Volume 24 Issue 14
Originally issued as F3

Global Journal of human-social science: F
Political Science
Volume 24 Issue 3 Version 1.0 Year 2024
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Political Conceptualisation of the Phenomenon of "Blooming Complexity" in K. Leontiev's Theory of the Three-Phase Development Process

By Anton Pastukhov
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Abstract- The peculiarities of the political perception of the phenomenon of "blooming complexity" are analyzed, which is actualized in the theory of the processuality of natural development in the teachings of K. Leontiev. An attempt is made to conceptualize the political foundations of the "blooming complexity" phenomenon. The basic scientific problem is the identification of characteristic features of the second phase - "blooming complexity", which fits into the triadic system of the birth, establishment and decline of states and civilizations in the theory of K. Leontiev. The results of the study are representative of the characteristics of the political features of each period of the system: primary simplicity, flourishing complexity, secondary confusing simplification - which appear in homologous unity and historically encapsulate a certain state-civilization in the general historical context.

Keywords: k. leontiev, blooming complexity, despotic idea, triune historical process, nationality, political system, political development, political process, conservatism, historical and political formation.

GJHSS-F Classification: FOR Code: 160609



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2024. Anton Pastukhov. This research/review article is distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). You must give appropriate credit to authors and reference this article if parts of the article are reproduced in any manner. Applicable licensing terms are at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Political Conceptualisation of the Phenomenon of "Blooming Complexity" in K. Leontiev's Theory of the Three-Phase Development Process

Anton Pastukhov

Abstract- The peculiarities of the political perception of the phenomenon of "blooming complexity" are analyzed, which is actualized in the theory of the processuality of natural development in the teachings of K. Leontiev. An attempt is made to conceptualize the political foundations of the "blooming complexity" phenomenon. The basic scientific problem is the identification of characteristic features of the second phase - "blooming complexity", which fits into the triadic system of the birth, establishment and decline of states and civilizations in the theory of K. Leontiev. The results of the study are representative of the characteristics of the political features of each period of the system: primary simplicity, flourishing complexity, secondary confusing simplification - which appear in homologous unity and historically encapsulate a certain state-civilization in the general historical context. The concept of "blooming complexity" was scientifically reflected upon, in the process of consideration of which the ideas of the immanent despotic idea of the state, the concept of the real forces of society, the vision of K. Leontiev regarding the concepts of nation, nationalism, nationality, politics of foundations, etc., were articulated and worked out, as well as the peculiarities of the imperative of the social stratification A political revision of the historiosophical theory of development was carried out, according to which a certain state-civilization, passing through a three-phase process, is replaced by another. During the disclosure of the research topic, the principles of objectivity and impartiality were used, as well as the elimination of subjective evaluative judgments.

Keywords: k. leontiev, blooming complexity, despotic idea, triune historical process, nationality, political system, political development, political process, conservatism, historical and political formation.

Introduction

The relevance of the scientific study of the political legacy of K. Leontiev is due to the fact that he created an original concept of the development of state-civilisations and stated that the historical fate of secondary mixing simplification, which precedes the natural annihilation of the state organism, cannot be avoided. For example, J. Baudrillard articulated a narrative about the crisis of Western democracy, stating that "our system has reached the stage of ultimate saturation and is now beginning to vulgarise - in your interpretation, this is the phase of secondary simplification. Rather, it is a path to total banality" (Baudrillard 2016: 194-195). Also, the modern conditions of the thinker's work are evidenced by the identification of those components of the apogee of political and social development that allow us to characterise a particular state in terms of its stability, political and cultural power, etc. The category of the despotic idea, which cements a new worldview of the state's political system, deserves special attention.

This problem has been studied by foreign and domestic scholars, in particular: A. A. Meleshchuk, G. D. Gachev, A. R. Bury, M. D. Klyashtornyi, M. V. Kuznetsov, H. Clauter, M. O. Emelyanov-Lukianchykov, S. M. Pushkin, V. M. Mikheev, and others.

Leontiev's political-state doctrine has a polyphonic aspect: "there was no one ideal centre from which all private thoughts in Leontiev's worldview would emanate and converge like radii" (Solovyov 2007: 45), states V. Solovyov. However, we would like to actualise the basic borderline component of his doctrine, namely, the political paradigm of the historical process through the prism of the existence of statescivilisations and their self-determination, with all its peculiar phenomena and features.

According to V. Rozanov, the theoretical and methodological topicality of K. Leontiev's political doctrine is central: "Leontiev's doctrine of the three phases of any development, any history, any progress - this doctrine is the root of 'all Leontiev', of all his objections and affirmations, of his politics and monasticism" (Rozanov 2007: 39). It was most fully outlined in the work "Byzantism and Slavism" (1975), in which K. Leontiev proves the difference between the concepts of "progress" (technical, scientific, industrial, economic and especially egalitarian-liberal) and "development": "gradual ascent from the simplest to the most complex, gradual individualisation, on the one hand, from the world around us, and on the other - from similar and related organisms, from all similar and related phenomena.

A gradual transition from colourlessness, from simplicity to originality and complexity.

The gradual complication of the constituent elements, the increase in the richness of the inner and at the same time the gradual strengthening of unity" (Leontiev 2007a: 180) is how the thinker understands the process of development and improvement of all processes and phenomena: precisely as an increase in

Author: Ph.d Student, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Faculty of Philosophy, 60 Volodymyrska St., 01033, Kyiv, Ukraine.
e-mail: antonipastukhov@gmail.com,
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7256-521X

© 2024 Global Journals

diversity in harmonious unity. The category of progress is considered by Leontiev in a pejorative connotation, for example, V. Gamsheeva believes that "progress is understood negatively because of its 'intermittency' and 'unconventionality.' Adulation of progress, hope for the achievements of science and technology, and not for God, is not a rational thought, as some naively believe, but a dangerous form of religious consciousness" (Gamsheeva 2017, 79).

If we talk about the political contextualisation of the definition, then we come to what is ideal for K. Leontiev's ideal structural status of the state is one in which there is a broad vectorisation of political and metaphysical meanings, forms and representations, under the centrifugal retaining force of internal despotic unity; in other words, there is an immanent centre of metaphysical (immovable and absolute) principle in any political system that does not allow semantic variation to function outside its jurisdiction: "so that the highest point of development, not only in organic bodies, but in organic phenomena in general, is the highest degree of complexity, united by a kind of internal despotic unity" (Leontiev 2007a: 180). In this way, the thinker articulates an important, partly central concept in his political philosophy - "complexity". This category fits into the triadic construction of the emergence, establishment and extinction of states, using the example of all other natural organisms that also go through processes: youth, maturity and old age.

It should be nuanced that the thinker's system of views can be attributed to the organic theory of the origin of states (G. Spencer, N. Danilevsky), based on the fact that "the laws of development and fall of states are probably not only homogeneous with the laws of the organic world, but also with the laws of the emergence, existence and death of all things" (Leontiev 2007a: 180), but this is not the end of the story, as will be shown below. N. Berdyaev falsely and biasedly perceived Leontiev's picture of historical and political development, believing that K. Leontiev only "acts as a defender of a kind of sociological realism and even naturalism" (Berdyaev 2007: 10) - this statement trivialises and distorts the epistemological completeness of the doctrine of the three-stage progressive development of states, especially conceptually distorts the understanding of the second evolutionary stage. Our mental attitudes are more similar to the vision of P. Struve, who argued that "in essence, Leontiev, as a philosopher of history and political thinker, is a deeply penetrating metaphysical mind" (Struve 2002: 484); the essence of his doctrine is metaphysical, and its formalisation takes on the contours of organic theory, but the latter does not essentially affect the former.

K. Leontiev depicts his picture of the graded evolution of political organisms as a sinusoidal organic development of state structures, which has a three-phase modus (Leontiev 2007a: 185), and consists of:

- Primary Simplicity, characterised by homogeneity, uniformity and one-form society, public institutions, culture, etc. In this phase, the political form and existential constitution of the community, substantial original characteristics, attributes and demarcation symbols of a particular socio-political group begin to be nominally formed, departing from the ancient integral structure that this anthropological community was part of; at the same time, "simplicity and uniformity in the beginning, more equality and more freedom", great homogeneity and uniformity of thoughts, life, behavioural activism, etc. are postulated - "differences are not enough". etc. - "there are not enough differences" (Leontiev 2007a: 188) within the community, the thinker states. Similarly, there are no explicit signs of separation from other political and state systems yet, due to the lack of immanent complexity of forms, which is the determinant that acts as a conjuncture of difference from other political communities. This is followed by a process of complexity, whose distinctive features are "the strengthening of power, a deeper or sharper (depending on the initial structure) division of classes, a greater variety of life and a diversity of regions" (Leontiev 2007a: 188) - that is, like all natural phenomena, the state becomes more complex and gradualised.

An important aspect of the historical path of a people is its starting point: "the beginning of history always puts an indelible stamp on the entire subsequent role of the people" (Leontiev 2007a: 188) - that is, at the very beginning of the emergence of a national community, there are some objective (historical, political, geographical, etc.) prerequisites for its further distinctive and unique development, which can be more or less actualised in the key of the historical progress of the nation.

At this time, the dominant structural element of the political system should be progressives and modernisers who lead the existence of the state organism to "flourishing complexity" through permanent intentions to create new things and establish a model of substantive political development.

- Blooming Complexity (or "flourishing complexity of manhood" as interpreted by G. Gachev (1991: 50), where the main properties are: political and social diversity, cultural and foreign policy differences, class individualisation, state power and influence of state institutions, external heterogeneity and immanent syncretism of constituent parts in ontic polyphony, as well as diversity of all forms, ideas and feelings, and even suffering: "At the same time, on the one hand, wealth increases, on the other hand, poverty increases, on the one hand, the resources of pleasure become more diverse, on the other hand, the diversity and subtlety (development)

© 2024 Global Journals

of feelings and needs generate more suffering, more sadness, more mistakes and more great deeds, more poetry and more comedy. There are great wonderful dictators, emperors, kings, or at least brilliant demagogues and tyrants..." (Leontiev 2007a: 189). Therefore, this period is the most metaphysically heterogeneous, distinctive, all-developed, since it is the scaling of all ontological spheres of life, rather than the vectorial development of one side (for example, technical progress or social eudemonism). A. Meleshchuk believes that for K. Leontiev, "the viability and historical stability of any nation is determined by the diversity, differentiation and expressiveness of all forms of its cultural life" (Meleshchuk 2017: 170). The philosopher states that in these historical moments, the aristocratic principle and the monarchical principle are highly actualised: "behind the internal need for unity, there is a tendency to one-man rule, which, by right or only by fact (author's note), but always grows stronger in this era" (Leontiev 2007a: 189), i.e. one-man rule may be revolutionary, but it will also be considered legitimate based on the spirit of the era. In this example, the monarchy is the integrative force that allows the constituent parts of the political community to function without leading to disintegration: The provinces are diverse, but subject to a strict hierarchy; social groups differ in opinions and views, but do not escape the ideological root cause; cultural differences are intensified in a complex form of centre supremacy; thus, the state logos dominates the entire social organism, but does not repress and quantify the latter, but optimises the work of a complex and multidimensional mechanism. V. Zenkovsky writes: "Leontiev's cult of statehood meant the same 'binding' principle that he ascribed to the moment of form in the ontology of beauty... Statehood ensures the life and development of a people or peoples, but the very strength of statehood depends on the spiritual and ideological health of its population" (Zenkovsky 1991: 261). Schematically, the essence of this phase can be illustrated in the following theoretical variation: Various structural and functional elements (spheres of the sociocultural existence of the state) begin to individualise and develop in their own logic of action and even tend to alienate when an original master idea (which does not necessarily correspond to the monarchical or aristocratic principle, they can be its synergistic components) attracts them and places them in a strict metaphysical framework that does not allow for disintegration of the system. In other words, the despotic central organising idea of syncretism, which prevents political unity from decaying due to the complication of cultural and social conditions of existence, and the structural and functional elements of the political system, which, in the process of complication, themselves become more individualised and substantive in their originality, inductively interact with each other and thus form an original form of the state.

The most important attribute of the period of complexity is social inequality and the need for clear social stratification for the optimal functioning of the political system: "groups and strata are necessary, but they have never been completely destroyed, only reborn..." (Leontiev 2007d: 364). The differentiation of society, and even social inequality, is an imperative for the relevant life of the state, where strata should be complex in their immanence. N. Berdyaev believes that "'flourishing complexity' is the greatest inequality of positions, the greatest diversity of parts, restrained by despotic unity" (Berdyaev 2007: 10). Each social group has its own central idea that determines the peculiarities and uniqueness of these groups: the nobility has its own, the bureaucracy has its own, the aristocracy has its own, etc., and it (this metaphysical basis) should not flow into other stratified communities, while they are constantly engaged in the process of interaction: "interaction (now friendliness, now hostility, now solidarity, now antagonism) between these groups and strata is inevitable; but the mixing and mutual penetration of the contents of these groups and strata is nothing but the proximity of decomposition" (Leontiev 2007d: 368). From this, the thinker derives the concept of real forces of society, which he sees in some fundamental social elements that "determine the character of the history of a nation" (Leontiev 2007d: 369), i.e. directly affect the paradigmatic landscape of the state, its form and idea. Their essence includes: their special internal organisation; varying degrees of their separation; and their natural static nature. Further, we can distinguish the following groups of social institutions or real social forces in the thought of K. Leontiev:

a) spiritual institutions - religion and the church;
b) state institutions - the monarch, the army, the bureaucracy or the bureaucracy;
c) social institutions - communities and specifics of land tenure;
d) economic institutions - capital and labour parameters;
e) cultural institutions - the nature of science and art.

Thus, the variability of change and transcendence of the quality of the connection of all the above subsystems organises a special political-state formation, different from the others. None of them "can be completely erased from the social organism. It is only possible to bring each of these forces to its greatest or smallest manifestation" (Leontiev 2007d: 371). The concept of political and social statics is inextricably linked to a period of flourishing complexity: "the salvation is not to intensify the movement, but to

© 2024 Global Journals

somehow suspend it..." (Leontiev 2007d: 366). Leontiev was an absolute opponent of social, economic, political or cultural mobility, whether in capitalism, individualism, urbanism, etc. - in them he found dispositions to undermine the political system of the state and create a link to the transition to the phase of secondary simplification.

In this time (of blooming complexity), the metaphysics of the state, its individual and distinctive form of being, is manifested. "Form is the despotism of an inner idea that prevents matter from scattering. Breaking the bonds of this natural despotism, the phenomenon dies" (Leontiev 2007a: 186). It is in this connotation that K. Leontiev perceives the form of a phenomenon, including political, in the context of the postestablishment dictatorship of an idea that organises the entropy of matter, gives it a deterministic appearance, character and image, and when it loses its own metaphysical identification (the centre of the organising idea), or departs from it, the politically organised unity is destabilised and comes to the point of self-annihilation. P. Struve writes about Leontiev hat "he not only practically but also metaphysically understood the nature of the state and gave it a justification" (Struve 2002: 484). Leontiev is convinced that for both the individual and the state, the ideological and spiritual side of ontology are "indestructible needs" (Leontiev 2007a: 185). Thus, in this contextuality, K. Leontiev sharply alienates himself from the fundamental determinants of the theory of organic development of states and acts as an idealist for whom the primacy of ideas is more fundamental than the primacy of material givenness. In fact, the establishment of an original and original political principle and the constitution of a kind of conciliar social formation on its basis is the basic characteristic of the second period of the state's existence. However, there is no need to draw an equivalence between the concepts of "state" and "statehood" - the former is the subject itself, existing as a phenomenon, while the latter is its essence, those substantive properties that personify a *particular state*: these include its own system of political and legal ideas embodied in the very life of the national organism, as well as in laws.

For K. Leontiev, "the development of the state is accompanied by a constant clarification, separation of its inherent political form" (Leontiev 2007a: 186), i.e., the comprehension and establishment of its own state and cultural singularity. He is convinced that every nation and political unity has its own form, and it is "basically unchanged to the historical coffin" (Leontiev 2007a: 191). As noted above, it is precisely in the phase of complexity that this original paradigm for a state system is revealed, for example, Athens developed its characteristic type of democratic republic, ancient Egypt a sharply class-based monarchy, Sparta created "a compressed and despotic form of aristocratic republican communism with something like two hereditary presidents" (Leontiev 2007a: 192), at the apogee of Rome's development, an electoral dictatorship or the so-called electoral emperorship was established, etc.

At the same time, in the context of the development and apologetics of a kind of state foundation, the philosopher is puzzled by the understanding of nationalism, nationality and national beginning, which somehow reorganise identity itself - "even between the expressions nationality and nationalism, I find a significant shade" (Leontiev 2007c: 823). Therefore, in his work "The Cultural Ideal and Tribal Politics" (1888), he argues with vivid reasoning that the policy of nationalism leads to cosmopolitan results, which in the hermeneutical structure of his ideas are identical to decomposition and state elimination. S. Khatuntsev is convinced that "Leontiev developed a range of original ideas about national movements and national politics, created a personal, albeit small in scope, conceptual and terminological apparatus for this area, wrote and published several special works on the national question, and became a theorist of a special kind of nationalism - "cultural" nationalism" (Khatuntsev 2014). On this basis, K. Leontiev operationalises the concept:

- *the nation* is an existing, given being, defined by territory and language: "the nation is the thing itself; the term nation corresponds to the most concrete of all concepts, belongs to the order that is being analysed" (Leontiev 2007c: 824). Leontiev did not consider the concept of "nation" in detail, systematically, considering it "too visual", almost physical, at the level of ethnogeographical data (Khatuntsev 2014);
- *nationality* acts as a set of separating features and characteristics of one people from another, what is hidden behind the nation, its idea when the common qualities of one community (internal integration) are opposed to other qualities of another community (external demarcation), i.e. the functioning of immanent syncretism with exogenous disunity. It is more immobile, difficult to change. "Nationality is an idol, an idea hidden behind the real and concrete physical phenomenon that we call a nation" (Leontiev 2007c: 825), "nationality is a distraction from the nation; its imaginary and imagination-coloured shadow, its reflection in our minds and in our imagination" - this is how Leontiev understands this political category: "the sharper these signs are, the more expressive this totality of them is, the more nationality, i.e. peculiarity, originality, originality, is in a nation" (Leontiev 2007c: 824-825). The basic features that can distinguish one nationality from another are: religious differences, differences in the form of political

© 2024 Global Journals

institutions, and everyday features that are not so much external as reflect the psychological constitution of people, i.e., they are a form of the idea of the people. The author also articulates nationality as a concept of historically acquired features and existing qualities, which is how it differs from the national ideal;

- the *national ideal* is a potentialised nationality, i.e., the enthroned features and ideas of the nation: "it is a different subjective idea of different citizens about the idol of the future real nation" (Leontiev 2007c: 826);
- *nationalism* is "rather a kind of driving, active principle that acts in the name of this shadow (nationality - author's note)" (Leontiev 2007c: 827). Thus, Leontiev sees nationalism as a system of agency for affirming one's own identities;
- *tribalism or tribal politics* is a policy aimed at supporting the interests of language and tribe alone, which leads to cosmopolitan results. N. Berdyaev wrote that "he (Leontiev - author's note) was absolutely negative about nationalism, about the tribal beginning, which, in his opinion, leads to revolution and the democratic equation" (Berdyaev 2016: 86) - but here we should draw a dichotomy between tribalism and nationalism, as shown above. According to Leontiev, "for a political programme to succeed, a central unifying idea is necessary, around which peoples could rally, and he considered the commonality of blood without such an informative idea to be barren and even dangerous" (Gronin 2021).

Thus, based on the philosopher's ideas, it is necessary to clearly distinguish between the concepts of national and tribal politics: The former is seen as culturally selective, protective and creative, it is a policy that separates the metaphysics of one nation and state from others; the latter aims at tribal emancipation, the search for ways and methods to manifest national freedom, which leads to the same methodology developed by Western Europe, that is, the general social equalisation, mixing and homogenisation of society. The former is ontologically and axiologically broader, the latter is narrower. Therefore, we should also distinguish between tribal and national ideals. The fundamental problem is that there is a process of overlapping concepts, the understanding and ideas of tribalism contaminate the category of nationality and the concept of nationalism that comes from it.

Proceeding from the irrelevance of using the concept of nationalism, the thinker recreates his own category, the so-called *policy of foundations* - an applied, active policy aimed at actualising and preserving the cultural and historical foundations of the people and closely related to the concept of nationality as the essence of cultural, historical, folk and other principles. The former determines the procedural landscape of the latter, and sees it as the cornerstone of its functionality. Therefore, the main state idea in a period of flourishing complexity should be the policy of fundamentals.

It should be further nuanced that in this period of the state's life, conservative and protective forces should be an important socio-intellectual beginning, which will restrain the annihilating direction leading to the third phase of the life of social organisms, and is also an implication of the decline and death of systematised political unity: "all the guardians and friends of reaction are right, on the contrary, in theory, when the process of secondary simplifying mixing begins; for they want to heal and strengthen the organism" (Leontiev 2007a: 194). Their ideologemes and conceptual constructions will slow down or freeze the natural entropic process of decomposition of human communities, under the important condition of appealing to the abovementioned politics of the foundations.

N. Berdyaev was convinced that "only in this aristocratic flowering did he (K. Leontiev - author's note) see the beauty of life and suffered madly from the consciousness that the 'liberal-egalitarian process' takes humanity in the opposite direction, to the realm of the bourgeoisie, which causes disgust and disgust in the aesthete and aristocrat, romance and mysticism" (Berdyaev 2007: 5) - because for K. Leontiev is synonymous with social uniformity and homogeneity, it is opposed to the phase of state fruition, unacceptable to the logic of political system complication and is a distinctive feature of the third phase of state development.

- Secondary mixing simplification, for which the basic parameters are: internal and external uniformity, similarity with related phenomena and objects, reduction of the number of distinctive features, weakening of unity, general mixing and idealess commonality. This phase precedes the phenomenon of the death and elimination of the state: "simplification of constituent parts, reduction of the number of signs, weakening of unity, strength and at the same time mixing. Everything gradually decreases, mixes, merges, and then disintegrates and dies, turning into something common, not existing in itself and not for itself. The pernicious becomes more uniform internally, closer to the world around it, and more similar to related, close phenomena (i.e. freer)" (Leontiev 2007a: 185), freedom here being understood as the possibility of going beyond systemic despotism and ascending to other similar objects and phenomena. Zenkovsky was convinced that "the degeneration of statehood and the spiritual degeneration of peoples go hand in hand, and here the naturalist in Leontiev suggested

© 2024 Global Journals

to him the idea of the 'cosmic law of decomposition'" (Zenkovsky 1991: 261). Thus, the third period of extinction is as natural a stage in the functioning of states as death is for any living organism - it is the fate of all societies. However, we can determine the most fatalistic principle of decomposition for K. Leontiev (he actualises it in the context of his entire work) - it is homogeneity, uniformity and generality; the abolition of hierarchy within the state and the external original constitution of an integral political organism: "the very mixing is already a kind of simplification of the picture, a simplification of the legal fabric and everyday patterning. Mixing all colours leads to grey or white. <…> People are simpler personally, in opinion, tastes, in the simplicity of consciousness and needs; communities and whole national or religious remnants are simpler among themselves" (Leontiev 2007a: 195). Based on the above, it can be argued that, according to Leontiev, there is a synchronicity between the whole (the state) and its constituent parts (individuals, social or national communities, cultural identities, etc.), and since the phenomenon of the fading of the whole in one way or another affects the units within its sphere, this leads to the destructivisation of the overall system, both from the centre and from the periphery. G. Gachev, analysing the ideas of K. Leontiev, is convinced that in the third phase, civilisation "is moving towards the lowering of Spirit and Beauty, simplifying the individual and his needs, the structure of society, and the range of interests, activities and goals. Egalitarian vulgarity of democracy", he states (Gachev 1991: 50).

However, "secondary simplification and secondary confusion are the essence of the signs, not the cause, of state decay" (Leontiev 2007a: 215), and Leontiev sees freedom as the main source of the decay of states, which postulates a departure from the authority of state institutions, the non-glutinisation of the internal despotic idea of society, and the extension of rights and freedoms to all social elements. N. Berdyaev wrote that "Leontiev professed the mysticism of power, adored the state, the mystical meaning of freedom was closed to him" (Berdyaev 2007: 19); "he values the individuality of some fictitious whole, not the living human individual" (Berdyaev 2007: 13). In principle, one can understand Leontiev's thorough rejection of individualism, since he saw it as a departure from the sacred and central idea of society, which leads to the establishment of the decomposition of the entire state unity; the main axiological attitude for the thinker is the primacy of the power and strength of the common over the private, of holism over individualism: "he preached the morality of values, the values of beauty, flourishing culture, and state power, as opposed to a morality based on the supremacy of the individual, on compassion for the human being," summarises N. Berdyaev. However, all of the above does not counterbalance the latter's words, but only complements them. P. Struve states the existential objective generality of Leontiev's formula of state inequality: "Leontiev's understanding of the state is combined with an extremely acute, also metaphysical and mystical, sense of the inequality of forces in the economy of nature and history. A conscious and submissive acceptance of this dismemberment and this inequality is necessary" (Struve 2002: 485) - perceiving inequality in everything (from natural phenomena to historical hierarchy), he gives it the colour of objectivity not only in anthroposocial reality, but in all ontological systems.

An important feature of simplification is the process of smoothing out the morphological outlines of a cultural and historical type, which is represented by egalitarianism, eudemonism, expansion of rights and freedoms, denunciation of class partitions - "the egalitarian-liberal process is the antithesis of the development process" (Leontiev 2007a: 187). Anything that cancels the ontological diversity of class, cultural, national, ethnic, etc. communities is a direct evil of the organic development of civilisation, but due to the historical inevitability of these processes, they can only be suspended, frozen, and prevented from being actualised. "The passion for equality and mixing is destructive for cultures and civilisations and leads to their old age and death. The transfer of the ideals of equality and justice to the realm of culture, in his opinion (K. Leontiev's opinion - author's note). Leontiev - author's note), means virtually unification of creativity, levelling of individuals and styles, intellectual averaging, replacement of true cultural values with flat platitudes, replication of cultural templates, widespread domination of dullness, mediocrity, and bourgeoisie" (Buryi 2017: 120), writes A. Buryi, stating that egalitarianism and social equality are the political detonator that undermines the state foundation.

It should be noted that those initial distinguishing universal attributes of a nation that begin to form in the phase of primary simplicity and are ideologically established in the moment of flourishing complexity are not annihilated: "that in the process of decomposition and death, some features that emerged in the period of flowering or complexity remain until the last minute" (Leontiev 2007a: 213). Thus, we can come to the conclusion that there are certain deep constitutions in the national life of a society that are preserved throughout the historical life of a people.

Thus, from the thinker's apothegm we come to the conclusion that every cultural state (i.e., a state with a civilisational landscape) goes through a triune process of birth, maturation and extinction - a process he considered fatal (Berdyaev 2016: 86). Likewise, each

© 2024 Global Journals

historical period of the life of a political organism corresponds to an optimal form of government: during the birth of the state, aristocracy functions, in the middle and the most static period - sole power "even in the form of a strong presidency, temporary dictatorship, sole demagoguery or tyranny" (Leontiev 2007a: 140), and during the death of state integrity - democratic, egalitarian and liberal principles (plutocratic principle of government). Based on the above, we come to the conclusion that for K. Leontiev the most appropriate form of government is the one that is equivalent to the political principle in the period of flourishing complexity, namely, one-man rule.

However, it should be noted that the greatest duration of the existence of states varies from 1000 to 1200 years, but "cultures, combined with states, mostly outlive them" (Leontiev 2007a: 195), i.e. culture as a phenomenon of existence can exist without the state, and the state without culture will rapidly come to the third phase of stagnation. The thinker comes to this conclusion by analysing the fundamental historical retrospective of the life of states, for example: Egypt, ancient Babylon with Assyria, the Jewish state, the Perso-Median state, the Greek republics, Rome and Byzantium, former France, England and Germany - "all of them had one thing in common: they were complex and within their national boundaries there was more or less deep diversity" (Leontiev 2007b: 72). After reflecting on the historical information about these political entities, Leontiev concludes that one civilisation replaces another in the unfolding of history, with an approximate functioning in the 10th-12th centuries, with an immanent triadic logic of existence. Thus, the thinker forms a special historiosophical concept, according to which the main determinant of historical development is the state-civilisations, which postulate the cyclicity of the world-system, and the latter, in turn, takes the form of a wave-like scheme.

Summing up, it should be noted that the phenomenon of "blooming complexity" articulated by the author cannot but be considered in a complex system of triadic development: without actualising the first stage of primary simplicity, characterised by homogeneity and uniformity, as well as without understanding the essence of the third period of repeated mixing simplification - therefore, only in ideological monolithicity does this political phenomenon enter into its ontological integrity. This triadic process is the methodological basis of K. Leontiev's doctrine, which he extrapolated to all state structures. We can consider the category of "blooming complexity" to be multi-conceptual, since it incorporates a multiplicity of concepts and ideas that constitute it in the field of political foundational metaphysics. Important substantive features of this phase are: the presence of class partitions, i.e. social and class differentiation; the functioning of the politics of principles led by a conservative and protective element of the political elite; the establishment of an original cultural paradigm of the existence of the people and the state as its protector; a special political form with a fundamental and centrally organising despotic idea, etc. Analysing the latter factor of the phenomenon we are intellectually dissecting, we should point out its system-forming theoretical potential for creating a possible syncretic political system of state metaphysics. An important feature of K. Leontiev's doctrine is also the changeability and transgressiveness of one state-civilisation by another, which leads to the conclusion that history thus takes on an undulating and sinusoidal movement.

References Références Referencias

1. Gronin, Glenn. 2021. *«The Revolutionary Konstantin Nikolaevich Leontiev»*, Disenchanted Wanderer. NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY PRESS. The Revolutionary Konstantin Nikolaevich Leontiev. cornellpress.cornell.edu. Web. URL: https://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/the-revolutionary-konstantin-nikolaevich-leontiev/.
2. Zlatkova, J. 2015. *«Byzantism and Slavdom: Political Ideology of Constantine Leontiev»*. Cyril and Methodius: Byzantizm and the Word of the Slavs. Ssaloniky. Academia.edu Web. URL: https://www.academia.edu/37923396/Byzantism_and_Slavdom_Political_Ideology_of_Constantine_Leontiev
3. Berdyaev, N. A. 2007. *K. Leontiev is a philosopher of reactionary romance. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO. (in Russian).
4. Berdyaev, N. A. 2016. *Russian idea*. Moscow: "E". (in Russian).
5. Gachev, G. D. 1991. *Russian Duma. Portraits of Russian thinkers*. Moscow: "News". (in Russian).
6. Zenkovsky, VV 1991. *History of Russian Philosophy*. Volume 1, part 2. Leningrad: "EGO". (in Russian).
7. Zenkovsky, V. V. 2005. *Russian thinkers and Europe. thinkers of the twentieth century*. Moscow: Republic, 2005. (in Russian).
8. Leontiev, K. N. 2007a. *Byzantism and Slavism. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO, 2007. (in Russian).
9. Leontiev, K. N. 2007b. *Literacy and nationality. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO. (in Russian).
10. Leontiev, K. N. 2007c. *Cultural ideal and tribal politics. Letters to Mr. Astafiev. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO. (in Russian).
11. Leontiev, K. N. 2007d. *The average European as an ideal and an instrument of world destruction. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO. (in Russian).
12. Rozanov, V. V. 2007. *About Konstantin Leontiev. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO. (in Russian).

© 2024 Global Journals

13. Solovyov, Vl. S. 2007. *In memory of K. N. Leontiev. Literacy and nationality. Anthology of thought: East, Russia and Slavdom*. Moscow: EKSMO. (in Russian).
14. Struve, P. B. 2002. *Konstantin Leontiev. Leontiev K. N. Russian memoirs. XIX century. My literary destiny Memories*. / Comp., intro. article, note. T. F. Prokopova. Moscow: Russian book. (in Russian).
15. Khatuntsev, S. V. 2022. K.N. *Leontiev on nationalism and national politics*. 8ref.com. Web. 2014. URL: http://8ref.com/9/referat_91394.html. (in Ukrainian).
16. Baudrillard, J. *Zhukh terrorism. There was no Gulf War.* Moscow: RIPOL classic. (in Russian).
17. Bury, A. R. 2017. *Konstantin Lentiev and Volodymyr Solovyov as "mirrors" of Russian culture of the 19th century*. Taurian historical scientific readings. Tavria National University named after V. I. Vernadskyi. Kyiv. tnu.edu.ua. Web. URL: https://tnu.edu.ua/sites/default/files/normativbasa/tnuistorctenia012017.pdf#page=120. (in Ukrainian).
18. Gamsheeva, V. M. 2017. "*The formula "development-progress" in the philosophy of history of K. M. Leontiev*. "Gilea: scientific bulletin": Collection of scientific works. - Kyiv. Issue 121. (in Ukrainian).
19. Meleshchuk, A. A. 2017. *Peculiarities of organicism in the philosophy of history of K. Leontiev and M. Danylevsky.* "Gilea: scientific bulletin": Collection of scientific works. - Kyiv. Issue 127. (in Ukrainian).

© 2024 Global Journals