

## International Congress of Aesthetics 2007 “Aesthetics Bridging Cultures”

### Aesthetics and Violence

*Konstantin M. Dolgov, Russia.*

It might seem that aesthetics as the science of art or the science of beauty has no relation to violence, whatever violence it is political, physical, spiritual, intellectual etc. Is it rightful to examine whatever interrelation between aesthetics and violence in historical or modern sense?

It appears that aesthetics and violence have not only been closely interconnected genetically and historically, but in a certain way also - through art and by means of art – have been interdependent.

In such ancient monuments of culture as *Iliad*, *Upanisads*, *Bible* and others they glorify the heroes Ingra, Achilles, Moses and many others for their heroic deeds: Ingra – “emperor of the Universe”, “Killer of Vritra and of gods, destroyer of a number of fortresses; Achilles – the hero of the Trojan war, “killer of Hector” and the victim of Paris; Moses – prophet yakve, legislator and chief of Jewish people. Ancient art has glorified “heroes” for their feats in battles and wars. And the more enemies they destroyed, the more fortresses and cities they ruined, the greater were their feat and glory. Areat man is the emperor, military chief, conqueror of new Lands, Destroyer of the whole peoples and tribes. And the art not only exercised the function of reflecting ideas and moods, but as well was an effective means of breeding of “great assassins” and violators.

An example of such art can be found in the works homer and ancient Greek tragedians. Plutarch writes about Alexandre the Areat: “He also wanted to have “Iliad”, corrected by Aristotle and Known by the title of “Iliad from the box”, always by his hand, Keeping it along with his dagger under the pillow and thinking that the reading of “Iliad” stimulates and encourages military valor”, as Aunesicrit depicted it. And when Alexandre being in the heart of Asia, had no opportunity of getting quickly any other books, he wrote to Carpal who sent them to him. He sent the stories by Philistes, many tragedies by Euripides, Sophocles and Eschiles as well as the hymns by Telestes and Philoxen. At first, Alexandre admired Aristotle, in his own words, no less than his own father because due to his father he lives and due to Aristotle he lives properly”<sup>1</sup>.

So the art of homer, ancient Greek tragedians and other ancient authors bred Alexander up as military chief and conqueror bringing to other peoples devastation, slavery and death.

At the same time this very art bred him up also as a great politician, who built up new cities and states, enlightened Asia, imparting to it Greek Customs, culture and laws. He acted as universal constructor and peace builder: his country under his rule expanded greatly, people

---

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch. Jzbranye žizneopisanija. V2 tomox.

united on the basis of the good and disunited on the basis of evil and consequently, on the distinction between merit and vice.

Aesthetics is one of the most mysterious and subtle disciplines. Evidently that's why the greatest thinkers of all times turned to it at the climax of their activities until, starting from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche the philosophy itself became aesthetic. So what is the reason for the mystique, depth and subtleness of this discipline which is thus somewhat unnatural to qualify as science? Why does it capture souls and interest of people well experienced in life and spirit making them admire the Magnitude of sensuous and intellectual world, the power of desires and contemplation, the aspiration for the truth and beauty, kindness and justice, love and freedom. And finally how is the aesthetics related to violence?

It seems to me that we could find an answer to the last question if we analyze carefully Dostovsky's words about beauty. And he said not only that the "beauty will save the world" – words familiar nowadays to everyone, but also the frightening and horrifying words that: "Beauty is the most horrible thing! Horrible because uncertain and it is impossible to define it because the god posed only riddles. There are lots of mysteries. Too many puzzles oppress man on Earth. Beauty! I can't stand that another man, even superior to me in heart and mind, starts from the ideal of Madonna and ends with the ideal of Sodom. It is even more terrible that those who have the ideal of Sodom in their hearts do not renounce the ideal of Madonna and their hearts are burning really like in their early years. No, the man is deep, too deep... Then which looks like shame to the mind appears the beauty to the heart. Is the beauty in Sodom? Believe that it is in Sodom for too many people. It is dreadful that beauty is not only horrible but also mysterious thing. Devil is struggling with God and men's hearts are the battlefield"<sup>1</sup>.

Many artists and thinkers felt that beauty is dreadful and sometimes unbearable and ruinous for Man, but it was Dostoevsky who reflected this feeling most fully and deeply.

Beauty not only brings Man up to heaven, encouraging him for feats, inspiring him to creative activity, bestowing him with love and moments of incomparable bliss, it also can turn his life into continuous torment, real hell, into something dreadful, when he doesn't want to live any more, when death is the best way out.

Most often beauty combines in itself beautiful and hideous, truth and lie, freedom and oppression...a great number of antinomies and contradictions, puzzles and mysteries, sense and nonsense.

It is a common knowledge that ancient Greeks adored beauty and raised arms to fight for it. Modern wars are coming from the Devil, all of them have been fought in the name of evil and against beauty and good. The expulsion of beauty from the life of the modern society is equal to the expulsion of freedom, which leads to the loss of the sense of life, supreme values and ideals.

At the end of the XIX- the century there appeared aesthetics of "art for the sake of art", which reflected the tendencies opposite to aesthetics, in one way or another connected with reality.

It scarcely is the point to prove that aesthetics of "art for the sake of art" -W is not the concoction of some artists or theoreticians of art - it became the reflection of economic, social, political and other relations within the Western society, which became formalized (society of abstract symbols, signs, figures etc.). In the "formal" society Man, his labor, life, values - every-

---

<sup>1</sup> Dostojevky

thing becomes the object of mystification and manipulation which in their turn are the means and forms of violence. Camus, for instance, wrote quite rightly that: "this society chose as its religion the morality of formal principles and makes no distinction between the words "freedom" and "equality" writing them on its prisons and financial temples. The most slandered value today is of course freedom". For a century the mercantile society used Freedom as its privilege, viewed it rather as law than duty and felt no remorse in using the opportunity of putting the formal Freedom at service of the most real oppression. Should one be surprised that this society needed art not as a means of liberation but as a harmless exercise of style or a usual entertainment? Manufacturers of art in bourgeois Europe at the turn of centuries elevated irresponsibility to the level of their principle, since responsibility led to the painful break-off with society. This epoch begot the theory of art for the sake of art which was nothing else than the justification of their right to irresponsibility. Art for the sake of art, entertainment of a solitary artist, is really an artificial art of a false society of abstractions. Its logical result was the salon art, purely formal which is nourished by sophisticated speculations and leads to a complete destruction of reality. As a result the art breaks itself off the society, cutting off thus its own roots" Negative character of aesthetics of "art for the sake of art" is almost evident. However this theory had some positive aspects: endeavor of escape of artist and art from the hostile reality to the world where disappears the violence of money, rough interests and tastes, violence of a debased and perverse society and mob. Aesthetics of "art for the sake of art" focused attention on the problem of form in its most universal sense, which was utmost important for the further development of art and its fate. The cultivation of absolute beauty as the supreme and eternal value along with the truth, good, freedom and justice, the assertion independence of art from morality, religion, politics, the accentuation of the importance of artistic form as the supreme criterion of art - all this promoted the development of high art and protected it from various forms of external and internal violence.

The founders of aesthetics of "art for the sake of art" - Flaubert, Gotier, Goncourt brothers, Baudlaire and others created a sort of "literature of resistance" to various forms and methods of violence. So, Flaubert - founder of "new" novel, "the crossroads of all our literary problems of today" (Sartre), alter ego of madam Bauvarie, "idiot" who became a genius, an early neurosis of which caused a radical change of individuality and a completely new vision of beauty, considered that there is neither false nor true idea, that every thing should be based on experience which is itself a radical evil and truth is only the necessity of belief. The dialectics of being and non-being, god and devil, life and death constituted the structure of its inner space, interrelation with eternity where the depth is just the irreversible movement towards death. The experienced religious and original alienation - in family or Fatum, rational and secular alienation - in the depth of irrational and holy, in the ideology "pater familia", alienation in monarchic and theocratic hierarchy - three dimensions of any experience, which interpret and destroy it. Rebellion against violence of "mediocrity", against "mould" covering the soul, against banality and complacency of bourgeois "mob", against the yoke of "trite truths" of a bourgeois consciousness, "common sense" of the epoch, - isn't it the sense and pathos of "Madam Bauvarie"? And the "Temptation of Saint Anthony" - this unique encyclopedia of spiritual violence of all times, displaying the genesis of the various forms and species of orthodox and non-orthodox ideal, sensual, psychological violence, the aim of which was to defame not only the God himself and connected with him theories, but also to defame Man, human reason and human ideals and values. Anthony won the dispute with the devil who demanded from him just one thing: "Bow to me and damn the ghost that you name God". However, with the help of prayer and belief Anthony overcomes temptations and in rapture is ready to accept life in all its magnitude up to "being the very matter" best he would feel unnatural temptations and lethal violence.

The protection of Man and the world Human values - earthly and heaven-ly - is realized by Flaubert through and by means of beauty. All his works are imbued with the aspiration for beauty. But most vividly the pathos of beauty is displayed in "epic poem" "Salambo" and in three legends and tales: "The legend of St. Julian the Merciful", "Simple soul", "Irodiada". So, on return from his journey to Tunisia, where he specially visited Carthege, Flaubert writes: "I have the power of plastic emotion! The resurrection of the past is in me! I need to portray through beauty, alive and authentic". But the was against beauty, void of idea. While working at "Simple Soul", Flaubert wrote to Turgenev: "It seems to me that the French prose can come to the beauty deprived of idea. Do you agree that our friends are not too preoccupied with Beauty? And there is nothing more important than that in the world!" He virtually portrays battle scenes in "Salambo", his novel irradiates beauty. Beauty here practically opposes evil and violence. The same refers to the three legends. Great Russian writer I.S. Turgenev was so amazed by the perfection of "The Legend of St. Julian the Merci-ful" and "Irodiada" that decided to translate them into Russian himself. "Amased by their various beauties", Turgenev recommended them for publication in "Herald of Europe". Even in the satirical novel "Bouvar and Pecuchet", the characters of which intend to "ameliorate" all aspects of human life and given the caricature and grotesque of these characters, they appear attractive guys, arousing smile and laughter. It seems that the whole novel is the denunciation and ridicule of mediocrity and superficiality of the bourgeois who consider that the truth and beauty are "in their pocket". Meanwhile, as it is shown in the novel, whatever affair Bouvar and Pecuchet start - reforming of the agriculture, pedagogy, science etc. - everything ends in a flop, since the superficial "book". Knowledge can't substitute for profound knowledge of culture. Culture can't tolerate the violence of revolting mediocrity, as well as the twaddle of stupid reformers, since as it is widely known from the time of Socrates and Plato, beautiful like truth, is difficult. And if people don't possess the deep knowledge of the essence of culture they won't get help from any, even the most up-to-date "The-saurus of Truisms".

Balzac in wrote about "pensee a exprimer", "systeme a batir", "science a expliquer", without which artistic activity is impossible. The importance of every detail of an artistic work is conditioned by its integral structure. Realism envisages rich imagination and quick intuition. The Freedom of an artist depends primarily upon his mastery of material, his artistic consciousness and artistic realization. Artist's hand reflects and continues thought in its comprehension. That's why, portraying a woman, an artist almost doesn't see her.

Flaubert to a large extent develops the aesthetic principles of Balzac but he clearly transferred the struggle of fundamentals to the soul, heart and thought of an artist. Realism for him the starting point, since "great art is scientific and "7 impersonal", it perceives objective reality. However, to reproduce reality is just the very beginning of art, which is inseparably connected with beauty. Then it is necessary "to depart from realism to reach the beauty", which constitutes the essence of art. The real art is the search for the truth and beauty. Naturally, this search for truth and beauty includes various "dramatic and tragic collisions, struggle of an artist with all possible species of external and internal violence, which not rarely end in defeat and death of an artist. Thomas Mann in his novel "Doctor Faustus" depicted it very well. One could also recall the fate of Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Hölderlin and many others beauty and violence, life and death seen to have always been inseparable.

In ancient times art stood in the same row with religion and philosophy and poets were at the same time prophets and priests, sages and legislators and even founders of religious concepts - such as Homer and Hesiod. In more recent times art was progressively separating itself from religion, and instead of serving the gods, itself turned into deity and idol. The separation of art from religion gradually led it to the loss of that inspired it - to the loss of Holiness, sanctity - all that transfigured man and the world.

If formerly "pure art" worshipped only a perfect artistic form, pure beauty as it was, in the early XX century artists turn towards the day-to-day life, towards its contents, aspiring for its exact and strict reproduction, that is for its realistic reproduction as well as they are eager to serve their society, its ideology and morality, its world outlook and aesthetics.

Having put itself at the service of society, art pursued positive aims: to become the power that transforms reality, including Man, the power able to oppose evil and transform Life in the spirit of Humanistic ideas and ideals, power, arousing Love and compassion, asserting freedom and social justice.

However, as once remarked a great Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov: "To depict is yet to transform and blame is not yet correction ... in order to cure and renovate this life. To get it one should be close to Earth, and have Love and compassion for it, but something else is also necessary. For a powerful impact on Earth, to turn it around and transform it one has to concentrate on Earth *unearthly powers*. Art that has separated itself from religion should enter a new free liaison with it. Artists and poets should again become priests and prophets but already in a more important sense: not only religious idea will possess them, but they themselves will possess it and will intentionally rule over its earthly incarnations. Art of the future which after a long trial will return to religion, will be totally different from that primitive art that was still identical with religion"<sup>1</sup>.

And though the Russian literature and art have never lost their connection with religion, their certain distance from religion has been evident. That's why Solovyov discerned in literature and art of the future their organic inter- /? connection with religion, that is the literature and art of the future will be religious.

In Russia at that time there were a lot of religious writers and artists, but Solovyov called "precursor of a new religious art" only Dostoevsky. Why?

Examining the works by Goncharov, Leo Tolstoy and other Russian novelists, Solovyov noticed that they "portray the life tutch as they see it, in its ready, rigid and clear forms. Such in particular are the novels by Goncharov and Leo Tolstoy"<sup>2</sup>. They reproduce the Russian society in its patriarchal life, in long-existing, obsolete forms. In this both writers are close to each other. As far as peculiarities are concerned, Goncharov represents the "power of artistic generalization"<sup>3</sup> (Oblomov) and Tolstoy - the "perfect reflection of the "perfect reflection of the *mechanism of mental phenomena*"<sup>4</sup>.

Naturally, the depiction of details and psychological analysis of soul are realized against the background of a long-existing immobile life and immobile images of an immobile world. The only possible motion - the backward motion - towards the life of the eternal nature ("Cosacks" "Three deaths"). Even Tur-genev in his best novels "The Hunter's papers", "Gentry's Hearth" portrayed only "social posture" of an old nobiliary world, like Goncharov and L.Tolstoy also did.

Is it this "statics" and "Asian conservatism" that caused the Tolstoy's theory of "non - resistance to evil by violence", certainly, along with the all-forgiving love and charity of universal evangelisation, which the great writer so vehemently advocated?

---

<sup>1</sup> Solovjev VI. S. Sochinenije V2 tomach.

<sup>2</sup> Solovjev VI. S. Sochinenije V2 tomach. M. 1988. C.294.

<sup>3</sup> Tam že. C.294.

<sup>4</sup> Tam že. C.295.

Dostoevsky, probably, better than all other Russian writers reflected the prophetic function of our literature, since having, social development the main object of his works he foresaw the turns of this development and prejudged ) them. The criterion of judgment was his belief- the summit of spiritual genesis from the height of which he could see clearer, deeper and further than the others all existing tendencies their objectives, deviations from these objectives, fallacies and mistakes. Dostoevsky took the side of these who sought for social truth and justice, who was burning to realise social ideal, but he severely censured the wrong ways and indecent methods of reaching the ideal, having passed through all circles of the earthly hell - sentence to execution, penal servitude, suffering from incurable disease he suffered out his belief like no other Man. Among the horrors of "The dead house" Dostoevsky discerned the "truth of the public sentiment" and "wrongness of his revolutionary aspirations". He understood that under condition one should not lose belief in God and the Realisation of his sinful-ness.

"He was the first to realise that the individuals - even the best ones - have no right to violate society for the sake of their own predominance... that the social truth is not invented by single minds but is rooted in the public sentiment...that this truth has a religious meaning and is related to the belief of Christ, to the ideal of Christ"<sup>1</sup>. The realisation of these truths permitted Dostoevsky to foresee the social development of Russia and real events of the social evolution. So, the novel "Crime and Punishment" was written just before the crime of Danilov and Karakozov and the novel "The Devils" preceded the Netchaev's trial.

In his novels Dostoevsky denounces the right of the mighty, arbitrariness, convincing that no one has the right, and there can be no such right, to sow the grains of evil and violence since it is a great sin, violation of internal moral truth. Autosanctification of Man should be the moral feat of self-renunciation. Not the "Man-God" but "God-Man"!

Appealing to return to the public religious ideal, based on the belief in Christ, Dostoevsky never idealised and absolutised the people, because people is not something single and ideal, it combines positive and negative aspects, good and evil, obsolete and nascent er. That's why not the people is an ideal, but Church as a mystical body of Christ. It is the public belief in Church that Dostoevsky called "Russian Socialism"<sup>2</sup>. Every man should get back to the true belief, buried in the soul of people, to the social ideal of brotherhood and universal solidarity, to the ideal, having not the national but religious and moral meaning. Every people should discard its national egoism and turn to the universal truth. All the tribes and peoples keeping their national character, getting rid of their national egoism, can and should unite in the common cause of "universal reno-vation". "But the world mustn't be saved forcefully... Its ideal demands not only the unity of all men and of all human deeds, but the most important – their *human unity*. The most important is not the unity but a free consent to unite. The ultimate condition of a really universal brotherhood of men is freedom... There is only one guarantee: the infinity of human soul which doesn't permit Man to stop forever and to get complacent over something partial, shallow and incomplete, but makes him aspire for harmonious life, universal and common cause. Of all religions only Christianity places beside perfect God a perfect *Man* The completeness of Christianity is the universal brotherhood of men and the whole life of Dostoevsky was an ardent rush towards the universal brotherhood to men"<sup>3</sup>.

Aesthetics of Dostoevsky, like his philosophy, bore universal character since to attempted to resolute all-human and along with it concrete human problems of an individual. Universalism and all-human character of ideas and ideals he combined with problems troubling every individual. Pathos of his "active love" characterised by "labour and tenacity", was concentrated on every individual, since love for the whole mankind turns out to be hatred to an individual.

Dostoevsky's "active love is aimed against abstract love for the whole mankind, which hides "brutal" cruelty, though "beast is never so cruel as Man, so artistically cruel". It appears that cruelty also can be "beautiful". It is to this beauty that Man comes when he orientates himself towards "beauty without idea", towards formal, void beauty, deprived of humanism.

Aesthetics of Dostoevsky - is the aesthetics of Beauty and its aesthetic ideal. In this sense he is the representative of classical aesthetics. At the same time, Dostoevsky foresaw its decline in future society, which is in our modern society, that's why he is a prophet, foretelling the fate of Man, art, society. And all his prophecies were closely connected with the ideal of beauty. "The need of beauty and creative work embodying it is inseparable from Man and without it Man would not want to Live. Man wants it, finds it and accepts love *without any conditions* only because beauty is beauty and worships it without asking about its price and use. And probably the greatest mystery of artistic activities is that the image of beauty, created by it becomes an idol *without any conditions*. And why it become an idol? Because the need for beauty develops for the most part when Man is in conflict with reality, in harmony, in struggle, that is when he lives because Man lives primarily when he is looking for something and gets it; then he displays the most natural desire for harmony, tranquility and in beauty there are both - harmony and tranquility... Beauty is harmony and the guarantee of tranquility; it materialises human ideals"<sup>4</sup>.

Should one be surprised that in the XX century beauty became an idol (and even earlier - at the end of XIX century), idol and ideal not only for a narrow group of representatives of "art for the sake of art" but for the vast strata of the modern society, living in conflict with reality and with themselves. At the same time, dehumanisation of reality led to dehumanisation of beauty - it not only became void of humanistic contents but the beauty itself was progressively moved to periphery of human life. Morbid society couldn't look at beauty which clearly reflected like in mirror its chronic diseases. Morbid society can't stand the glamour and shine of Beauty.

Nevertheless, life is impossible and unthinkable without beauty. Every man is constantly looking for it, consciously or unconsciously. "Looking for beauty man lived and suffered. If we understand his former ideal we first to all will display great reverence of the whole mankind, ennoble ourselves by compassion for it, understand that this compassion and understanding of the past guarantees to us the presence of humanism, vital force and ability for progress and development. Moreover one can treat the past "byronically". In the tortures of life and creation there happen the moments not of despair, but of infinite melancholy, some unintentional hesitation, distrust and along with it offender emotion before the past and magnificently finished fates of the disappeared mankind. In this enthusiasm (by as we call it), before the ideals of beauty created by the past we express our longing for the present and not for the reason of our impotence before our life, but on the contrary for the ardent longing for life and ideal that we seek in tortures"<sup>5</sup>.

The ideal of beauty pulls us together with all the previous generations bringing them up to the present and plunging us into the past and then into the future provoking thus some kind of responsibility in us for the past and future generations, for everything that is happening on our sinful Earth. And we don't get forgiving from them only penitence and self-renunciation are our fate. But if beauty accepts no conditions, if it is *unconditional* that exists and can exist only "without only conditions" freely, absolutely freely, then it is necessary to create for. Man and his creative activity the conditions of absolute freedom, though filled with infinite responsibility.

Examining the works of Dostoevsky Vladimir Solovyov focused attention on the question con-

cerning the object of the activity and the qualitative of the creator, that is on the question - what to do and who does it?

According to Solovyov, if the social ideal is not connected with internal spiritual life of people and is based on the enforced economic and social way of life then to reach this ideal it is enough to remove external obstacles. In this case ideal brings to people a great sorrow since "the ideal itself is referred to the future; and in the present man deals with things that contradict this ideal and all of his activity turns to *the destruction of the existing*, and since the latter is based on people and society this *activity* transforms into violence over people and the whole society. The social ideal is substituted by antisocial activity. There is a clear answer to the question "what to do" To kill all the opponents of the future ideal social system, that is all the defenders of the present...such a social ideal is completely based on the soil of the evil governing in the world...it needs not the spiritual forces, but the physical violence, it demands from mankind not the internal *transfiguration* but an external *transformation*"<sup>6</sup>.

That is the thing that happened in Russia in 1917, when the existing reality can absolutely counter to the socialist ideals; the constructive forces of society were completely oriented towards the destruction of the existing: the civil war destroyed the defenders of the existing regime and then were destroyed the defenders of the established "socialist regime" (in the 30-s and 40-s - Stalinist repressions).

Solovyov prophetically predicted like Dostoevsky the future events in Russia. He disclosed the psychology of a Man, who in certain conditions is able only to kill and in the long run dies himself of violence. «Man who bases on his moral disease, his anger and madness his right to act and to transform the world on his own will - such a man whatever are his fate and deeds, by his very essence is an assassin; he would inevitably violate and kill others and finally himself would inevitably die of violence»<sup>7</sup>. Stalinist repressions of the 30-s and 40-s show that irrespective of the motives of actions made in the aim of "the happy future", the actions themselves were ruinous and brought death to millions of people.

Solovyov considered that Russia could have avoided this fate if it hadn't renounced God, the Christian idea, the belief in Man and Nature. However, unfortunately, the thing happened: the struggle against "enemies of people" - internal and external led in the long run to the defeat of "socialist system" on the whole.

The way of salvation, traced by Solovyov, it seems, hasn't yet lost its significance. "The first step to the salvation...to feel the impotence and one's own slavery, those who will feel it, will never become killers; but if they -stop on this sentiment of their impotence and slavery, then they will come to *suicide*... To suicide comes everyone who realizes the all-human evil, but doesn't believe in superhuman Good. Only through this belief Man of thought and of conscience escapes suicide...To believe in the Kingdom of God - is to unite belief in God, belief in Man and belief in Nature. All the fallacies of reason, all the wrongful theories and all the practical abuses come from the division of these three believes. All the truth and all the good come from their organic unity... Through this pernicious division of the three elements and three believes has passed the whole free enlightenment of Europe. Here appeared the *mystics*,... *humanists*... *naturalist*... three abstract schools... But not in them is the spiritual future of Russia and mankind. Wrongful and fruitless in their confrontation, they find the truth and the constructive force in their inner unity - in the completeness of the Christian idea...This Christian idea must become the basis for the rational spiritual evolution of Russia and in the context of the fate of the whole of mankind. This was realized and foretold by Dostoevsky... he was at once a mystic and a humanist and a naturalist"<sup>8</sup>.

Indeed, the pernicious division of these three elements and three believes was characteristic both of Europe and of pre-revolutionary Russia. And after the revolution of 1917 these three elements and three believes were simply dis-carded: they renounced the belief in God, in Man and in Nature. Belief in God was announced a prejudice, belief in Man was replaced by belief in collective, party, state; and belief in Nature - by belief in its conquest, which led to a ruinous destruction of natural resources, to the destruction of flora and fauna.

Because of wrongfulness and fruitlessness of separately taken mystics, humanism and naturalism, they were also discarded as prejudices of bourgeois consciousness.

It seems that now it's time to appreciate the prophetic vision of Dosto-evsky and to follow him in order not only to combine three elements and three believes but also to make them an internal conviction of every man, since from their separation and division proceeds evil and violence, and from their unity -good and beauty.

---

<sup>1</sup> Uraz. soch. C.298.

<sup>2</sup> Tam že. C.300.

<sup>3</sup> Ukaz. soch. C.306.

<sup>4</sup> Dostojevskij F.M. Poln sobr.,soch. V.30 - tomax. L-d 1978. C.94.

<sup>5</sup> Ukaz. Soch.C.96.

<sup>6</sup> Ukaz. Soch. C.309-310.

<sup>7</sup> Tam že. C.311.

<sup>8</sup> Ukaz. Soch. C.311-314.