According to Kant, “two human inventions may be considered the most complicated ones: these are the art of governing and that of educating...”; “Parents take care of their family, whereas rulers take care of their states. The final goal both set is the common advantage and the perfection mankind is destined for...”\(^2\). Violence seems to be the simplest and the most universal way of governing. However, it reduces the human world to the animal-like, barbaric level. In Kant’s opinion, it is only morality that makes a man a person, \textit{homo sapiens}. Yet politics is commonly considered to be outside morality nowadays. Many notable politicians, lawyers, and even philosophers try to convince us that this is true. Still, this persuasion has failed to justify itself in both theoretical and practical aspects. Politics is inconceivable without morality, as it transforms into something else when outside it. I. Berlin has understood it perfectly, as he considers that “political theory is a branch of moral philosophy which starts from applying moral categories to political relations”\(^3\).

Humanistic politics (I. Kant, F. Dostoevsky, M. Gandhi, M. L. King, etc.) is based on the following thesis: \textit{good ends can be achieved only with good means}\(^4\). This statement is not a wish of an abstract cartoon character, but an axiom proven by practice. The point is that the ends depend on the means they are achieved by; this is why good ends cannot be achieved through bad means; otherwise, they will mutate and become different, not good ones. Answering the question, “What is the true policy?” Russian philosopher I. A. Ilyin (1883-1954) writes, “\textit{Adopting organic solidarity of everyone with everyone}”. He continues, “The True Political...
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\(^{4}\) “Nonviolence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek” (Кинг-младший М.Л. Письмо из бирмингемской городской тюрьмы // Ненасилие как мировоззрение и образ жизни. – М., ИВИ РАН, 2000). (King Jr., M. L.: Letter from Birmingham Jail. Nonviolence as a World Outlook and a Way of Life. Moscow: Institute of World History at the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2000, p. 281).
Allegiance is not directed at separate groups or independent classes, but the entire nation in general. Politics, by its very nature, does not split people or kindle their fury to make them confront each other; on the contrary, it unites the people by using the things all of them have in common. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist division of society into antagonistic classes and inciting bloody struggle between them is regarded by Ilyin as “political immorality”.

The activity of Mahatma (Mohandas Karamchand) Gandhi (1869-1948) may serve as a model of humanistic policy of nonviolent resistance: he succeeded to make a seemingly impossible thing, practically proving the possibility of non-violence politics and won when violence was a widespread and accepted norm, perceived as something mundane and ordinary, unlikely to cause any protest. Before him, violence in political affairs was considered to be as natural and necessary as the biological death of a man of old age.

In America, the famous follower of Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King (1929-1968), the African American Baptist priest, spoke against racial segregation. King regarded Gandhi as his teacher, and his destiny was similar: he was shot by an assassin. Gandhi’s position is sacrificial; he kept sacrificed himself for every man and mankind. Socrates, Jesus, Gandhi, King, and many others are examples of such behavior. The more personalities sharing this position emerge, the faster war and violence cease to exist. It depends on the attitudes and actions of every person.

Immanuel Kant also spoke against Machiavelli’s absorption of morality by politics and Machiavellian separation of politics from morality, “Politics says, ‘Be wise as serpents’, while morality adds (as a constraining limitation), ‘harmless as doves’,” “true politics ... cannot take a step without paying tribute to morality in advance”. Kant, who has inherited the tradition of classical political philosophy (Aristotle), argues that the true purpose of the policy is “correlating with the general purpose of society. He summarized the theoretical search of the Enlightenment, justified the legal forms and methods of struggle for changing the social system, and announced the personality to be an end in itself for a...
social organization, “... the right of a person should be considered sacred, no matter what it may cost the ruling power”. “Kant demands what is proper. This requirement, along with his apparent ‘simplicity’, is only in the belief that politics based on morality and law would be most fruitful, the most appropriate to the *innate human rights* – equality and freedom”.

Kant expressed his socio-political ideas in his works titled *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose* (1784) and *Perpetual Peace* (1795). In the latter, he mentions that a moral politician must base his activity upon “natural law as the ideas of reason, which is a model, no matter what it may cost to self-interest”\(^9\). According to Kant, this requirement is *objective* by nature, this is why “(in theory) there is no discrepancy between politics and morality;” this discrepancy arises in practice, *subjectively*, when a man has to struggle against selfishness in himself, not to bring it outside, into political life\(^12\). The problem today is that the things Kant considered objective and axiomatic, natural and a priori, are not only questioned, but denied altogether. Politics, even in theory, is recognized not only as a thing separated from morality, but having nothing to do with it; it is regarded as the “dirty work” where everything is admissible. There are calls to come to terms with such an understanding and such “politics”. But while practice may take any turn, is it permissible to adapt the theory to the bad practice and justify it, even theoretically? The hideous *existent things* should not be allowed to dominate over the *things that should be*, i.e. the requirement of moral intelligence inherent in man\(^13\).

Kant advocated good means to achieve the good, “… allegedly good intentions cannot wash away the stain of injustice off the means applied. – As to the objection saying that, due to such doubts of using power in order to establish the rule of law, all the land would have probably still remained in a state of lawlessness, well, even this kind of objection can destroy the specified legal provision as little as the pretext suggested by the revolutionaries who oppose the state, claiming namely that, when the state system is faulty, the nation has to transform it by using power, and, in general, injustice should be applied once and forever, in order to help justice succeed and go strong”\(^14\). Kant stands for non-violent reforms, recognizing

---

\(^9\) Ibid., p. 55 – 56.
\(^12\) Ibid., p. 48.
the malignancy of any revolution which “destroys any legal status”\textsuperscript{15}.

Yet Kant, in his naïve enlightener-like manner, has supposed that even the devil, if he has the intellect, will finally transform into a luminous angel\textsuperscript{16}, not to mention world history and such trifles as human selfishness: Kant undoubtedly believes in its socialization. Like his predecessors, he has believed that socialization of self-interest would reach the degree able to turn humanity into an “overall legal civil society” instead of the belligerent nations\textsuperscript{17}. On the one hand, Kant opposes Machiavellian separation of politics from morality; on the other hand, he glorifies the antagonism existing in society and the selfish nature of man, returning to the methodology developed by Machiavelli and Hobbes. Kant compares humble people to sheep and glorifies the “envious rival vanity”, the “insatiable thirst to possess and dominate” as engines of progress, without which “all excellent natural inclinations of man would have remained undeveloped forever”.

Dostoevsky is more pessimistic about this aspect: he presupposes that God and the devil are struggling in the heart of man to gain his soul. Dostoevsky regards human nature as antinomic; according to him, reason cannot combat evil alone, moreover, reason itself can serve it. Unlike Kant, who became the founder of German classical political philosophy, Dostoevsky may be referred to as the founder of existential humanist political philosophy. He has developed his ideas especially deeply in \textit{The Brothers Karamazov}, \textit{The Idiot}, and \textit{The Devils}, where he provides unmatched criticism of revolutionary violence. According to Dostoevsky, “compassion is the main and perhaps the only law of existence for the entire mankind”\textsuperscript{18}. It is reflected throughout all his writings. The most profound, significant, and radical is the symbol of the “single tear shed by a child”, described by Dostoevsky in the \textit{rebellion} of Ivan Karamazov, when the character refuses to accept a bright future perfect society, if creating its foundation requires at least one tear of the child, “And if the sufferings of children go to swell the sum of sufferings which was necessary to pay for truth, then \textit{I} protest that the truth \textit{is} not worth such a price”\textsuperscript{19}. Dostoevsky agrees with Kant that the person is an end in itself and can never serve as a means.

However, Kant has developed a series of realistic suggestions, by which mankind can eliminate wars (no regular army, refusal to finance warfare, non-interference with internal affairs, etc.). His suggestions can be put into practice, yet reality lacks its single aspect: political will, on the one hand, and the requirements
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\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., vol. 7, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{17} Кант И. Идея всеобщей истории… // Там же. – Т. 8. (Kant I.: Idea for a Universal History…, ibid., vol. 8, p. 12).
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., vol. 14, p. 223.
of universal civil society, on the other hand, which could force politicians to actually address the issue of ending violence in the world. Some of these items are implemented, partly they are breached, and some have not even been accepted yet (refusal to finance arms production and keeping standing armies; elimination of the arms race).

Yet, along with that, Enlightenment utopianism is typical of Kant, too. He believes that the public will get enlightened by itself if given freedom. “For this enlightenment, only the freedom to use one’s own mind on public is required”. Formulating the categorical imperative of treating the others the way you wish to be treated in *The Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant actually reproduces the general will of Rousseau, giving it a priori features, “... the social imperatives of practical reason have a priori nature”\(^{20}\). The categorical imperative cannot be disobeyed because it is universal, not because it is commanded by God. Replacing the notion of an absolute by the category of universality, Kant tends to create a complete ethical system independent of theological study using it and freedom as the basis. The general will can even turn a masochist or a sadist into a respectable citizen; more exactly, only the general will can save the categorical imperative from some masochistic or sadistic perversion: everyone could not be like that. Only in these circumstances, the categorical imperative is able to work out. In the sphere of morality, the things able to become a universal law are the truth.

Violent Machiavellian, Hegelian-Marxist, and Liberal Bolshevik methodology of solving social problems (we can see the extreme right wing join the extreme left wing, inciting violence in Russia) must be replaced by a truly humanistic, democratic one (not in the sense of “democracy” as the ideology of usurpation and holding power, but in the sense of the rule of the people), which is focused not upon the “spirits of history” (Hegel), the “national state” (Machiavelli), “antagonistic classes” (Marx), yet on the fragile human personality, more valuable than any ideology, be it “Marxist Bolshevik” or “liberal-democratic”, “whose anger is unjust, as it is cruel” (Dostoevsky). A. S. Solzhenitsyn, following the moral tradition of the great Russian literature, has also defended the principles of humanistic politics, “Well, if the state, party, social policy is not based on morality, man will have no future at all. On the contrary, state policies or human behavior, determined by the moral compass, are not only the most humane, yet, ultimately, the most prudent ones for their own future”\(^{21}\); “It is often forgotten that only moral politics yields good fruit in the long run”\(^{22}\). The writer criticizes the substitution of the UN and its Security Council by NATO and the U.S. decisions, and the
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wars unleashed by the U.S. State Department under the guise of “humanitarian purposes”. The new political theory, based on the well-neglected principles of the “axial age”, world religions, and true humanity, should be an existential-personal one, not a class dialectical and liberal extremist one. Freedom, democracy, and justice are not the ends in themselves. They are only the means (often unsuitable ones, if violence is needed for implementing them) used to achieve the personal and social good. In international politics, where the “democracy” understood ideologically and geopolitically has won, anything that promotes the establishment of a single sovereign power on Earth (unipolarity) is “democratic”, whereas everything that does not fit into this scheme (multipolarity) is regarded as undemocratic. The method of overcoming these ideologemes, neutralizing them should be implemented at the theoretical and practical levels. The most appropriate and effective way for this purpose is the assertion of priority of moral values, especially non-violence, in domestic and foreign policy. In today’s world, “democracy”, “liberalism”, “freedom”, or other distorted and discredited values are unable to rectify the situation; only the non-violent, morally oriented, existential personal politics can do that. This is exactly the policy the spiritual traditions of humanity, its best minds have sought to promote. Deepening, developing, and spreading a culture of active and efficient (not pacifist disarming) non-violence, capable of resisting the evil and violence without resorting to their own methods, is necessary. Morality requires protecting those insulted and humiliated, neutralizing aggressive intentions. Non-violent moral politics should not indulge in extreme violence or extreme pacifism, which denies resisting violence and evil. Moral politics should be life-affirming, able to assert the truth of its principles both theoretically and practically.

Mankind will only reach the level required for survival in the modern era when it recognizes (not in words but in deeds) the highest value of human life, each individual human life, and when the great humanist principle formulated by Immanuel Kant and stating that “man is the goal and can never serve as a means” is implemented. A person cannot be sacrificed to any interests or ideologies. Yet he may perceive himself as a sacrifice of love and kindness, if the person chooses serving the others. The universal values of non-violence mankind developed in various cultures: Taoism (naturalness), Hinduism (ahimsa), Christianity (“Thou shalt not kill”), Islam (Allah is perceived as “compassionate, merciful”), etc., have to be recognized, and man should proceed from them. The common good is unattainable otherwise. Rejecting these principles of the “axial age” implies returning to some pre-civilized state of barbarism, which is now seen in international politics, where the cult of violence and ultimatums has prevailed.
In this age of globalization, national interests and values have to be balanced with those of all mankind, represented by the world religions, philosophy, and spiritual culture of different nations. Going back to dividing the world into antagonistic “blocks” or using definitions like “rogue countries” and the “axis of evil” is unacceptable. It is obvious that this sinister terminology is unable to lead the world toward multipolarity and mutually beneficial cooperation based on international law. Current law should harmonize national and human interests Kant laid the foundations for.

In the early 20th century, a number of Russian thinkers warned of a real threat to the endorsement of totalitarian ideology, including its stabilization in the West, the deep crisis of the Euro-Atlantic democracies (N. Berdyaev, S. Frank, G. Fedotov, I. Ilyin, etc.) In the end of the previous century, A. Zinoviev spoke of “totalitarian democracy”, whose essential features have to be explored yet, but which was already triumphant at that moment.

The Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO declares, “... the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind”. This is especially true in the modern world which is fraught with global catastrophes. All political and social forces, states, and governments should condemn violence. We see how easily terrorists and extremists of all stripes can find common ground. In his day, Leo Tolstoy urged to unite all the good forces, but his voice was not heard. It must be recognized that not all means are good in the competitive political in-fighting and international struggle. Therefore, violence and invoking it should be excluded. All the actions should be taken only in accordance with the legal framework, morality, and international law.

Translation: Ivanova Tamara

Zhrnutie

Základy morálnej politiky: I. Kant, F. Dostojevskij a iní

Autor sa v príspevku cez prizmu Kantovej tvorby v porovnaní s F. Dostojevským zaobera možnými variantmi vzájomného vztahu medzi násilím a nenásilím, formulujúc koncept humanistickej politiky: cnostný cieľ je možné dosiahnuť iba cnostnými metódami. Základný rozdiel vymedzených variantov
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Zusammenfassung

Grundlagen der Moralpolitik: I. Kant, F. Dostojewski und andere

Politik der Gewaltlosigkeit (d.h. aufgrund des Non-Widerstands gegen das Böse mit Kraft, was den Widerstand gegen das Böse mit Gewalt nicht ausschließt, aber manchmal benötigt) finden kann. Die Grundsätze dieser Politik wurden schon in der „Achsenzeit“ durch Weltreligionen und Philosophie entdeckt und später bei I. Kant, F. Dostojewski, M. Gandhi, M. L. King u. a. entwickelt.

**Schlüsselworte:** Humanismus, Moralpolitik, Machiavellismus, Kompromiss, Gewaltlosigkeit, Non-Widerstand, Pazifismus

**Аннотация**

**Основания моральной политики: И. Кант, Ф. Достоевский и др.**

В исследовании, через призму творчества И. Канта в сравнении с Ф. Достоевским вскрываются варианты соотношения между насилием и ненасилием, формулируется понятие гуманистической политики: **благая цель может быть достигнута только благими методами.** Определяется основополагающее различие в специфических вариантах понимания соотношения между моралью и политикой в контексте духовных и интеллектуальных традиций. В статье анализируется продолжающийся уже более века спор в русской философии относительно оправданности применения насилия. Полемика, развернутая И. Ильиным по поводу доктрины Л. Толстого о непротивлении злу силой, нашла живой отклик как со стороны Н. Бердяева, так и других мыслителей начала прошлого века. Не завершилась она и по сей день, спровоцированная еще творчеством Николо Макиавелли и Иммануила Канта. Автор, основываясь на скрупулезном прочтении первоисточников, стремится расставить акценты в данном споре, ориентируясь на понятие гуманистической политики. Пацифистское непротивление рассматривается как аморальное. Подчеркивается, что решение современных глобальных как международных, так и внутренних проблем возможно лишь на основе гуманистической политики ненасилия (*неспротивление злу насилием*, что не исключает, а иногда нуждается в *противлении злу силой*) принципы которой открыты еще в «осевое время» мировыми религиями и философией, развиты И. Кantom, Ф. Достоевским, М. Ганди, М.Л. Кингом и др.

**Ключевые слова:** гуманизм, моральная политика, макиавеллизм, макиавелльство, компромисс, ненасилие, непротивление, пацифизм
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