

Belkina L.A.

**CHRISTIAN'S VIEWS
AUTHORS OF THE XX CENTURY ON THE PROBLEM OF HUMANITY**

The author analyzes the philosophical views of Christian authors of the twentieth century (D. Bonhoeffer, A. Schweitzer, B.P. Vysheslavtsev) on the problem of humanity in connection with the change in their contemporary socio-cultural situation. Their concepts, according to the author, can be presented as follows - moral responsibility and the need to live for others, to sympathize with them (D. Bonhoeffer); reverence for life and the will to live (A. Schweitzer); the foundation of humanity in the intimate (heart) closeness of man and God (B.P. Vysheslavtsev).

The author analyzes the philosophical views of Christian writers of the twentieth century (D. Bonhoeffer, A. Schweitzer, BP Vysheslavtseva) to the problem of humanity in connection with the change of contemporary socio-cultural situation. Their concepts, the author believes, can be represented as follows –the moral responsibility and the need to live for others, to sympathize with them (D. Bonhoeffer), reverence for life and will to live (A. Schweitzer); foundation of humanity in an intimate (cardiac) proximity of man and God (BP Vysheslavtsev).

Key words: humanity, Christianity, culture, Bonhoeffer, Schweitzer, Vysheslavtsev, moral responsibility, God, love, mercy.

Keywords: humanity, Christianity, culture, Bonhoeffer, Schweitzer, Vysheslavtsev, moral responsibility, God, love, mercy.

Christian humanistic values did not remain unchanged at the level of reflection of the philosophers of the modern era. Socio-cultural collisions of the twentieth century, perhaps the most inhuman in the entire history of European civilization, led to a change in the understanding of Christianity at its worldview and ideological levels. Using the example of several personalities, we will show the main trends in the change in the Christian worldview in the refraction of the problem of humanity, which is so urgent for the past twentieth century. In this respect, in our opinion, one of the indicative figures is the figure of the German Lutheran thinker of the first half of the twentieth century, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the largest Christian author of modern times. In his views, the problems of humanity and the practice of mercy, disinterested compassion generally become central precisely in the context of the actual denial of the classical traditional Christian picture of the world, which prevailed for almost two thousand years in Western culture. Moreover, not so much in questions of a cosmogonic, cosmological order (these processes began long before D. Bonhoeffer), as in the most important thing - in the question of man's relation to God. D. Bonhoeffer develops a rather specific version of "irreligious Christianity".

At the heart of his position lies the rejection of the traditional Christian opposition of the higher and otherworldly, transcendental, divine worlds of the earthly, sinful, human. The very figure of Christ as a realized God-manhood is a clear and the best evidence of the complete unity of these two worlds. D. Bonhoeffer sees the general meaning and purpose of Christianity not at all in the fact that a person strives all his life for some kind of "afterlife" "eternal" life, living only with its anticipation, fruitless hope and illusory hope for some kind of "heavenly kingdom". The historical purpose of Christianity is precisely to turn man into earthly existence, to arrange this "here" and "now" being on the principles of moral responsibility for others. Shifting such social and spiritual responsibility for earthly affairs onto God,

D. Bonhoeffer estimates his time quite highly, believing that humanity itself and man have come of age. The most important sign of such maturation is that for the modern common man, the question of salvation of his soul, of gaining transcendental immortality is no longer so relevant and significant for individual experience. One can probably argue with this

conclusion of D. Bonhoeffer, but it reflects the general tendency of non-classical culture and the crisis of the system of traditional social regulations. Modern culture, based on the rapid development of science, no longer needs a traditional God, whom he calls a "working hypothesis" used by people at earlier (immature) stages of their development to explain the world and their own life. Denying in this way practically all the basic dogmatic content of Christianity, its main sacraments, D. Bonhoeffer nevertheless does not deny Christianity in general and speaks of the need for Christianity "without God" or "without religion". The coming-of-age process of the world and society cannot be interpreted as anti-Christian. On the contrary, the writer stresses, for the first time he opens up the possibility for man to see the "true" God of the Bible. Almost two thousand years of experience in the historical development of the Christian Church, he characterizes as "a preliminary stage of general lack of religion" [1, p. 111]. emphasizes the writer, for the first time he opens up the possibility for man to see the "true" God of the Bible. Almost two thousand years of experience in the historical development of the Christian Church, he characterizes as "a preliminary stage of general lack of religion" [1, p. 111]. emphasizes the writer, for the first time he opens up the possibility for man to see the "true" God of the Bible. Almost two thousand years of experience in the historical development of the Christian Church, he characterizes as "a preliminary stage of general lack of religion" [1, p. 111].

The religiosity of traditional society is a kind of "outer" shell of being and everyday life of a person. It is practically not given as a purely personal experience, the spiritualization of the mundane is replaced by the dominance of the norms and rules prescribed by tradition. Comprehension of the meaning turns into learning and repetition. Modernity changes everything. This is how D. Bonhoeffer writes about it in one of his letters: "The time when people could tell everything in words (be it theological reasoning or pious speeches) is long gone; the same applies to the times of interest in the inner world of man and in conscience, and this means also in the time of religion in general. We are approaching a completely irreligious period; people may already just be irreligious. Those who honestly call themselves "religious" do not practice religion in any way. Our common Christian proclamation and theology, dating back 1900 years, rely on the "a priori religiosity" of people. ... If ... it turns out that this "a priori" does not exist at all, that it was a temporary historically conditioned form of human self-expression, if, thus, people really become radically irreligious ... - what will this mean for "Christianity"? " [1, p. 111]. D. Bonhoeffer asks what now, in the conditions of modern civilization, can and should be Christianity for a person. Is it possible at all to say that today people can be held together by something transcendental? Society has become as secularized as possible. And this is a fact that is foolish to deny. if, in this way, people do become radically irreligious ... - what will this mean for 'Christianity'? " [1, p. 111]. D. Bonhoeffer asks what now, in the conditions of modern civilization, can and should be Christianity for a person. Is it possible at all to say that today people can be held together by something transcendental? Society has become as secularized as possible. And this is a fact that is foolish to deny. if, in this way, people do become radically irreligious ... - what will this mean for 'Christianity'? " [1, p. 111]. D. Bonhoeffer asks what now, in the conditions of modern civilization, can and should be Christianity for a person. Is it possible at all to say that today people can be held together by something transcendental? Society has become as secularized as possible. And this is a fact that is foolish to deny.

But this, according to D. Bonhoeffer, does not mean a complete denial of Christianity and Christ himself. The main question he asks is, how can there be an irreligious Christianity? How can Christ be the "Lord of the world" [1, p.111]? In his opinion, the truly biblical God is not at all some kind of absolute substance, beyond all human experience on Earth. Life in Christ, but without a religious God, means complete autonomy of the individual and his responsibility. In other words, the once sacralized religious life, worship, etc. must be replaced by life for others. What does it mean?

Genuine acceptance of Jesus into one's life should be expressed in such an attitude of a person to a person in which everyone strives to devote his life to the Other, i.e. D. Bonhoeffer's problem of humanity actually follows directly from the secular (and partly even

pantheistically) interpreted Christology and theology. The most important attribute of God is, as the writer emphasizes, not omnipotence and omniscience, not transcendence or eternity, but presence in the world itself and compassion. Consequently, a person who gives up his existence without any pride or complacency to other people, who considers help, compassion, benevolence and absolute selflessness to be the meaning of his earthly path, and acts as a person in the image and likeness of God. Jesus himself gave the model for such unselfish service. The New Testament in this sense is a description of genuine service to others, to the whole world. Caring for a neighbor, sick, needy, weak, offended or humiliated is the realization of a real religious non-traditional consciousness and feeling. There is no need to wait for some mythical salvation, but to do "good deeds" and thereby draw closer to God. Proceeding from this, it is clear how the worldly earthly life of a person, his daily current experience, can reveal the presence of God in himself.

D. Bonhoeffer strongly opposes the dual interpretation of the two worlds (divine and human) as completely ontologically insurmountable and non-intersecting spheres. Therefore, life in Christ, real Christian behavior, is a worthy human life based on deep and sincere humanity. "Irreligious" Christianity does not require a person to have some completely specific belief in the otherworldly God, does not require any special inner experience, but only presupposes the presence of a certain type of human relationship. To be religious is to be Human. A man with compassion for the earthly path of Christ himself.

D. Bonhoeffer has a negative attitude to the philosophical and metaphysical constructions of God that were born in the history of European culture. Such constructions, appealing to transcendence, may have been useful for solving some theoretical and cognitive problems (as, for example, in I. Kant). However, the real meaning of divine transcendence D. Bonhoeffer sees not at all in the fact that man is "outside of God", that God is "a man in himself", but in the fact that God himself is "man for another", while external piety is very often turns out to be nothing more than hypocrisy, tinsel, self-deception or deception of others. A Christian should not be concerned with personal salvation, his task is to do good and just among people.

D. Bonhoeffer considers the activity of the church from the same point of view. The tragic mistake of the latter in traditional society was that she almost completely ignored the real earthly life of a person and directed her efforts and the efforts of the parishioners to something transcendent. The mission of the church is selfless service and helping people, the whole society. At the same time, the church should not turn into a semblance of another political party with a specific program of activity.

The Church should become an example of the realization of the ideals and principles of Christian life, i.e. disinterested service to people, accomplishment of good and justice. The position of the church must be socially active. D. Bonhoeffer is one of the few authors of modern times who openly declared the incompatibility of traditional Christianity with the realities of modern social reality and worldviews based on scientific knowledge. This kind of "secularization" of Christianity, perhaps, became a form of its salvation in the conditions of radical socio-cultural perturbations of the twentieth century. If in traditional Western culture the field of morality, morality, interpersonal relations was completely subordinated to the church and religious ideology, now, on the contrary, the ethical dimension of social relations, the problem of humanity as its key knot became a "refuge" of religious values. However, let us not forget about the fundamental circumstance that it was thanks to Christianity in the bosom of Western civilization that the semantic-symbolic forms of the object-objectifying consolidation of the personal "way" of cultural existence were formed. The position of another major Christian-oriented thinker of modern times, Albert Schweitzer, seems to be somewhat different in this matter. His philosophical views, it should be noted, have become quite popular in our time, especially in connection with the growing global problems, threats to the very existence of mankind. In particular, the complex of environmental issues often requires a radical revision of the established traditional principles of man's relationship to nature and the world around him. The theme of humanity in the work of A. Schweitzer is concentrated around his "ethics of reverence for life." Speaking about the general ideological context of the

“ethics of reverence for life”, it is necessary to note such directions of non-classical European philosophy of the late 19th - early 20th centuries as philosophy of life and personalism. The fact is that the initial thesis of A. Schweitzer's reasoning about the essence of morality, goodness, humanity is connected precisely with the recognition of the fundamental nature of the phenomenon of the so-called “will to live”. The will to live has a truly ontological meaning. Thanks to her, everything that is in the world, from microscopic organisms, insects, plants and ending with man himself, in general is and constantly dwells in a peculiar state of endless self-affirmation. In this inescapable striving to be, any will to live inevitably collides with another will of the same kind. However, at the level of human existence, endowed with thinking and freedom, the will to live acquires its deeper meaning - life affirmation through “life denial”. And this is the foundation of human morality, the essence of good as such. What does it mean? When considering the position of A. Schweitzer, it becomes quite obvious its, at times, an amazing affinity with the oriental worldview principles. Especially with Hindu and Taoist traditions. In general, the tendency to increase the “presence” of eastern meanings and motives in Western culture and thinking is one of the most significant for the twentieth century. This concerns not only A. Schweitzer. But his “ethic of reverence for life” while maintaining a general connection with Christian morality, nevertheless, very vividly testifies to the crossroads of eastern and western ideas. This is directly related to clarifying what reverence for life is, how it relates to the principle of the will and its life affirmation.

A. Schweitzer suggests considering the conscious, thinking attitude of a person to the world, nature, and other people as an experience of contemplative “getting in” and “experiencing”: “I do not know the essence of phenomena, but I comprehend them by analogy with the will to live inherent in me. Thus, knowledge of the world becomes my experience of the world. Cognition that has become the experience of the world. Cognition, which has become an experience, does not transform me in relation to the world into a purely cognizing subject, but arouses in me a feeling of inner connection with it. It fills me with a sense of reverence for the mysterious will to live that manifests itself in everything. It makes me think and wonder and leads me to heights of reverence for life. ...

It puts me internally in relation to the world and forces my will to experience everything that surrounds it, as the will to live ”[2, p.217]. In fact, these words could express the position of the Taoist or Hindu world attitude. A. Schweitzer criticizes classical philosophical rationalism, the brightest example of which, in his opinion, is the metaphysics of Rene Descartes and his famous position “cogito ergo sum”. This Cartesian “I” is extremely far from ethics and is devoid of any, as A. Schweitzer emphasizes, humanistic content. Genuine life-affirmation is possible only on the path of humility before everything, i.e. admiration for the slightest manifestation of life in absolutely any form. Life in general then makes sense when it is an actual acceptance of the other, a renunciation of all monocentrism and egoism. And since a person is endowed with the power of thought, his life affirmation is, first of all, an awareness of responsibility before life. Ethics is based on this responsibility. “The only possible, meaningful, constantly, vividly and concretely polemicizing with reality principle of ethics says: self-denial for the sake of life based on reverence for life” [2, p.216]. Humanity, therefore, consists in the fact that a person, who is conscious of his will to live and who exists precisely as a willing self-assertion, is obliged in this becoming to absolutely desire another, the same will to live, i.e. to wish the other to be like the same equal will. This desire is the highest and universal criterion for good. The criterion of goodness as such. His “materialization” is a reverent attitude towards life. “Ethics is, therefore, that I feel compelled to show equal reverence for life, both for my will to live and for any other. This is the basic principle of morality. Good is what serves to preserve and develop life, evil is what destroys life or hinders it ”[2, p.218]. Such ethics endows life itself with the highest absolute value. Regardless of the forms and methods of its manifestation. The practical embodiment of such humanity, therefore, is nothing more than a real help to any life, ridding it of unnecessary suffering, not causing it the slightest harm. Life is not just the highest value in itself, it is sacred. And therefore, a person who multiplies the very possibility of being for everything realizes his own kind of universal responsibility for life. Moreover, A. Schweitzer emphasizes,

that the definition of ethics and humanity as reverence for life is more universal and inclusive, for example, compassion. The principle of compassion is narrower; morality cannot be based on it alone. The question that for classical metaphysics, for R. Descartes, was unambiguously solved - the question of the nature of my thinking, of why exactly I am aware of this world, life itself and treat everything from the point of view of my "I", for A. Schweitzer remains open. The nature of the awareness of will precisely through thinking in me is a mystery. And it should also encourage us to revere life. The ethics of reverence for life is absolute, i.e. uncompromising character. There can be no half-hearted acceptance of another will, just as there cannot be half-acceptance of one's own will. The will to live cannot be realized

In social terms, the principles of reverence for life are manifested in the fact that a person must independently realize his own responsibility to society and other people. If a person is given something more than others, for example, health, property, success, talent, etc., then he is kind to this, i.e. A morally aware person should not take it for granted; he should share these benefits for the sake of another life. He must give his talent, his strength, his energy, his skills to the world, to people. But this must certainly be an exclusively sovereign matter. Nobody can judge another! For every will to live has a value in itself. Humane moral behavior obliges a person to try in every possible way to use his "human capital", to look for the slightest opportunity to help someone. A universal and absolute ethic of reverence for life should not be replaced by a relative ethic of ultimate purposefulness. For example, if something is beneficial to an individual team, can serve its integral development, then this is not necessarily ethical in relation to its individual members or society. generally.

Only the highest ultimate expediency can "justify" this or that action. Such substitutions occur very often and seem morally justified, since they appeal not to individual egoistic goals, but to the interests of the whole. However, the ethical, the humane cannot be reduced and identified with the unselfish. "The sphere of action of ethics extends as far as the sphere of action of humanity, which means that ethics takes into account the interests of the life and happiness of the individual. Where humanity ends, pseudoethics begins All previous ethics have misled us, hiding from us our guilt in cases where we acted for the purpose of self-affirmation or on the basis of transpersonal responsibility. ...

True knowledge consists in comprehending the secret that everything around us is the will to live "[2, p.227]. A. Schweitzer sees the essence of culture itself precisely in such humanity, in the sphere of morality (as such). In his opinion, culture as a special human being can in no way be deduced from the evolution of nature. For only man is given to know and be aware of his will to live, to treat everything as the same will. And - to revere her. Only in man, only through our experience, the world opens to itself as the will to live. And this discovery is culture. Culture is fundamentally humane. "Culture is nothing more than the most complete development of the will to live, which is composed of all types of progress of the will to live available to man and mankind, which is in awe of life in all its manifestations in the sphere of human activity and which seeks to improve the spirituality of reverence for life "[2, p.230]. Culture only then becomes a true self-affirmation of a person when it is a merciful human activity reverent for life.

The problem of humanity in such its ethical and socio-anthropological dimensions also became the subject of research in Russian philosophical thought. Almost all the major Russian thinkers of the Christian-oriented direction (I. Ilyin, N. Berdyaev, S. Frank, N. Lossky, E. Trubetskoy, etc.) paid considerable attention to this subject, accumulating in this semantic and conceptual direction their search efforts in all key issues of philosophy, history, law. We will dwell in more detail on the ideas of the famous Russian author of the era of the "Silver Age" and then of the Russian emigration B.P. ...

It should be noted that B.P. Vysheslavitsev, being in the tendency of practical orientation of knowledge characteristic of all Russian philosophy and social thought, emphasizes that the value of philosophizing, theoretical knowledge is generally determined not by the degree and sophistication of abstract constructions, but precisely by their ability to bring real benefits in solving urgent problems of society. "Philosophy should now be not an exposition of theoretical problems that are little accessible to people, but a teacher of life" [3,

p. 56]. In his major works (Ethics of Transformed Eros, Philosophical Poverty of Marxism, Eternal in Russian Philosophy, etc.), he tries to discover the deepest fundamental foundation of human existence, linking it with spiritual reality. In his anthropology, of course, there are traces of the influence of psychoanalysis S. Freud and K. Jung (the concept of sublimation in Freud and the archetype of the self in Jung), theosophy, as well as the discussion that unfolded in the late 19th century in academic and confessional circles about the influence of Indian spiritual culture (especially Hinduism) on the development of Christianity. B.P. Vysheslavtsev builds a hierarchy of the ontological structure of the personality, distinguishing seven levels in it, starting with the lowest sensory (animal) and ending with the highest "spirit" that forms the self of "I". The movement from the lowest to the highest level also reflects the formation of the culture itself, and is interpreted by B.P. Vysheslavtsev as sublimation. In contrast to the classical psychoanalytic concept of sublimation (in Z. Freud), the Russian thinker emphasizes precisely the moral value dimension of ontological spiritualization. as well as the discussion that unfolded at the end of the 19th century in academic and confessional circles about the influence of Indian spiritual culture (especially Hinduism) on the development of Christianity. B.P. Vysheslavtsev builds a hierarchy of the ontological structure of personality, distinguishing seven levels in it, starting with the lowest sensory (animal) and ending with the highest "spirit" that forms the self of "I". The movement from the lowest to the highest level also reflects the formation of the culture itself, and is interpreted by B.P. Vysheslavtsev as sublimation. In contrast to the classical psychoanalytic concept of sublimation (in Z. Freud), the Russian thinker emphasizes precisely the moral value dimension of ontological spiritualization. as well as the discussion that unfolded at the end of the 19th century in academic and confessional circles about the influence of Indian spiritual culture (especially Hinduism) on the development of Christianity. B.P. Vysheslavtsev builds a hierarchy of the ontological structure of the personality, distinguishing seven levels in it, starting with the lowest sensory (animal) and ending with the highest "spirit" that forms the self of "I". The movement from the lowest to the highest level also reflects the formation of the culture itself, and is interpreted by B.P. Vysheslavtsev as sublimation. In contrast to the classical psychoanalytic concept of sublimation (in Z. Freud), the Russian thinker emphasizes precisely the moral value dimension of ontological spiritualization. Vysheslavtsev builds a hierarchy of the ontological structure of the personality, distinguishing seven levels in it, starting with the lowest sensory (animal) and ending with the highest "spirit" that forms the self of "I". The movement from the lowest to the highest level also reflects the formation of the culture itself, and is interpreted by B.P. Vysheslavtsev as sublimation. In contrast to the classical psychoanalytic concept of sublimation (in Z. Freud), the Russian thinker emphasizes precisely the moral value dimension of ontological spiritualization. Vysheslavtsev builds a hierarchy of the ontological structure of the personality, distinguishing seven levels in it, starting with the lowest sensory (animal) and ending with the highest "spirit" that forms the self of "I". The movement from the lowest to the highest level also reflects the formation of the culture itself, and is interpreted by B.P. Vysheslavtsev as sublimation. In contrast to the classical psychoanalytic concept of sublimation (in Z. Freud), the Russian thinker emphasizes precisely the moral value dimension of ontological spiritualization.

Moreover, the levels of personal structure, which were highlighted by Z. Freud or K. Jung, are in this case only moments of a more general one. His idea of humanity in culture is also connected with this. The ontological self of man, his "spirit" B.P. Vysheslavtsev calls "heart". The heart forms the deepest mystery of man, his highest mystical certainty, which cannot be cognized by a reflexive or sensory way. This mystery is higher than consciousness, soul, or even more emotional experience. It is the mysticism of the heart, in his opinion, as an expression of the fundamental existential selfhood of the individual, which underlies true humanity and cultural experience itself. Culture is fundamentally religious. Since the heart is not just an awareness of my own separation from the world, my, so to speak, "egg", not just the center of my will, but it is a part of God himself in me. In this case, B. P. Vysheslavtsev resorts to using the Hindu concept of Atman to emphasize the specifics of the human self. In other words, man is a person by virtue of the divine in him. And because of this, he

“reverently” refers to another person as the same “presence” of God. A humane relationship between people is their mystical connection through God and in God. “A person who really wants to look into his own depth must certainly become a religious person, he must experience a religious feeling, a feeling of reverence, mystical awe in relation to himself, in relation to the bottomlessness of my heart, he must see in himself” the whole a world full of infinity ... For religion is at the same time the recognition of the Divinity of God and the Divinity of man himself. Religion is the finding of God in himself and himself in God,

Genuine humanity is essentially Christian love for one's neighbor, based on the "intimate" (B. Vysheslavtsev) closeness of man and God. The depth of such closeness is mystical and cannot be somehow objectified. B.P. Vysheslavtsev emphasizes that the foundations of good in society, morality are a derivative of the relationship between two individuals, i.e. two hearts. Moreover, this attitude is significantly different from compassion. The philosopher notes that the concept of compassion is just characteristic of the Hindu spiritual tradition, including Buddhism.

It is quite different in Christianity. We have already given a description of the oriental ideas of humanity in B.P. Vysheslavtseva. Let us only repeat that compassion, in his opinion, closes another existential secret from a person, makes the mystical “I” of the Other inaccessible. The East does not know this highest level of man's ontological ascent (in the hierarchy of B.P. Vysheslavtsev). The seventh highest level not only separates the individual from the collective experience, but posits him in divine connection with all - which, in essence, determines the nature of humanity in culture.

Sublimation, as B.P. Vysheslavtsev, in fact, means a deep connection of an individual person living with emotions, private thoughts and passions, with the eternal and infinite, with the absolute. Sublimation also means such a unity of people at a certain highest level that “removes” the particular contradictions of individual “souls” in a general mystical fusion. “Potentially all souls live in me and act, at least to an infinitely small degree ... In this universal permeability of souls, in their conciliarity (every soul is conciliar, for it is a collection of images and reflections of former and future souls and persons) there is a kind of eternity and eternity of souls ... ”[4, p.819].

B.P. Vysheslavtsev denies the possibility of genuine secular humanity. Concepts such as collective morality, social solidarity, class consciousness (and let's not forget that he, as a representative of the Russian emigration, witnessed the Bolshevik dictatorship in Russia, which asserted class morality and atheistic humanity as the highest and absolute) are only false ephemeral constructions, behind which there is actually evil and heartlessness. The secular version of humanity is a false veil of private interests, which almost always in history has acted as a beautiful slogan for the accomplishment of not at all good deeds. “The greatest crimes were committed for the sake of such humanity, were justified by declamations of love for humanity, rhetoric in the spirit of Rousseau and Robespierre. First of all, we can say that these people do not have a heart, but, consequently, they have lost mystical connection with their neighbors and with God, they have lost, of course, their real “I”, have forgotten about it, do not suspect about its existence”[4, p. 766]. Without it, “there is no true ethics” [4, p. 767].

As we have already emphasized, the basic intuitions of B.P. Vysheslavtseva are in the general worldview channel of modern times, which characterizes the development of philosophy, Christianity in the conditions of the emergence of an industrial civilization, as well as the devaluation of traditional cultural regulators and constituents of experience.

Summing up, it should be noted that the general intellectual symptoms of the 20th century do not remove the problem of humanity from the agenda at all. Changes in Christianity itself, its traditional image and the corresponding picture of reality led to the postulation of the immutable significance of precisely the ethical humanistic dimension of religious consciousness. A departure from the senses of the transcendent as an ontological self-assertion of man was clearly indicated. The sphere of communication and activity is regarded as the most important and intrinsic dimension of the earthly existence of man. The personality becomes at the center of this Christian quest.

LITERATURE

1. Bonhoeffer D. *Resistance and humility* // *Questions of philosophy*. 1989. No. 11. P. 111.
2. Schweitzer A. *Reverence for life*. M.: Progress, 1992. S. 217.
3. Quoted. Quoted from: B.P. Vysheslavitsev and his "philosophy of the heart" // *Problems of Philosophy*. 1990. No. 4. P. 56.
4. Vysheslavitsev B.P. *Eternal in Russian philosophy* // Vysheslavitsev B.P. *Industrial culture crisis. Selected Works*. M.: Astrel, 2006. S. 765.