



Interpretation of Alexander Bogdanov's novels (utopia or artistic reflection future sociality?)

Rozin V.M.

Institute of Philosophy, Moscow

| Received: 31.08.2023 | Accepted: 02.09.2023 | Published: 05.09.2023

*Corresponding author: Rozin V.M.

Institute of Philosophy, Moscow

Abstract

The study opens with the formulation of problems: the genre of novels is called into question as a utopia (the author believes that it is rather a social projection in the form of a work of art), the actions of the characters are incomprehensible, it is not clear why Bogdanov builds the plot so paradoxically. To resolve these problems, the author turns to the personality of Bogdanov, shows its duality: on the one hand, the desire for power and leaderism, on the other hand, the denial of these values and switching to scientific and teaching activities. This approach allows building a plausible, from the point of view of the author, reconstruction of the artistic reality of the novels and its events. At the same time, the author distinguishes two types of events in artistic reality. The first type is events that line up in response to a completely conscious problem or task. The second type does not imply an awareness of the problem facing the artist (it can only be felt as a vague dissatisfaction or desire), and there is no clear understanding of the way to solve this problem. The proposed reconstruction also makes it possible to explain some features of the evolution of Bogdanov himself: break with V.I. Lenin and the Bolshevik leadership, rejection of leaderism, switching to the construction of the science of "Tectology".

Keywords: socialism, personality, novel, understanding, problems, solution, duality, invasion, suicide, evolution

We are talking about two novels by Bogdanov: "Red Star" (1908) and "Engineer Manny" (1912). They are usually considered utopias, and the second novel is interpreted as the first rehearsal of the concept of "Tectology" (the following understanding migrates from site to site on the Internet: "The novel is a popularization of A. Bogdanov's scientific ideas about "organizational" science, which he later outlined in his work "Tectology"). Bogdanov wrote his first novel during the difficult period of his break with Lenin and Plekhanov, which is indirectly reflected in the first lines of The Red Star, where the main character, comrade Leonid, who, I assume, expresses Bogdanov's position, explains his break with another hero, Anna Nikolaevna, partly reflecting the views of Bogdanov's opponents:

"Gradually, it took the form of a deep ideological disagreement - in understanding our relationship to revolutionary work and in understanding the meaning of our own connection. She went into the revolution under the banner of duty and sacrifice, I under the banner of my free will. She joined the great movement of the proletariat as a moralist who finds satisfaction in its highest

morality, I as an immoralist who simply loves life, wants its highest flowering and therefore enters into that course of it that embodies the main path of history to this flowering. For Anna Nikolaevna, proletarian ethics was sacred in itself; I thought that it was a useful device, necessary for the working class in its struggle, but transient, like this struggle itself and the structure of life that gives rise to it" [1].

In fact, the differences were much more serious. Lenin and his followers, comrades the Bolsheviks, believed that the working class of Russia should take power and the workers were quite ready for this in terms of their development. Bogdanov, proceeding from observations of social reality, proceeding from a culturological point of view, was sure that, on the contrary, the workers had not grown up to solve such a problem, were not yet ready, that there was still no necessary science on which they could rely, and therefore the main work must be reduced, firstly, to the construction of such a science, and secondly, to the education, development and cultivation of the workers. As B. Legrand writes in 1929 in the introduction to the novel: according to Bogdanov,

set forth in the brochure "Problems of Socialism", "... the proletariat as a class, before setting itself the task of conquering power, must master science, rework it in accordance with its class interests, to create and develop a new science - a general organizational science, as Bogdanov called it, which should be the science of building a new socialist society. Any other attempt to implement the program of the proletariat, according to Bogdanov, would be "a program of adventure, the darkest in the history of the proletariat, the most difficult in terms of consequences ... The only end of the adventure would be the long reign of the Iron Heel" [2, p. 38].

Elsewhere in the same pamphlet, Bogdanov formulates his conviction as follows: until the working class masters science, it cannot, must not attempt to implement socialism (see [2, p. 69]). Its task, according to Bogdanov, is: to collect, develop, harmoniously systematize the embryos of a new culture, elements of socialism, arising in the depths of the capitalist system, without encroaching on the direct seizure of power and the transformation of society to the accumulation of the necessary elements of culture (see [ibid., p. 74, 103]).

Well, in the second novel "Engineer Manny", in my opinion, it is impossible to find a popularization of the ideas of organizational science, there are only two fragments where the author speaks only about the concept of such a science, nothing more. "On this path, Natty (the son and follower of Manny. - VR) came to his greatest discovery - he laid the foundation for a general organizational science. He was looking for simplification and unification of scientific methods, and for this he studied and compared the most diverse methods used by mankind in its knowledge and work; it turned out that both are in the closest relationship, that theoretical methods arose entirely from practical ones, and that all of them can be reduced to a few simple schemes ... In the end, he came to the following conclusion: no matter how different the elements of the universe are - electrons, atoms, things, people, ideas, planets, stars - and no matter how different in appearance their combinations, it is possible to establish a small number of general methods by which these whatever elements are connected to each other, both in the elemental process of nature and in human activity. Netti was able to clearly identify three main of these "universal organizational methods"; his students went further, developed and more accurately investigated the findings. This is how a general science arose, which quickly embraced the entire organizational experience of mankind ... Since that time, the solution of the most complex organizational problems has become a matter not of individual talent or genius, but of scientific analysis, like mathematical calculation in problems of practical mechanics. Thanks to this, when the era of a radical reform of the entire social system arrived, the greatest difficulties of the new organization were relatively easily and quite systematically overcome: just as natural science had earlier become an instrument of scientific technology, so now universal science has become an instrument for the scientific construction of social life as a whole. And even earlier, the same science found wide application in the development of organizations of the working class and their preparation for the last, decisive struggle.

This is all, of course, only an idea here, not even a sketch of a theory.

Reading both novels multiplies questions (at least for me). Why is this a utopia, since Bogdanov in *The Red Star* describes socialism as he understands it, and clearly believes that such a society can be

built? The term utopia comes from other Greek. οὐ "not" + τόπος "a place that does not exist" or, according to another version, "a good place". Can the texts of Plato's "State" or "Red Star" be considered utopias? Rather, these are social projects, carried out first in the form of a dialogue, the second - a work of art.

What is characteristic of a social project? The idea, its development (thinking based on social knowledge), setting for the implementation of the developed project [14, p. 84-88]. In *The State*, Plato formulates the idea of an ideal state and discusses the conditions for its implementation. "So let's," Plato says through Socrates, "let us mentally build a state from the very beginning. As you can see, it is created by our needs" [12, p. 130]. He refers to the conditions for implementation the existence of the project itself and the relevant knowledge (borrowed by him from his other works), the training of philosophers, if I may say so, government workers and reformers who decided to devote their lives to social reorganization, and finally, the search for enlightened rulers. "Meanwhile," Socrates says, "it is enough for one such person to appear, having a state in his subordination, and this person will do everything that is now not believed ... After all, if the ruler establishes the laws and customs that we analyzed, then not it is impossible that citizens will willingly fulfill them" [12, p. 283]. Plato also understands that it is impossible to create a new social order without a cardinal alteration of a person (that is, without taking people out of the cave into the sunlight). Plato places his main hopes here not on coercion, but on persuasion, encouragement and education. "If someone begins to drag him by force up the steepness, up the mountain and does not let him go until he takes him into the sunlight, will he not suffer and will not be indignant at such violence? And when he came into the light, his eyes would be so amazed by the radiance that he could not see a single object of those that he is told about the authenticity" [12, p. 296].

As you know, the project of reorganization of the state Plato failed to implement. He did not find an enlightened ruler and could not captivate free citizens with his ideas. It is not surprising, therefore, that in his declining years, Plato bitterly writes in the *Laws*: "everything indicated now is unlikely to ever have an opportunity for implementation, so that everything happens according to our word. It is unlikely that there will be people who will be satisfied with such a structure of society ... All this is like a story about a dream, like a skillful modeling of the state and citizens from wax! [13, p. 198].

Bogdanov borrows a lot from Plato, but also from Marx. Plato - the methodology of social design, Marx - the object of design - socialism, the organization and economy of which is based on the rejection of private property, rational management and distribution, on free (without money) satisfaction of needs. At the same time, Bogdanov foresees (more precisely, works through the project) the problems that the socialist economy will face: the difficulties of planning the mont blanc of the needs of citizens and countless economic processes. "The numbers change every hour," Manny explained, "within an hour, several thousand people managed to declare their desire to move from one job to another. The central statistical mechanism notes this all the time, and every hour an electrical transmission carries its messages everywhere ...

- The Institute of Accounts has its agents everywhere, which monitor the movement of products in warehouses, the productivity of all enterprises and the change in the number of employees in them. In this way, it is precisely ascertained how

much and what should be produced for a certain period of time and how many working hours are required for this. It then remains for the institution to calculate, for each branch of labor, the difference between what is and what should be, and report it everywhere. A flood of volunteers then restores the balance.

- And the consumption of products is not limited in any way?

- Absolutely nothing: everyone takes what he needs, and as much as he wants.

“And it doesn’t require anything resembling money, no evidence of the amount of work done or obligations to do it, or anything like that?”

- Nothing like this. Even without this, we never lack free labor: labor is the natural need of a developed socialist person, and all kinds of disguised or overt coercion to work are completely superfluous for us.

- But if consumption is not limited by anything, then is it not possible for it to fluctuate sharply, which can overturn all statistical calculations? ..

- The difficulties here are very great. The Institute of Accounts must keep a sharp eye on new inventions and on changes in the natural conditions of production in order to take them into account accurately. A new machine is introduced - it immediately requires the transfer of labor both in the area where it is used, and in machine production, and sometimes in the production of materials for one industry or another. Ore is depleted, new mineral wealth is discovered - again the movement of labor in a whole series of railroad tracks, etc. All this must be calculated from the very beginning, if not quite accurately, then with a sufficient degree of approximation, and this is not at all easy until data are obtained direct observation” [1].

I see Gosplan and Gosstab of the USSR. Bogdanov, of course, could not predict that the economy and the economy, based on socialist planning and distribution, would lose out to the capitalist market, adjusted on the basis of social science and experience in overcoming economic crises.

Many questions arise when reading Bogdanov's novels. For example, while reading *The Red Star*, I came to an episode where one of the leaders of the Martians, Sterni, proposes to destroy the earthlings. “On Mars,” he explains to other leaders, “the reserves of radio matter, necessary as an engine for interplanetary communication and as an instrument for the decomposition and synthesis of all elements, came to an end: it was only wasted, and there were no funds for its renewal ... The people of the Earth own it, and in no case will they voluntarily cede it, they will not cede any significant part of its surface. This follows from the whole character of their culture. Its basis is property protected by an organized population. Although even the most civilized tribes of the Earth actually exploit only an insignificant part of the forces of nature available to them, their desire to seize new territories never weakens. The systematic plunder of the lands and property of less cultured tribes is called colonial policy among them and is regarded as one of the main tasks of their state life. One can imagine how they will react to a natural and reasonable proposal on our part - to cede to us part of their continents, in exchange for which we would teach them and help them to use the rest incomparably better ... For them, colonization is only a matter of brute force and violence; and whether we like it or not, they will force us to adopt this point of view towards them ...

And now, if we took for ourselves a part of the earth's surface by means of the necessary violence, then there is no doubt that this would lead to the unification of all earthly mankind in one feeling of earthly patriotism, in merciless racial hatred and malice against our colonists; the extermination of aliens by any means, even the most treacherous, would become in the eyes of people a sacred and noble feat, giving immortal glory. The existence of our colonists would become completely unbearable. You know that the destruction of life is generally very easy, even for our culture; we are immeasurably stronger than earthly people in case of open struggle, but in case of unexpected attacks they can kill us just as successfully as they usually do it with each other. It must also be noted that the art of extermination is developed among them incomparably higher than all other aspects of their peculiar culture.

And in the end, after long hesitation and a fruitless, painful waste of energy, things would inevitably come to the formulation of the question that we, beings conscious and foreseeing the course of events, must accept from the very beginning: the colonization of the Earth requires the complete extermination of earthly humanity ... - We must understand the need and look her firmly in the eyes, no matter how severe she is. We are facing one of two things: either a stop in the development of our life, or the destruction of life alien to us on Earth. There is nothing third before us” [1].

What is not clear to me here: how can it be, the socialists (according to Marx, following after the capitalists, a higher stage of human development, and obviously more humane) propose to destroy the population of an entire planet? Even as a script, it does not fit in my head. However, why does it not fit, because Marx wrote in *Capital*: “The hour of capitalist private property is striking. Expropriators are expropriated” [9, p. 772-773], and didn't the Bolsheviks destroy a whole class (the bourgeoisie), a significant part of the wealthy peasants (kulaks), exiled intellectuals (many philosophers and humanitarians) abroad, and systematically destroyed the enemies of the people. Does the Martian Sterni, who proposes to destroy people, differ significantly from Trotsky, who explains why the Bolsheviks expelled the philosophers in the 1920s? Trotsky, in an interview with the American journalist Strong, called this action “humanism in the Bolshevik way”: “We sent these people because there was no reason to shoot them, and it was impossible to endure” [8].

As can be seen from the beginning of the next novel, “*Engineer Manny*”, in the end, the Martians leaned towards a humanism that overrides even the Bolshevik approach, they decided “for the near future to abandon all direct, active interference in the affairs of the Earth; they think of limiting themselves for the time being to its study and the gradual familiarization of earthly mankind with the more ancient culture of Mars. And I fully agree with them that caution is necessary in this matter. So, if the discoveries of their science about the structure of matter were now known on Earth, then the militarism of nations hostile to each other would have in the hands of destructive weapons of unprecedented power, and the entire planet would be devastated in a few months” [3].

I also do not understand the hesitations of the protagonist of the “*Red Star*” Leonid. On the one hand, he seems to be a very reasonable person, prepared to be an intermediary between the Martians and people, on the other hand, as it turns out, he cannot control his actions at all (having lost his mind, he kills Sterni, who offered to destroy earthlings). Similarly, in “*Engineer Manny*” the main character, a brilliant engineer who planned the construction

of canals on Mars, and also very intelligent, without hesitation, in a fit of anger, kills his assistant engineer Maro, who weaves intrigues against him.

On the one hand, Leonid is ready to take on the mission to promote the ideas of the Martians on Earth, but on the other hand, he doubts whether an intellectual can solve such a problem without the help of the working class. "For the second time," Leonid reflects, "what my spiritual strength crashed against was the very nature of that culture into which I tried to enter with my whole being: I was suppressed by its height, the depth of its social connection, the purity and transparency of its relations between people. Sterni's speech, which roughly expressed the whole incommensurability of the two types of life, was only an excuse, only the last push that threw me into that dark abyss, to which the contradiction between my inner life and the entire social environment, at the factory, in the family, was then spontaneously and irresistibly leading me in communication with friends. And again, wasn't this contradiction much stronger and sharper just for me, a revolutionary intellectual, who always did nine-tenths of his work either simply alone, or in conditions of unilateral inequality with fellow co-workers, as their teacher and leader, - in an atmosphere of isolation of my personality from others? Couldn't the contradiction turn out to be weaker and milder for a person who lives nine-tenths of his working life in at least a primitive and undeveloped, but still in a comradely environment, with its perhaps somewhat rude, but real equality of employees? [1].

In the second novel, this contradiction between the individual and the social environment (the work team) reaches its limit. Engineer Manny, deeply aware of such a conflict, decides to withdraw from life, to commit suicide. It turns out that Bogdanov, who is a bright personality, in the person of Manny decides to deal with her in favor of the socialist cause. In "Memories of Childhood" in 1925, Bogdanov interprets his personality in this way.

"Personality is a small cell of the living fabric of society, its subjectivism expresses only its limitations. I fought against subjectivism when I encountered it in other people; Naturally, I also tried to overcome it in myself... It is inevitable that a person looks from his own point of view, operates with his own methods. But in what sense is all this "own" for him? He himself belongs to a collective - a class, a social group, or several such collectives, the life of which, to varying degrees and degrees, gave the content of his practical activity and his thinking. Personality is nothing more than a small center of application of social forces, one of the innumerable points of their intersection. Her point of view and mode of understanding are hers only in the sense that they find their embodiment and expression in it; it would be more correct to say that the person belongs to them, and not vice versa... The method is more than a person" [10].

Almost the same thing was said by my teacher, G.P. Shchedrovitsky: "From all sides I hear - Man! Personality! - it's all a lie. I am a vessel with a living, self-developing mind. I am thinking thinking, its hypostasis and materialization, the organism of thought and nothing else. This is how I view myself and treat myself this way, and many of the difficulties of my individual life are connected precisely with a clear understanding of my special nature, with the fact that I am a clot of thinking and am obliged to live according to its laws ... I always think, and this is pleasure , equal to which I do not know. I always mean one thing: I am a bollard, a servant of my thinking, and then there is an action of

thinking, mine and others, who, in particular, communicate. This is my essence as a person. Thinking thinks, play plays" [15, p. 9].

I also don't understand the remark about science at the end of Manny the Engineer. Such a science must be understandable to workers, integrate the possibilities of different sciences (physical, biological, social), a science that describes the universal laws that govern the organizational actions of people. Bogdanov believes that it is on the basis of these laws that socialism can be built and the main problems of mankind can be solved. At the same time, in both novels, he shows that the ball is ruled by the social element. The latter is formed by the actions of individuals and non-individual processes (economic, social, historical, cultural), and it is impossible to understand how one is related to the other.

It seems that the rational activity and science of the Martians should ensure their unhindered progress, but the trouble is that nature is depleted and there are no more resources, the remnants of selfish behavior remain, almost insane solutions are offered (to destroy earthlings). Or, in the second novel, Manny the engineer must plan well-managed and smooth construction of the Martian canals. However, bad luck: the workers' unions, the government, the syndicates of the bourgeoisie, society act on the basis of their own interests, weave intrigues, fight each other, which, in the end, leads to the collapse of the entire project and Manny's imprisonment.

The science that Bogdanov proposes in the novel "Engineer Manny", which becomes clear a little later, is "Tectology". Do its laws take into account the social element and the difference in cultures (Martian and terrestrial), which Bogdanov so convincingly described in both novels? He is sure that yes, he takes it into account, I strongly doubt it. It is unlikely that the main social and psychological processes can be reduced to organizational experience (organization-disorganization). "In general," writes Bogdanov in Tectology, "the whole process of man's struggle with nature, the subjugation and exploitation of its elemental forces, is nothing but the process of organizing the world for man, in the interests of his life and development. Such is the objective meaning of human labor.

Even more obvious is the organizational character of cognition and thought in general. Its function is to coordinate the facts of experience into harmonious groupings - thoughts and systems of thoughts, that is, theories, doctrines, sciences, etc.; and that means organizing an experience. The exact sciences organize all the modern techniques of machine production; they are capable of this only because they themselves represent the organized experience of the past, primarily also technical.

Artistic creativity has its principle of slenderness and harmony, and this means organization. It organizes ideas, feelings, moods of people with its special methods, closely adjoining knowledge, often merging directly with it, like fiction, poetry, painting. In art, the organization of ideas and the organization of things are inseparable. For example, taken by themselves an architectural structure, a statue, a painting are systems of "dead" elements - stone, metal, linen, paints; but the vital meaning of these works lies in those complexes of images and emotions that unite around them in the human psyche.

We see that human activity - from its simplest to its most complex forms - is reduced to organizing processes" [4].

However, modern research shows that even many processes in production and construction, not to mention cognition, thinking, artistic creativity, cannot be reduced to organizational experience and management [7; 14].

By the way, organizational science does not answer the question of what type of sociality is assumed in the construction of socialism (whether private property will be preserved for someone, who will be the social hegemon, how power will be chosen, what relationships between people and communities are expected, whether law or laws will be preserved will defend only the proletariat, etc.). Reading both novels, we cannot get answers to these questions. There is a suspicion that Tectology avoids the most important problem - the definition and constitution of the coming sociality.

Interestingly, almost a hundred years later, the methodological school of G.P. Shchedrovitsky, with whom I studied, became the object of similar criticism. One critic calls the methodologists' approach "managerial fetishism." "The essence of managerial fetishism is that any shortcomings of the system can be eliminated without restructuring its foundations through effective management (management). The prosperity of the system depends solely on the quantity and quality of effective managers to whom it entrusts its destiny. This philosophy was very close to that part of the Soviet leadership that did not want to change anything in the social order, but at the same time understood that literally everything needed to be changed in order to survive. Methodologists inspired her with a false hope that there was a way out, it was enough for those in power to buy their "social-philosophical stone" ... Although they did not manage to receive official recognition of the theory of methodologists, they were given freedom unprecedented in the USSR to spread their unorthodox views ... Gorbachev went the other way: he chose to break the system, and the methodologists turned out to be historically unclaimed" [11].

But let's not criticize Bogdanov from the position of modernity, let's better try to understand him as the author of "Red Star" and "Engineer Manny", as a man of his time. To do this, we first offer a brief description of his personality, bearing in mind the solution of our problem.

Bogdanov's biography suggests that as a person he was split. On the one hand, being at one time the second person in the Bolshevik Party and enjoying great prestige among the workers, he was no stranger to striving for power and leadership. On the other hand, Bogdanov saw the dangers of both. He deliberately broke with the Bolsheviks (in June 1909, Bogdanov was expelled from the Bolshevik Center at a meeting of the expanded editorial board of the Proletary newspaper, and in January 1910, at the Paris Plenum, he was removed from the Central Committee), and hinted that Lenin's victory could lead to big trouble ("The only end of the adventure would be the long reign of the Iron Heel"). Although Bogdanov focused on building Tectology, teaching and experimenting with blood transfusions, he certainly retains a sense of his importance and a desire to influence the course of building socialism in Russia.

And he understands socialism in his own way: rather economically and as a rational activity. Both, in his opinion, should be based on scientific knowledge. But Bogdanov understands science for his time in a very modern way: of course, it must be an exact science, but combining the achievements of the natural, biological and social sciences on the basis of the Marxist method and, no less

important, practice-oriented. Such a practice, Bogdanov is convinced, is a general organization. Why organization? Well, it was a sign of the times: the ideas of building a new person and culture, "life-building", as they wrote then, were in the air.

"We feel very well," wrote I. Vereshchagin, "that architectural requirements can and should be made not only to buildings, but also to any thing, any person and his face. At present, not only new factories are being built, but also a new culture and a new person" [1, p.130] "The new society," declares the creator of Soviet psychology L.S. Vygotsky, - creates a new person. When they talk about the remelting of man as an undoubted feature of the new humanity, and about the artificial creation of a new biological type, then this will be the only and first species in biology that will create itself... In the future society, psychology will be the science of the new man" [5, With. 436]).

Arrested by the GPU in September 1923, Bogdanov wrote to F.E. Dzerzhinsky: "General organizational science. Doesn't general disruption, world disorganization speak sternly and authoritatively of its necessity? And when our working class, by the force of events, had to take up the organization of the entire life of the country, was it not the most tragic thing in its position that it had to do it gropingly, and with the help of specialists from the old science, which itself never set the task as a whole? And is a universal scientific organization of the world economy into socialism conceivable without a well-developed tool - a universal organizational science? The question of a single economic plan comes up with brutal urgency. Ask our scientists-specialists - professors Groman, Bazarov, the head of the State Planning Commission Krzhizhanovsky himself - is organizational science necessary and useful for solving this issue?"

Methodologically, Bogdanov is also under the influence of cultural studies, which was rapidly developing at the beginning of the 20th century. In fact, he explains the failures of the contact between Mars and Earth precisely in a culturological way, by the difference in the history and cultures of both civilizations of the solar system.

These personality traits allow me to build an explanation of some features of the artistic reality of Bogdanov's novels and outline the understanding of the problems formulated above.

In my opinion, the conflict with Lenin was only a kind of trigger for Bogdanov to revise his own ideas and values. The problematic situation was something like this: Bogdanov felt that he himself did not understand what the socialism to which the Bolsheviks called for would be; the role of the leaders themselves was also unclear, whether they should command and direct, like Lenin, or educate and change consciousness, preparing the conditions for further steps. Bogdanov resolves this situation in two ways, both in rational discourse, having written a number of articles, and in artistic form. The latter provided additional opportunities: it was possible to live the looming future and treat it not only rationally, but also sensually, emotionally. responding to both thoughts and feelings.

It will not be a discovery for the reader that Bogdanov, as a scheme for constructing the artistic reality of the first novel, took the novel by HG Wells "The War of the Worlds", which was published several years before the "Red Star". This is indicated by the coincidence of the planets and the invasion of the Martians (the scenario proposed by Sterney). However, it is natural that Bogdanov radically altered all events. Before characterizing them,

I will note two types of events that are created by the artist in a literary work in a genre close to Red Star and Manny the Engineer.

The first type is events that line up in response to a completely conscious problem or task. For example, the events of the Martian Institute of Calculations are an artistic description of the socialist model of distribution, which Bogdanov first thought through within the framework of scientific discourse. Or another example. Based on the two worlds of Wells, Bogdanov creates a metaphor that can be read as two different planetary pictures of the world, but also (which already implies a certain culture) as a picture of the world (worldview) proposed by Marx and the Bolsheviks, opposed to the scheme of consciousness (worldview) of workers. In other words, Bogdanov deliberately created a metaphor that allows him to see with his own eyes the difference between the socialist and popular worldviews, as well as their clash and incompatibility.

The second type of events does not imply awareness of the problem facing the artist (it can only be felt as a vague dissatisfaction or desire), just as there is no clear understanding of the way to solve this problem. I came to understand this type of event by analyzing one case, namely the story that happened to Carl Jung in adolescence. Here is the story.

Once, on a beautiful summer day in 1887, Jung, admiring the universe, thought: "The world is beautiful and the church is beautiful, and God, who created all this, sits far, far away in the blue sky on a golden throne and ... Here my thoughts broke off and I felt suffocated. I was numb and remembered only one thing: Don't think now! Something terrible is coming.

(After three days and sleepless nights, heavy from internal struggle and experiences, Jung nevertheless allowed himself to finish the thought he had begun and such a seemingly harmless thought).

I mustered up all my courage, as if I had suddenly decided to immediately jump into the fire of hell, and gave the thought a chance to appear. I saw a cathedral in front of me, a blue sky. God sits on his golden throne, high above the world - and from under the throne a piece of feces falls onto the sparkling new roof of the cathedral, pierces it, everything collapses, the walls of the cathedral break into pieces.

That's it! I felt an unspeakable relief. Instead of the expected curse, grace descended on me, and with it an inexpressible bliss that I never knew ... I understood a lot that I did not understand before, I understood what my father never understood - the will of God ... Father accepted the Bible commandments as a guide, he believed in God as the Bible prescribed and as he was taught by his father. But he did not know the living God who stands, free and omnipotent, stands above the Bible and above the Church, who calls people to become just as free. God, for the sake of fulfilling His Will, can force the father to leave all his views and beliefs. Testing human courage, God forces us to abandon traditions, no matter how sacred they may be" [1, p. 46.50].

During this period, young Jung was preoccupied with two existential problems. First. Relationship with his father, a hereditary clergyman. According to Jung, the father did his duty dogmatically: having religious doubts, he did not try to resolve them, and in general was not free in relation to the Christian Faith and God. The second problem is building one's own relationship with God, clarifying one's attitude towards the Church. A little later than the episode under consideration, these problems were resolved radically by Jung: he breaks spiritually with both his father and the

Church. After the first communion, Jung comes to a decision, which he understands as follows.

"In this religion, I no longer found God. I knew that I would never be able to take part in this ceremony again. Church is a place I won't go to anymore. Everything is dead there, there is no life there. I felt pity for my father. I realized the tragedy of his profession and life. He fought death, an existence he could not accept. An abyss opened up between him and me, it was boundless, and I did not see the possibility of ever overcoming it" [16, p. 64].

Jung's work about God the revolutionary destroying the church, as well as the comprehension of the fantasy that visited him in general, can be considered a work close to artistic. As we can see, the first phase of Jung's work is a crystallization of an unconscious intersubjective situation (conflict with the father and the church). The second phase is a visual picture (fantasy) that opened up before Jung, and he does not understand its meaning, more precisely, he understands it as a catastrophe of his worldview, therefore he is extremely frightened. The third phase is a spontaneous, and in this respect also unconscious, composition of an explanation of what is happening (Jung learned, understood the real will of God). In short, this is an example of an event that was created by a person on a whim, unconsciously, although it was clearly determined.

So, Bogdanov in his novels creates several important events on a whim. In Red Star, this is, for example, Sterni's proposal for an invasion. Behind him, probably, is the problem of the incompatibility of the visions and minds of socialists and workers, which can even lead to disaster and the power of the Iron Heel. It's an impulsive murder by Leonid Sterni. "Your recovery and participation in our common work," Sterney said, "destroyed part of my argument ...

- Extermination ... in part, - I interrupted (the story comes from the name of Leonid. - V.R.), and, probably, all the longing and torment was reflected too clearly in my unconscious irony. Sterni turned pale and looked at me uneasily. There was silence.

And suddenly a cold ring of pain with an unprecedented, inexpressible force squeezed my heart. I leaned back in my chair to keep from screaming insanely. The fingers of my hand convulsively grasped something hard and cold. I felt a bladed weapon in my hand, and the spontaneously overwhelming pain became a frenzied despair. I jumped out of my chair, delivering a terrible blow to Sterney. One of the legs of the tripod hit him in the temple, and without a cry, without a groan, he leaned on his side, like an inert body. I dropped my weapon, it rang and rattled against the cars. It was all over" [1].

In this case, behind this narrative is, on the one hand, a deadly conflict between representatives of two different worlds, on the other hand, a way to switch the plot (according to S. Neretina, this is a classic trope). The spontaneous murder of Manny Maro's assistant is no less expressively described in "Engineer Manny". "And you would not think," Manny said, "to commit a crime against science and humanity for the sake of ... the budget?

The tinge of cold contempt in the spoken words was stronger than a slap in the face. Maro straightened up, his eyes lit up with a cynical gleam, business restraint replaced by impudent mockery.

- Crime?! What phrases! And you have nothing more to say? But we will act in the most legal manner. As for the earthquake... it will probably happen when we're gone!

Yes, you won't be here then!

Manny jumped up, and Maro did not have time to dodge his movement, fast as lightning. A bronze knife would not have been a weapon in the hands of an ordinary person, but engineer Aldo was a descendant of ancient knights. The carotid artery of the neck and throat were severed by the impact. Blood spurted out in a fountain, and Maro fell. Several convulsions, weak wheezing... Then silence" [3].

I think that Manny's suicide is an event created by Bogdanov on a whim. This is again, on the one hand, a trope, on the other, an event that allows Manny to leave (in fact, to break Bogdanov himself with the Bolsheviks, since he was disappointed in the methods of building socialism by them), to leave in order to create conditions for his son Netti, also a brilliant engineer (give place to another incarnation of Bogdanov, who switched to the construction of the science of "Tectology"). In prison, in a dialogue with a vampire (probably a metaphor for "social evil"), Manny says:

"You lie, Vampire, and you will not deceive me with naive sophisms. You, as always, call for treason. I know the path I've been on. Every step he took was a blow to the past. And you dream of making me the enemy of the future! I know my way. My struggle with the elements... only Natty is able to continue it worthy of me. My struggle with you, Feli Rao and your kind... Natty and his friends are the best, most faithful allies in her. I don't know if they are right in their belief in socialism, and I don't think so; but I am convinced that if they are wrong, they will be able to understand it faster than anyone else in time. Truth will win; but she will not win against what is full of strength and purity and nobility, but together with it!

Perhaps, on a whim, Bogdanov also describes the social element that buried the project of Manny and himself. In all these cases, it is important that the events of artistic reality are created on a whim, resolving poorly or generally unconscious problems of Bogdanov.

But no longer on a whim, at the very end of the novel, Bogdanov places a beautiful short story about the End of the World. "A huge high hall, flooded with light, thousands of people. But are they people? How free their poses are, how calm and clear their faces are, what strength their bodies breathe. And are they doomed?

What brought them here? What thought, what feeling united them in this general silence?... A new face enters and rises to a dais in the back of the hall. Obviously, he is the one who was expected: the eyes of all are directed to him. Is this Netti? Yes, Netti, but different, like a deity, in a halo of superhuman beauty. Amid solemn silence, he says:

"Brothers, on behalf of those who have undertaken the final task, I proclaim that we have done our part.

You know that the fate of our world was fully revealed many thousands of years ago. The weakened sun has long been unable to nourish with its rays the development of our life, our great common work. We kept the sun burning as long as we could. We blew up and brought down on the sun in turn all our planets, except for one, on which we are now. The energy of these collisions has given us an extra hundred thousand years. We spent most of them on researching ways to move to other solar worlds. This is where we failed miserably...

We have undoubted evidence that intelligent beings live in other star systems. On this we built our new plan...

The cold and emptiness of ethereal spaces, deadly for life, are powerless against dead matter. She can be trusted with images and symbols that express the meaning and content of our history, our work, all the struggles and victories of our world. Thrown with sufficient force, it will passively and obediently transfer to immeasurable distances our dear idea, our last will ...

From the strongest substance that nature could give us, we have prepared millions of gigantic shells: each is a faithful copy of our testament. They are made up of thin folded plates covered with artistic images and simple signs that can be easily deciphered by any rational being. These shells are laid on exactly defined places on our planet, and the direction and speed that it will receive from the initial push are calculated for each. The calculations are rigorous and tested hundreds of times: the goal will inevitably be reached.

And the initial push, brethren, will be in a few minutes. Inside our planet, we have collected a huge mass of that unstable matter, the atoms of which, exploding, are destroyed in an instant and give rise to the most powerful of all elemental forces. In a few minutes, our planet will cease to exist and its fragments will scatter into infinite space, carrying away our dead bodies and our living cause.

Let us joyfully meet, brothers, this moment in which the greatness of death will merge with the greatest act of creativity, this moment that will end our life in order to transfer its soul to our unknown brothers!"...

And when, after that, the vision was swallowed up by an oncoming hurricane of light and fire, the last thing that drowned in it was the same thought in Manny: "unknown brothers!" "[3].

Here, not on a whim, but quite consciously, Bogdanov admits that he firmly believes in the immortality of intelligent life. At the same time, he calmly relates to the death of an individual, believing that a person, as a subject (engineer) of himself, has the right to end his life by suicide if it no longer satisfies him or is impossible (whether the example of Paul and Laura Lafargue, whose suicide did Lenin approve?) As you know, Bogdanov died unexpectedly in 1928, putting on himself another experiment in blood transfusion. But was it by chance (as it is believed), did Bogdanov take risks only out of ignorance (he transfused himself with the blood of a person with Rhesus incompatible with Bogdanov's Rhesus)? Perhaps, anticipating the onset of the kingdom of the Iron Heel in the late 1920s, he deliberately decided to end his life? Moreover in his novels Bogdanov rehearsed such a departure on his heroes.

References

1. Bogdanov A.A. A red star. L.: 1929 <https://traumlibrary.ru/book/bogdanov-krasnaya-zvezda/bogdanov-krasnaya-zvezda.html>
2. Bogdanov A. Questions of socialism. Ed. writers in Moscow. 1918 see also <https://traumlibrary.ru/book/bogdanov-voprosy-socialisma/bogdanov-voprosy-socialisma.html#s008>
3. Bogdanov A. Engineer Manny. L.: ed. Krasnaya Gazeta, 1929 <https://coollib.com/b/387968-aleksandr-aleksandrovich-bogdanov-inzhener-menni/read>
4. Bogdanov A.A. Tectology. General organizational science. Moscow: Economics, 1989.

<https://traumlibrary.ru/book/bogdanov-tektologia-1/bogdanov-tektologia-1.html>

5. Vereshchagin I. On architectural Dostoevism and other things. *Modern Architecture*, 1928, N 4, pp. 130-131.
6. Vygotsky L.S. The historical meaning of the psychological crisis // *Sobr. op.* In 6 vol. M., 1982. T. 1. S. 292-436.
7. Golubkova L.G., Rozin V.M. *Philosophy of management*. 2nd ed. Moscow: Yurayt, 2018. 439 p.
8. "How they left us" (fragment of memories) Archival copy dated September 27, 2007 at the Wayback Machine // Osorgin M. A. *Times*. - Paris, 1955. - S. 180-185. Quoted from the publication: *Reader on the history of Russia: 1917-1940* / Ed. by prof. M. E. Glavatsky. - M.: JSC "Aspect Press", 1994. - S. 265-268.
9. Marx K. *Capital* / Marx K. and Engels F., Op. , 2nd ed., vol. 23, M.: GIPL, 1960. 907 p.
10. Unknown Bogdanov. In 3 books. Book. 1. M.: ITs "AIRO-XX", 1995. <http://ihst.ru/projects/sohist/document/bog95b2.htm>
11. *Novaya Gazeta*. N 105. 2021 <https://novyagazeta.ru/articles/2021/09/15/poison-kirova>
12. Plato. *State*. *Sobr. op.* in 4 volumes. T. 3. M.: Thought, 1994. S. 79-421
13. Plato. *Laws*. *Sobr. op.* in 4 volumes. T. 4. M.: Thought, 1994. S. 71-438.
14. Rozin V.M. *Design and programming. Design. Development. Implementation. Historical and social context*. M.: LENAND, 2018. 160 p.
15. Shchedrovitsky G.P. Sweet dictatorship of thought // *Questions of methodology*. N 1-2, 1994. C. 9-13.
16. Jung K. *Memories, dreams, reflections*. Publishing house JSC "AirLand Kyiv, 1994.. 416 p.