency. He considered the obligatory condition for the "positive-practical" implementation of socialism to be the formation of "organizational thinking" and the universalization of scientifically-organized labor.

His model of socialism was closely linked with the "program of cultural development" or the Proletcult project, as a strategy for a qualitatively new education of the proletariat. In many respects, his Utopia, «The Red Star», also proved to be prophetic, in which he, in effect, set out his vision of socialism, a society where the main thing is not the struggle for power, but the construction and joint collective work to create the natural, social and internal human world. Even his research on blood transfusion has become a kind of attachment to the solution of the same - social tasks, including the formation of the foundations of collectivism.

PROF. DR. TATYANA RUMYANTSEVA, Department of Philosophy of Culture, Belarusian State University, Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences. She received his Ph.D. in Philosophy from the BSU (1979); habilitation (1991) is on the topic: *Philosophical analysis of the methodological and conceptual bases of the theories of human aggression*. Her areas of specialization are the History of foreign Philosophy, German idealism of the second half of the 18th century and the first third of the 19th century, Modern Western philosophy (neo-Kantianism, neo-Hegelianism, Philosophy of life), the philosophy of the Ancient East. Since 1994 she is an Active member of the New York Academy of Sciences. She got three grants of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Belarus (2006-2008, 2011-2012, 2016-2020) and the grant of the President of the Republic of Belarus (2000). She got a title of "Honored Worker of the Belarusian State University" in 2013. She is a co-editor and co-author of the scientific project *World of Encyclopedias* and series of books *The Thinkers of the 20th Century*. She is an editorial board member of *Kantovsky Sbornik* (Kaliningrad), *Filosofia i psihologia* (Belarus), and few others.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Румянцева Т.Г. Агрессия: проблемы и поиски в западной философии и науке [Aggression: Problems and Searches in Western Philosophy and Science]. Минск, 1991.
2. Румянцева Т.Г. Фридрих Ницше [Friedrich Nietzsche]. Минск, 2008.
3. Румянцева Т.Г. Освальд Шпенглер [Oswald Spengler]. Минск, 2008.
4. Румянцева Т.Г. Философия Гегеля: от «Феноменологии духа»

к «Энциклопедии философских наук» [Hegel's philosophy: from the "Phenomenology of the Spirit" to the "Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences"]. Минск, 2014.

5. Румянцева Т.Г. Немецкий идеализм: от Канта до Гегеля [German idealism: from Kant to Hegel]. Минск, 2015.

Giuseppe Cospito

THE ISSUE OF REVOLUTION IN GRAMSCI (BETWEEN KANT AND MARX)

My speech aims at reconstructing the evolution of Gramsci's judgement about Russian Revolution, from his journalistic writings to the Prison Notebooks, by showing how this implies an overall rethinking of his own relation to Marx as well as to Kant. Already in spring 1917, Gramsci foresees that the February Revolution could become a proletarian revolution, and that this would realize in fact Kant's moral: only a society completely freed from oppression and exploitation will allow people to be free and autonomous. Shortly after the fall of Winter Palace, Gramsci writes that the revolution happened "against Marx's Kapital", or better against its literal interpretation as spread by positivistic Marxism of the Second International: this in fact supported the fatal necessity, for Russia, of a long bourgeois phase, prior to the actual establishment of socialism. Between the end of 1910s and the beginning of 1920s, Gramsci thinks it is possible "to do as in Russia" also for Italy and entire Europe; yet, from 1924, he starts elaborating a different vision of the revolution in the Western World, which in the Notebooks becomes a contraposition between war of movement – which can happen in political structures such as czarist Russia, where "the state was everything, the civil society was primordial and gelatinous" – and war of position, which consists in conquering one by one every single "element of trench and fortress", i.e. the complex of institution, structures and organizations (both public and private) which constitute overall the "civil society". At the same time, he develops the concepts of caesarism and bonapartism, which he draws from Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire, and of passive revolution. These allow Gramsci to analyse phenomena such as americanism and fascism from the perspective of a conservative modernization, or revolution without a revolution. Still, and most of all, Gramsci develops the concept of hegemony, highlighting the importance of the moment of consensus, besides strength, in the fight for conquering and maintaining power. This draws Gramsci quite far from his time's marxism-leninism, both on the political and theoretical point of view; for instance, he rejects the "ingenuous realism" of Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-criticism in favour of a phenomenism explicitly drawn by Kant's.

DR. GIUSEPPE COSPITO graduated from the University of Genoa with thesis in Philosophy and has a PhD degree in Philosophy at the University of Turin. He teaches History of Philosophy at the Department of Humanities

of the University of Pavia. He is a member of the scientific committee for the National Edition of Gramsci's Writings, of the Italian section of the International Gramsci Society, of the scientific committee (as well as secretary of the board) of the Ghilarza Summer School – an international school of studies on Gramsci, of the Fondazione Casa Museo Antonio Gramsci, of the scientific committee of the *International Gramsci Journal* and of *Gramsciana. Rivista di critica internazionale*, as well as the editing committee of *Il confronto letterario*. He is a member of the Società Italiana di Studi Kantiani. His research focuses mostly on Italian philosophical and political thought between 16th and 20th centuries, with particular reference to Machiavelli, Vico, Cattaneo and Gramsci, considered in his main connection to modern and contemporary European thought.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS

1. Introduction, comment and footnotes to A. Gramsci, *Quaderni del carcere*, vol. I, *Quaderni di traduzioni (1929–1932)*, ed. G. Cospito and G. Francioni, Roma, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 2007; vol. II/1, *Quaderni miscellanei*, ed. G. Cospito, G. Francioni and F. Frosini.
2. *Introduzione a Gramsci*, Genova, Il melangolo, 2015.
3. «Che cos'è l'uomo?». *Motivi kantiani negli scritti di Antonio Gramsci*, «Il cannocchiale», 3, 2012, p. 57-76.
4. *Il ritmo del pensiero. Per una lettura diacronica dei "Quaderni del carcere" di Gramsci*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 2011 (English translation: *The Rhythm of Thought in Gramsci. A Diachronic Interpretation of Prison Notebooks*, Leiden, Brill, 2016; Spanish translation: *El ritmo del pensamiento in Antonio Gramsci. Para una lectura diacrónica de los Cuadernos de la cárcel*, Buenos Aires, Ediciones Continente, 2016).
5. «Il gran Vico». *Presenza, immagini e suggestioni vichiane nei testi della cultura italiana pre-risorgimentale (1799-1839)*, Genova, Name, 2002.

Florian Grosser

KANT ON POLITICAL CHANGE WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF REASON: REVOLUTION, REFORM, AND THE 'DEMOCRACY-TO-COME'

This paper pursues three central aims: On the one hand, it seeks to reconstruct Immanuel Kant's reflections on profound, lasting, and justifiable political change as they – scattered over his practical-philosophical writings of the 1780s and 1790s – unfold between the poles of revolution and reform. On the other hand, it attempts to expound how Kant, in his philosophical investigations into the questions of novelty, of freedom, and of violence, challenges, undermines, and ultimately rejects the sharp dichotomy between revolution and reform and, thus, critically determines the contours of political change within the boundaries of reason. Finally, it aims at examining the extent

to which Kant's theoretical determination of 'complete change' – or, closer to völlige Umwälzung, the German formulation originally used by Kant: 'complete revolution' – goes beyond the insights gained by the 'men of revolution' (H. Arendt) such as, e.g., Thomas Paine or the Abbé Sieyès.

In addition, the paper's final section endeavors to explore whether and how Kant's reflections on political change can contribute to current debates on the subject: First, it will be indicated how his critique of political change can function as a corrective for both reformist and revolutionary biases that shape contemporary liberal and, respectively, (neo-)Marxist and (neo-)anarchist approaches. Second, a re-contextualization of Kant's thinking on political change will be proposed by showing how some of its key elements – among other things, the notions of Allmählichkeit, Annäherung, and (and the impossibility of) Weltvollkommenheit – are taken up in the context of a discourse that is rarely seen as a meaningful part of the reception of Kant in contemporary moral and political thought: It will be argued that these elements significantly inform Emmanuel Lévinas's and Jacques Derrida's reflections on the 'democracy to come', i.e., on a new, inherently transformative understanding of democracy.

DR. FLORIAN GROSSER (Dr. phil., Ludwig-Maximilian University Munich, 2011) teaches philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley and at Santa Clara University. His main interests lie in modern and contemporary political and social philosophy and in continental philosophy. His publications include the monographs *Revolution denken. Heidegger und das Politische 1919-1969* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2011) and *Theorien der Revolution zur Einführung* (Hamburg: Junius, 2013); the co-edited volume *Über Krise und Kritik – Crise et critique* (Basel: Schwabe, 2015); and the peer-reviewed article *Political Revolution* (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2016).

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

"No Right of Sedition"
Kant and the Problem of Revolution
in Political Philosophy in 18th – 21th
Centuries

November 9th – 10th, 2017, Kaliningrad

