

SCTMG 2020

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

THEOCRATIC STATE IN POLITICAL AND LEGAL VIEWS OF L. A. TIKHOMIROVA

Dina Viktorovna Alontseva (a)*

*Corresponding author

(a) Bunin Yelets State University, 28, Kommunarov str., Yelets, 399770, Russia, dina.alontseva@mail.ru

Abstract

Relevance. The article is devoted to relevant issues of the origins of the ideas of theocratic statehood in the state-legal views of the Russian philosopher Lev Aleksandrovich Tikhomirov (1852–1923). The emphasis is placed on the fact that one of the dominant ideas of political and legal thought in pre-revolutionary Russia was the idea of searching for optimal options for state development. The study aims at considering the phenomenon of theocratic statehood in the political and legal views of L. Tikhomirov. The objectives are determined by the purpose of the study and are aimed at showing the life and career of L. Tikhomirov, a description of his views on the phenomenon of theocratic statehood. Methodology. When writing this work, a wide methodological base was used. The basis was made up of three groups of methods: universal, general scientific, and special legal. The results of the study allowed the author to reconstruct the worldview of the Russian philosopher and public figure L. Tikhomirov on the essence of theocratic statehood. Conclusion. The philosopher connects the morality of power with the nation, since it is the beliefs and ideals of the people that make up the key principle of the reality of power itself. Special attention in the work of L. Tikhomirov deserves the idea of correlation of monarchy and theocracy. If the first one, in his opinion, is of interest from the state form point of view, then the second one is from the standpoint of justifying the existence of statehood itself.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Legal thought, views on the state, social structure, theocratic statehood.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

The Russian Orthodox state-legal tradition, on which the entire system of interaction between institutions of power and religion is based, is the successor of the Byzantine Empire. It so historically established that religious consciousness is immanently inherent in human history, and Orthodoxy was the basis of the spiritual and moral development of statehood and contributed to the realization of the Christian religious and moral ideal. The beginning of the twentieth century in the history of our state is characterized by fundamental changes not only in the structure of the state mechanism, but in all areas of public life. The policy of religious atheism, chosen as the spiritual basis for the development of the state, has led to irreversible changes in the entire state system, the consequences of which are acute today. As modern scholars note, “the split in society that occurred during that period was not so much in the economic, social and political spheres of life as in the spiritual sphere, since the spiritual crisis that gripped the minds of people of that era determined the world outlook of the country's population for many years” (Alontseva, 2017a, p. 4). The loss of spiritual values in the minds of the population led to a spiritual and moral crisis in the worldview of citizens. In this regard, an appeal to the political and legal doctrines of Russian thought at the beginning of the last century is quite justified and timely, since scientists of that era tried to build optimal options for state development.

2. Problem Statement

The beginning of the 21st century is characterized as an uneasy and difficult time in all spheres of society, including the spiritual one, because over the past decades a process of Christian rebirth has been outlined. Religious norms, church dogmas become fundamental in the life of the population. However, the atheism era of the last century does not fully give rise to the spiritual revival of Russia; the spiritual and moral crisis in the worldview of citizens has not yet been overcome. The Russian religious philosophy, which was banned almost throughout the past century, in the 21st century due to spiritual revival is gradually becoming the subject of study of modern political and legal thought. And this is no coincidence. Now, when such Western values as “hedonism and sexual emancipation become the norm <...> and if we do not want the human race to fall like Sodom and Gomorrah because of its depravity, it is necessary to radically change our attitude” (Alontseva, 2017b, p. 141). The state and the church are two social institutions that over the whole existence of statehood have overcome various models of their interaction. In this regard, an appeal to the ideas of representatives of Russian religious philosophy is quite justified and timely, since scholars of that era tried to build optimal options for state-church interaction. Note that the idea of confessional relations in Russian religious philosophy in the present period has been little studied. For example, Besschetnova (2019) reveals the spiritual and moral meaning of the concept of V.S. Soloviev, Tsyrempilov (2015) analyzes the origins of Buddhist theocracy.

3. Research Questions

The subject of the research is to study, firstly, the origins of the formation of state-legal views of Tikhomirov (1882); secondly, the laws that influenced the formation of the conceptual state-legal

worldview of an outstanding scientist; thirdly, the substantiation of the importance of the ideas of a philosopher for modern law science.

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to consider the phenomenon of theocratic statehood in the political and legal views of the Russian philosopher, public figure Tikhomirov (1888).

5. Research Methods

The methodological basis of the study is general scientific, private and special methods of cognition. The general scientific dialectical method made it possible to reconstruct the scientist's worldview position on the form of government.

Using methods of formal logic, the author was able to characterize the inconsistency of the political and legal ideas of the Russian philosopher.

The methods of scientific knowledge helped to conduct a doctrinal study of the scientific works of Tikhomirov (1882). In order to build a holistic worldview concept of the Russian scientist, comparative legal and formal legal methods were used. The use of a combination of various methods allowed us to achieve the designated goal.

Empirical methods. Analysis and generalization of the presented concept of the state structure of the Russian scientist gives a historical and legal interpretation of the state form development.

The method of content analysis will ensure the completeness, reliability and consistency of the data obtained as a result of generalization. Using prognostic methods, development trends of the object under study will be determined and a vision of the possible positive or negative consequences of the implementation of the provisions of the moral aspect of state power will be provided. Some sociological (modeling, extrapolation) and statistical (classification, correlation) methods of cognition will be used to identify individual patterns and development trends of the studied object, determine the main contradictions and ways to overcome them. The use of qualitative research methods (analysis and generalization, comparison, modeling, etc.) is due to the need to formulate hypotheses and productive ideas, as well as the need to understand and explain existing data.

6. Findings

The most prominent representative who developed the concept of a national idea was the Russian intellectual Lev Tikhomirov (1852–1923) brought up in the traditions of the spiritual environment. “A hero of political timelessness,” Nevsky (1927) described the scientist on the pages of the book “Memoirs of Lev Tikhomirov”. Indeed, the philosophical path of the thinker was twofold, from a fierce opponent of the autocratic system to the monarchist statehood concept development.

In June 1879, Tikhomirov took part in the work of the Lipetsk Congress of the secret revolutionary society “Earth and Freedom”. The main issue discussed at the congress was the political struggle against the autocracy by the method of terror. Terrorism, in the understanding of Tikhomirov (1927), is “an attempt to start a revolution with those that were available” (p. 199). He created the Executive Committee

of the Social Revolutionary Party, adopted its charter and developed a concept of activity. According to the memoirs of colleagues did not belong "to the group of the people of the Volunteer who immediately turned their word into action" (Figner, 1927, p. 120). The position of the philosopher at that time was based on the slogan "our struggle is a struggle for the power of the people" (Figner, 1927).

Revolutionary sentiment in the worldview of Tikhomirov did not prevail for long, having supported several revolutionary ideas, the scientist was arrested in November 1873 and convicted under the "193 process". According to his own memoirs, "the court strictly condemned the people harmless and very easily dangerous <...> the sovereign changed all this, increasing the punishment to dangerous <...> my guilt was very small, and I spent 4 years, 3 months and 6 days in prison <...> and then I was exiled" (Tikhomirov, 1927, p. 235).

However, Tikhomirov (1992) fled from exile, starting life in emigration, first in Switzerland and then in France. The period of life abroad can be described as a difficult time not only in the work of a scientist, but also in personal (family) life. The young father knew all the hardships of family life, the lack of material means, the lack of decent living conditions, the illness of his son, and the lack of demand as a public figure and scientist. The idea of what to do in this situation tormented Tikhomirov (1927) and became the reason for rethinking his life credo. "And in a moment of "mystical mood", according to his own recollections, he is given the answer, "And he delivered him from all his sorrows and granted him the wisdom and grace of the king of Egypt, Pharaoh" (p. 275). This religious dogma deeply affects his consciousness, radically changes his revolutionary worldview, giving rise to the idea of filing a petition to the tsar, of returning to Russia.

In May 1888, Tikhomirov finishes his scientific work "Why I Stopped Being a Revolutionary", publishes it and sends one copy to the Department of Public Policy with a request to appeal to the sovereign with a view to returning to Russia. Having received a positive answer, Tikhomirov returns to his homeland with ultra-monarchical views.

Having examined some stages of the philosopher's life, having understood the ideological sources of theocratic statehood, we will try to characterize the phenomenon of theocratic statehood in the political and legal views of the thinker.

And, to study the phenomenon of theocracy, it is necessary to turn to the ideas of the Russian thinker, who believed that the main types, forms of power that exist regardless of their evolution, are three – monarchy, aristocracy and democracy: "It is necessary to recognize all three forms of power as special, independent types of power that do not arise from one another, but that coexist constantly beside <...> in one form or another of the Supreme Authority the spirit of the people, their beliefs and ideals is expressed, what he internally recognizes as the highest principle, worthy of submission to him the whole national life <...> as the highest, this principle becomes unlimited m, autocratic <...> any sovereign power is ideocratic, i.e. is solely under the rule of its ideal <...> this moral or ideocratic lining of the Supreme authority is so sensitive that many researchers of political institutions tried to establish a connection between the form of the Supreme authority and the moral state of the nation <...> this connection, it seems to me, can be determined quite accurately <...> in various forms of supreme power it is expressed what kind of power the nation trusts in its moral state <...> democracy expresses confidence in quantitative power <...> aristocracy mainly expresses trust to the authority, a proven track record; it is a

trust in the rationality of force <...> The monarchy expresses confidence primarily in moral strength” (Tikhomirov, 1927, p. 283). From the given reasoning of the scientist, a peculiar interpretation of the essence of power by scientists based on its typology is traced. It is encouraging that the highest authority in the state, according to Tikhomirov (2007), is the supreme authority with the quality of morality. The philosopher connects the morality of power with the nation, since it is the beliefs and ideals of the people that make up the key principle of the reality of power itself.

The Russian philosopher pays particular attention to the definition of the term “Supreme authority”, which, in his words, means “the expression of a principle accepted by the nation as a unifying principle <...> when a state arises – this means that the idea of some Supreme authority arises, not to destroy private forces, but for their regulation, reconciliation, and generally agreement <...> the meaning of the Supreme Power consists in general obligatory reconciliation” (Tikhomirov, 1927, p. 402). The Supreme authority, which Tikhomirov talks about, can also be called a worldview model. Its principles are guided by the state.

From these positions, the connection between theocracy and monarchy seems obvious: “If there is not enough intense belief that embraces all aspects of life subordinate to one ideal in society, then the connecting force of society is a numerical force, quantitative, which creates the possibility of subordinating people to power even in when they don’t have an inner readiness for this <...> we all know all these formulas of democratic discipline by our proverbs <...> if comprehensive ideals are not clearly recognized by all, about at the same time, nevertheless, the people have faith in the existence of a reasonable law of social phenomena, then the domination of the aristocracy, people of the “best”, capable of by nature indicating this social rationality <...> appears, if, finally, some comprehensive ideal is alive and strong in the nation morality, all leading to readiness for self-submission, then the Monarchy appears” (Tikhomirov, 1927, p. 356). The monarchical statehood of the Russian Empire owes to Byzantium. The philosopher examines in detail the question of the origin of monarchical power, talking about the “royal right” to the supreme power, which belonged to the representative of the ruling dynasty. The scientist, distinguishing three types of monarchy: autocratic, absolutist and despotic, spoke of the need for their combination, if one prevails, the consequences of both progressive development and regressive movement are possible (Tikhomirov, 1927). While characterizing the monarchy as well as the Supreme authority, the philosopher devoted much attention to its moral essence, believing that only with monarchical statehood could the moral ideal of the nation be realized. L. Tikhomirov substantiated the historical mission (historical ideas of the nation) by the existence of a monarchical state.

Theocracy in the worldview of Tikhomirov (2007) appears in three guises, firstly, as a form of state; secondly, as a worldview model; thirdly, as a form of supreme power. In our opinion, based on this combination of the three elements into a single whole, not only the reconciliation of man and the state takes place, but also the justification of the meaning of their existence. The essence of the theocratic worldview model lies in the unity of the individual and collective goals of man and the state and their subordination to the moral law, which is a condition for justifying the existence of both the state and man.

On April 6, 2006, at the meeting of the 10th World Russian National Council, the “Declaration on the Rights and Dignity of Man” was adopted, which is devoted to the significance of moral law for a person, state, and society. In particular, the Declaration notes: “We distinguish two freedoms: inner

freedom from evil and freedom of moral choice. Freedom from evil is valuable. Freedom of choice acquires value, and personality dignity when a person chooses good. On the contrary, freedom of choice leads to self-destruction and damages the dignity of a person when he chooses evil. Human rights are based on the value of the individual and should be aimed at realizing their dignity. That is why the content of human rights cannot be disconnected from morality. The separation of these rights from morality means their profanity, because there is no immoral dignity” (Alontseva, 2017b, p. 142).

7. Conclusion

Correlating worldview ideas of the Russian philosopher L. Tikhomirov of the early 20th century and the position of the Russian Orthodox Church at the beginning of the 21st century, one can draw a certain parallel of property with respect to the moral component of state development. According to the scientist, the theocratic component in the structure of the state is based on the idea of morality justifying the existence of the state itself, and on the basis of the Declaration of the rights and dignity of a person, the content of the rights that citizens are endowed with is also based on the idea of morality, since immoral rights do not exist. Thus, the phenomenon of “theocratic statehood” in the political and legal views of Tikhomirov (1885) is revealed in the idea of a moral justification for the existence of both state and law.

References

- Alontseva, D. V. (2017a). “Nontraditional” marriages as a rejection of Christian values. *Moral imperatives in law, education, science and culture*. Mater. of the V Int. youth forum, held with the blessing of Metropolitan John of Belgorod and Starooskolsky (p. 16). Belgorod.
- Alontseva, D. V. (2017b). Bulgakov on the nature of the Russian revolution. *News of southwest state Univer. Ser. Hist. and law*, 7(2(23)), 141–146.
- Besschetnova, E. (2019). The idea of christian unity at the end of the nineteenth century (the case of VI.S. Solovyov). *Church Hist. and Relig. Cult.*, 99, iss. 1, 46–63.
- Figner, V. (1927). About notes of L. Tikhomirov. *Memories of Lev Tikhomirov*. Moscow, 515 p.
- Nevsky, V. (1927). Hero of political timelessness. *Memories of Lev Tikhomirov*. Moscow, 515 p.
- Tikhomirov, L. A. (1882). Abroad. *Memories of Lev Tikhomirov*. Moscow, 515 p.
- Tikhomirov, L. A. (1885). What can we expect from the revolution? St. Petersburg, p. 29.
- Tikhomirov, L. A. (1888). Why I stopped being a revolutionary = Pourquoi je ne suis plus revolutionnaire. Paris, p. 39.
- Tikhomirov, L. A. (1927). Epoch of “Earth and Will”, “Executive Committee” and “people's Will”. *Memories of Lev Tikhomirov*. Moscow, 515 p.
- Tikhomirov, L. A. (1992). *Monarchical statehood*. St. Petersburg, 244 p.
- Tikhomirov, L. A. (2007). *Guiding ideas of Russian life*. Moscow, pp. 139–141.
- Tsyrempilov, N. (2015). Gosudarstvo, Religii, Tserkov' v Rossii i za Rubezhom. *State, Relig. and Church in Russ. and Worldwide*, 33, 4, 318–346.