



Scientific article
IRSTI 02.91.09



<https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-154-1-8-18>

HOW THE WORLD IS PUT TOGETHER

^aVladislav SOFRONOV  

^a*Moscow Institute of Psychoanalysis, Moscow, Russian Federation*

 deepredminded@gmail.com

Abstract. This text proposes a "bright ontology" and a "materialist monadology" as alternatives to dualistic and nihilistic ("dark") worldviews. Arguing against teleology and linear progressivism, it posits reality as a continuous whole where everything is interconnected. The universe unfolds through a "dialectical play" of necessity and chance, where random sorting, accumulation, and "crystallization" of variants drive evolution - from pre-life to life, and from life to the rational being.

The rational being, particularly the human hand as a "universal organ," is analyzed as a key "fold" or "monad" within this continuum. It is both a product and an active agent of universal transformation, capable of either "dark" or "bright" crystallization. "Dark crystallization" results from dualism, alienation, and managerial exploitation, leading to closed, oppressive social forms (e.g., bourgeois society, fascism). In contrast, "bright crystallization" stems from a non-anthropocentric, Spinozist understanding of reason as harmonious co-action with the natural whole, fostering flexible, open-ended social and subjective forms. Drawing on Ilyenkov, Marx, Spinoza, Freud, and Benjamin, the text critiques epistemological roots of dualism, explores the paradoxical nature of reflexive consciousness, and advocates for a political and ethical project. This project involves a radical reassembly of both society and subjectivity towards a future grounded in universal kinship, consensus, and the revolutionary potential ("tiger's leap") inherent in the historical process.

Keywords: Bright Ontology / Dark Ontology; Materialist Monadology; Crystallization (Dark / Bright); Dialectical Logic; Rational Being / Universal Transformation.

For citation:

Sofronov, V. (2026). How the world is put together. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 154(1), 8-18. <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-154-1-8-18>

ӘЛЕМ ҚАЛАЙ БІРІКТІРІЛГЕН

^аВладислав СОФРОНОВ

^аМәскеу психология институты, Мәскеу, Ресей Федерациясы

КАК СЛОЖЕН МИР

^аВладислав СОФРОНОВ

^аМосковский институт психологии, Москва, Российская Федерация

Аңдатпа. Бұл мәтін дуалистік және нигилистік («қараңғы») дүниетанымдарға балама ретінде «жарқын онтология» мен «материалистік монадологияны» ұсынады. Телеология мен сызықтық прогрессивизмге қарсы пікір айта отырып, ол шындықты бәрі бір-бірімен байланысты үздіксіз тұтастық ретінде көрсетеді. Ғалам қажеттілік пен кездейсоқтықтың «диалектикалық ойыны» арқылы дамиды, мұнда нұсқалардың кездейсоқ сұрыпталуы, жинақталуы және «кристалдануы» эволюцияны – өмірге дейінгі кезеңнен өмірге және өмірден рационалды болмысқа жетелейді.

Рационалды болмыс, әсіресе адамның қолы «әмбебап орган» ретінде осы континуум ішіндегі негізгі «қатпар» немесе «монада» ретінде талданады. Бұл «қараңғы» немесе «жарқын» кристалдануға қабілетті әмбебап трансформацияның өнімі де, белсенді агенті де. «Қараңғы кристалдану» дуализмнен, иеліктен шығарудан және басқарушылық қанаудан туындайды, нәтижесінде тұйық, қысымшыл әлеуметтік формалар пайда болады (мысалы, буржуазиялық қоғам, фашизм). Керісінше, «жарқын кристалдану» антропоцентрилік емес, спинозистік ақыл-ойды икемді, ашық әлеуметтік және субъективті формаларды дамыта отырып, табиғи тұтастықпен үйлесімді ынтымақтастық ретінде түсінуден туындайды. Ильенков, Маркс, Спиноза, Фрейд және Бенджаминге сүйене отырып, мәтін дуализмнің гносеологиялық тамырларын сынайды, рефлексивті сананың парадоксалды табиғатын зерттейді және саяси және этикалық жобаны жақтайды. Бұл жоба қоғамды да, субъективтілікті де тарихи процеске тән жалпыға ортақ туыстық, консенсус және революциялық әлеуетке («жолбарыс секірісі») негізделген болашаққа түбегейлі қайта құруды көздейді.

Аннотация. В данном тексте предлагаются «светлая онтология» и «материалистическая монадология» в качестве альтернативы дуалистическим и нигилистическим («темным») мировоззрениям. Оспаривая телеологию и линейный прогрессизм, статья постулирует реальность как непрерывное целое, в котором все взаимосвязано. Вселенная разворачивается через «диалектическую игру» необходимости и случайности, где эволюцию – от не-жизни к жизни и от жизни к разумному существу – движет случайный отбор, накопление и «кристаллизация» вариантов.

Разумное существо или части его тела, например, рука человека как «всеобщий орган», анализируется как ключевая «складка» или «монада» в этом континууме. Оно является одновременно продуктом и активным агентом всеобщего преобразования, способным как к «темной», так и к «светлой» кристаллизации. «Темная кристаллизация» проистекает из дуализма, отчуждения и управленческой эксплуатации, порождая замкнутые, репрессивные общественные формы (например, буржуазное общество, фашизм). В противоположность этому, «светлая кристаллизация» коренится в неантропоцентрическом, спинозистском понимании разума как гармонического содействия с природным целым, способствуя формированию гибких, открытых социальных и субъективных форм. Опираясь на идеи Ильенкова, Маркса, Спинозы, Фрейда и Бенямина, текст критикует эпистемологические корни дуализма, исследует парадоксальную природу рефлексивного сознания и отстаивает политико-этический проект. Этот проект предполагает радикальную пересборку как общества, так и субъективности для движения к будущему, основанному на всеобщем родстве, консенсусе и имманентном историческому процессу революционному потенциале («тигрином прыжке»).

Түйін сөздер: жарқын онтология / қараңғы онтология; материалистік монадология; кристалдану (қараңғы; жарқын); диалектикалық логика; рационалды болмыс / әмбебап трансформация.

Ключевые слова: светлая онтология / темная онтология; материалистическая монадология; кристаллизация (темная / светлая); диалектическая логика; разумное существо / всеобщее преобразование.

Introduction

Contemporary thought finds itself at a crossroads defined by two powerful, yet seemingly exhausted, vectors. On one hand, the teleological promise of linear historical progress – be it liberal, socialist, or techno-utopian – lies in ruins, its narrative unable to account for the catastrophes of the 20th century or the looming ecological and social fragmentation of the 21st. On the other hand, we witness a profound resurgence of various ‘dark ontologies’: philosophical, aesthetic, and political frameworks that embrace cosmic indifference, radical alienation, and a fundamental hostility at the heart of being. This second vector, from Lovecraftian horror to accelerationist nihilism, offers not progress but a perverse solace in the inevitability of decline, often paired with a managerial ethos of exploitation within a meaningless universe (Lovecraft, 1928/2016). The choice appears to be between a discredited optimism and a seductive, masochistic despair.

This article proposes a way out of this false dichotomy by developing the foundations of a ‘bright ontology’ and its corresponding social project, a ‘materialist monadology.’ Our thesis is that the impasse is not ontological but epistemological, rooted in a dualistic model of consciousness that erects the Great Kantian Wall between the subject and the world. To dismantle this wall, we must return to a radically different understanding of reason and its place within nature, one best articulated in the Soviet Marxist tradition by Evald Ilyenkov (1974/2010). For Ilyenkov, the essence of a rational being is its capacity for ‘universal transformation’ – not a domineering imposition of will, but an activity that aligns with and unfolds the potentials of the material whole.

We will argue that this definition provides the key for reconceptualizing reality not as a collection of discrete entities or a battlefield between subject and object, but as a continuum – a single substance manifesting in infinite ‘folds.’ From this perspective, the entire history of the universe, from the random molecular permutations of pre-life to the emergence of the human hand, can be seen as a process of sorting and crystallization of variants. The hand itself is a monad not in Leibniz’s idealist sense (1714/1982), but in a materialist one: a unique, concentrated point of the universal continuum, inherently connected to all other points and capable of sensing them.

This framework allows us to reinterpret phenomena across scales through a unified lens. The dialectic of ‘dark’ and ‘bright’ crystallization becomes our central analytic tool. We trace its logic in the constitution of consciousness itself, analyzing the reflexive fold that simultaneously connects us to the world and generates the illusion of separation, a paradox explored through Freud (1920/2006) and Scheler (1921/2010).

The dynamics of socio-economic history, following Ilyenkov and Marx (1888/1955) to show how value-forms ‘crystallize’ into capital, and, with Benjamin, how modern experience congeals into the ‘monad’ of bourgeois society – a prime example of ‘dark’ social crystallization (1938/2015).

The contemporary political-ethical struggle, where the 'dark' tendency manifests as fragmentation, chauvinism, and the eudaimonistic dilemma of the isolated self (Lovecraft, 1928/2016), while the 'bright' possibility points towards a future of flexible, non-antagonistic subjectivity grounded in universal kinship (Fedorov, 1906/2000).

By synthesizing Ilyenkov's dialectical logic with Benjamin's philosophy of history, Spinoza's monism, and critical insights from psychoanalysis and cosmology, this article aims to sketch a philosophical alternative. It is an ontology that rejects both teleological providence and nihilistic accident, replacing them with a conception of history as a risky, open-ended process of 'crystallization.' Our task, therefore, is twofold: to provide a theoretical foundation for this 'bright ontology,' and to argue that its realization depends on a parallel and conscious political project – the 'reassembly' of both society and the human subject in the image of a universal, connected whole. The goal is not to predict the future, but to identify and strengthen the 'seeds of the future in the past' that make the 'tiger's leap' under the free sky of history a genuine, if difficult, possibility.

Materials and Methods

This study employs an interdisciplinary philosophical framework, synthesizing concepts from diverse intellectual traditions through critical textual analysis and dialectical synthesis.

Source materials encompass core philosophical texts by Evald Ilyenkov, alongside works from Western philosophy (Leibniz, 1714/1982; Spinoza, 1677/2005; Kant, 1781/2007), critical theory and Marxism (Benjamin, 1940/2021; Marx, 1888/1955), psychoanalysis (Freud, 1920/2006), Russian Cosmism (Fedorov, 1906/2000), and literary poetics (Tyutchev, 1865/1984; Lovecraft, 1928/2016; Tagore, 1910/2010). These sources provide foundational concepts and conceptual metaphors.

The methodological framework is grounded in the dialectical method, examining phenomena as unities of opposites. It utilizes conceptual transference, applying the central hermeneutic metaphors of the 'fold' and 'crystallization' across disciplines – from biological evolution and psychodynamics to political economy. The approach further involves immanent critique of dualistic epistemologies and a historical-materialist analysis of social forms.

The synthetic construction produces novel theoretical propositions – namely, a 'materialist monadology' and 'bright ontology.' These are formulated through a creative reinterpretation and synthesis of the source materials, contrasting with constructed opposing positions such as 'dark ontology' and linear progressivism.

In summary, the methodology constitutes a deliberate critical synthesis aimed at constructing an interventionist philosophical perspective on ontology, ethics, and political possibility.

Philosophical discourse

Pre-life, existing for billions of years in various corners of the Universe, randomly sorts through and accumulates different molecular variations until a system of self-replicating molecules occurs – the living. The living sorts through and accumulates variations – a tentacle, a fin, a paw – until the hand of a rational being occurs, which is simultaneously (universally) – a tentacle, a fin, and a paw. Just as a magnifying glass gathers and concentrates rays, so the hand of a rational being both builds nests and molds honeycombs, and carves The Thinker from stone,

"universally transforming nature, both external and its own" (Ilyenkov, 1974/2010, p. 54). And these rational beings that have occurred in various regions of the Universe sort through options, accumulate the seeds of the future in the past, and – perhaps – will make the 'tiger's leap into the open air of history' according to Benjamin (1940/2021).

If the hand - or a tentacle with seven appendages – of a rational being accumulates and concentrates within itself processes that have unfolded over billions of years not teleologically but through the dialectical 'play' of necessity and chance, then in a sense, any hand is also a 'monad.' As a result, it is connected to all preceding processes across the continuum of the Universe and - potentially - can and does influence all other points of the continuum (albeit mediatedly and to a minimal, yet non-zero, degree). Moreover, from this perspective, any process and any phenomenon at any point in the universe is concretely, though with varying degrees of 'distinctness' as Leibniz put it (1714/1982, p. 423), connected to all other phenomena and processes at every other point and 'senses' them (being both a consequence and a precondition). Thus, surprisingly, we are presented with the project of a 'materialist monadology.'

If any point in the continuum is connected to all its other points (the principle of monadology) and woven into the whole at the ontological level, then one can also speak of a bright ontology, if one is not afraid of beautiful words. (Bright ontology is the antithesis of the 'dark ontologies' into which a significant part of contemporary thought plunges with masochistic delight today). "The very stream of life that runs through my veins night and day runs through the world and dances in rhythmic measures" (Tagore, 1910/2010, p. 53). In this ontology, there is no dualism of consciousness and the world, noumenon and phenomenon; here, consciousness is not separated from the world by the Great Kantian Wall – the illusion of this wall arises due to epistemological reasons. (From a dualist epistemology, inevitably follows a specific morality: the morality of absolute otherness and even the aggressiveness of the world beyond the Great Kantian Wall – the Cthulhu problem: "The most merciful thing in the world, I think, is the inability of the human mind to correlate all its contents. We live on a placid island of ignorance in the midst of black seas of infinity, and it was not meant that we should voyage far. The sciences, each straining in its own direction, have hitherto harmed us little; but some day the piecing together of dissociated knowledge will open up such terrifying vistas of reality, and of our frightful position therein, that we shall either go mad from the revelation or flee from the deadly light into the peace and safety of a new dark age" (Lovecraft, 1928/2016, p. 7). At the foundation of the entire structure of such a significant work as Liu Cixin's *The Three-Body Problem* (2006/2016) lies a 'dark' categorical imperative: the only rational strategy when encountering the Other is its swiftest and most complete annihilation. Cthulhu's morality is a strong formulation of dualistic morality; in its weak formulation, it is the morality of contrast between an active subject and a passive object and, consequently, managerialism – the technocratic exploitation of nature.) So, what are the 'epistemological roots,' as they liked to express it in Soviet philosophy, of the dualism of consciousness and the world? If we agree with the assumption that consciousness is a 'fold' of similarity/difference, a unity that continuously produces divergence, then this very 'root' turns out to be consciousness itself, reflection itself – the reflexive effort to separate the Self and the non-Self, the Self and the Other, the Self and the world, subject and object – the spear that heals but constantly wounds, to slightly rephrase the ancient image used by Richard Wagner in *Parsifal*. Even at the risk of falling into monstrous simplification, it is impossible to resist the temptation to say that it is precisely the inseparable embeddedness of reason in the world

(an ontological interweaving so fundamental that a rational being could be called not even a 'thinking reed' but a 'thinking stone') that has, as its reverse side, the immediate, ever-present inevitability of a return to the pre-rational and pre-living. In this sense, a rational being is not so much a 'fold' as a low 'bump' on the world's surface, one that can all too easily be 'smoothed out' and disappear. Moreover, this disappearance is inevitable and will occur relatively soon – it is precisely this that reflection reveals to the subject at the very moment when the creature, already more-than-beast but still only-just-human, first recognizes its reflection in the water's surface. The reverse side (the price) of reason's closeness to the world is the all-too-easy cessation of an individual reason within the world, and the reverse side of reflection is the Great Kantian Wall. That is probably why, in difficult moments of life, we envy so much the serenity of animals and – even more so – the eternal peace of pre-living nature, the inexorability of sunrises and sunsets, the calm confidence with which spring replaces winter. "Unshaken order reigns throughout, / Full harmony throughout all nature – / In our illusory freedom alone / Do we feel the discord with it" (Tyutchev, 1865/1984, p. 202). As soon as the only-just-human understands for the first time why it feared the roar of the cave bear, the moment reflection arises, reason becomes trapped in a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, the rational being is constituted and exists in a constant orientation towards the world, in a constant mutual exchange with it. On the other, the reason that has arisen and exists in this orientation towards the world functions as one who rarely leaves his post (borrowing a term for our purposes this time from Max Scheler), *der Neinsagenkönner* ('the one best able to say no') – and this 'no' is directed at the world beyond human reason (1921/2010). The self-aware fear of falling asleep into death saves itself through a passion for autonomy: it begins to develop various ways to understand and practice this autonomy, to accumulate 'seeds,' and sort through options leading to the absolutization of consciousness's autonomy, which crystallize into a kind of 'monad' by the time Kant finishes his *Critique of Pure Reason*.

It is also important that this conscious fear is accompanied by a (not)self-aware striving to return to the pre-living: "Once upon a time... properties of life were awakened in inanimate matter... The tension that arose in matter, hitherto inanimate, strove to achieve equilibrium; such was the first urge – the urge to return to the inanimate" (Freud, 1920/2006, p. 263). 'Closeness' inseparable from 'distance,' a unity finding itself in difference, life striving towards death - the 'fold' – this dialectic seems to guide Freud when, on the pages of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* dedicated to 'metapsychological speculations,' he writes: "The concept of instincts of self-preservation which we attribute to every living being stands in remarkable opposition to the idea that instinctual life as a whole serves to bring about death" (Freud, 1920/2006, p. 264).

In the world of 'bright ontology,' in the continuous world of materialist monadology, there is no wall between noumenon and phenomenon, but there is folding-multiplicity: for the organism as a whole to live, the mechanism of apoptosis, the forced death of defective cells, must function ceaselessly in every one of its cells. The doe eats grass and is herself eaten by the tiger; a rational being can become the most terrible stone, the cornerstone of a death camp, or animate stone, as Bernini did in *The Ecstasy of Saint Teresa*. A rational being can be both a rolling, lethally indifferent, crushing stone and a stone in the foundation of a universal House of Culture – to be hard as stone in order to remain human, and to lose humanity and become petrified.

If we descend to the level of the most abstract formulations, we can say this: the transcendent does not exist; all that exists is on this side, on our side. And it is continuous; there are no gaps

in the fabric of being. What we take for discontinuity is only 'folds,' a fold is a distinct duality (or triplicity, etc. – multiplicity) without a distinct boundary. In turn, how the fabric of being folds and unfolds is determined by the categories of sorting and fixing variants (the accumulation of the seeds of the future in the past). Thus, life once folded into being happened on one of countless planets. Later, the human hand happened, one of an infinite number of variants of a limb ('the finitude of human existence'), yet capable of changing universally. This is Hegelianism, but a Hegelianism without teleology and linear progressivism (one is tempted to say: therefore, it is the Marxism of the 21st century).

Upon closer inspection, one can notice again and again the 'fold' that results from the sorting of variants and 'crystallization.' Through this lens, one can attempt to see, for example, the genesis of consciousness according to Freud. Reflecting on the 'onset of consciousness,' he writes how the 'incessant advance of external stimuli' on the 'cortex,' the organism's outer layer (which in his analysis belongs simultaneously to the external and the internal – thus being a fold), leads to it "providing the most favorable conditions for the reception of stimuli and is no longer capable of any further modification" (Freud, 1920/2006, p. 250). What is this if not crystallization after a prolonged sorting and accumulation of variants? Ilyenkov refers to these same patterns as the dialectic of the historical and the logical and dedicates a separate essay in *Dialectical Logic* to them. There, he reconstructs the analysis carried out by Marx in *Capital* and shows how, throughout history, various variants of value, commodity, and monetary relations are sorted and combined until the 'crystallization into capital' occurs. "All elements of the value relation are already present, but they still appear as abstract moments of the system preceding capitalism... These moments, although they already exist, have not yet intertwined into an inseparable and concrete image presupposed by the developed concept of value... It is precisely capital that transforms value into a truly universal relation, a concrete-historical universal category, by fully developing those moments which, although they existed before it, existed separately from one another, abstractly (as individual moments, as aspects, fragments, 'pieces' of the historically pre-capitalist system)" (Ilyenkov, 1974/2010, pp. 253-254). The essay also contains a detailed critique of linear progressivism as a form of flat evolutionism, the most tenacious variety of pseudo-historicism (Ilyenkov, 1974/2010).

Finally, it is these same processes, but in other spheres of social existence, that Walter Benjamin investigates. In his notes on Baudelaire, he traces how experience (*Erlebnis*) gradually separates from long-term experience (*Erfahrung*): "The replacement of the older narration by information, and information by sensation, reflects the increasing atrophy of experience" (Benjamin, 1938/2015, p. 121). How the 'traumatizing impact of shock' becomes an accepted, yet unnoticed, norm – until it congeals at a certain historical moment into the 'monad' of fully-formed bourgeois society: "That uncomfortable, glaring experience of existence in the industrial age (Benjamin, 1938/2015, p. 121). (The subtitle of the notes on Baudelaire is *The Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*). Baudelaire is so important to Benjamin because, on the one hand, he was the last great poet capable of giving a poetic image to this unpoetic society; and on the other, his poetry cannot be read without considering that the industrial age is the time of a society where the 'sorting of variants' is essentially complete. This is a society that has solidified into a dense mass, where the fate of the poet (and his poetry) cannot, therefore, be understood without understanding the fate of the proletariat and the fate of the commodity. "The sources of Baudelaire's heroic stance lie in the deepest foundations of the social order that had become established by mid-century. They are contained in the experience that taught

Baudelaire what radical changes had taken place in the conditions of artistic production. These changes consisted in the commodity form emerging in the artwork, and mass character in the public, more immediately and significantly than ever before" (Benjamin, 1938/2015, pp. 207-208).

To dance once more on the grave of teleology, one might say this: a 'bright ontology' should be founded on the thesis that there are no such things as inherently regressive or progressive vectors operating with predetermination. "To dispense with the notion of 'progress' as well as with the notion of 'period of decline' are two sides of one and the same thing" (Benjamin, 1982/2002, p. 460). Which possibility is realized is determined by the random sorting of variants in the pre-living and pre-rational, as well as by the confrontation, struggle, and risky interaction of rational beings. If the dice were thrown only once, instead of 'something', there would most likely be 'nothing.' But as far as we can see using various astrophysical instruments, the dice have been thrown billions upon billions of times – that is, how many times in the observable Universe gas has condensed under gravity and stars have ignited, planets have formed, galaxies, clusters of galaxies. In a world of a vast number of variants, the emergence and consolidation of 'something' in addition to 'nothing' (the new in addition to the old) is, so to speak, the birth of necessity from the sheer quantity of chance. And the fact that rational beings happened, folded into being on a planet, opens the next window of possibilities: these beings sort through variants so that something even more complex (even less probable) might happen – a 'society without repression' according to Herbert Marcuse (1955/2023). In this risky confrontation, the victory of the more complex variant is not only not predetermined but – in all likelihood, less probable than defeat; it is easier to fall from a tightrope stretched over an abyss (the abyss is also a fold, not a rupture) than to walk across it. Then the worst premonitions will come true, a 'dark crystallization' will occur (as happened in Germany in the 1930s), a 'dead monad' will form, an infinite dead end – a society where the private hates the general like a broiler chicken hates its factory farm, and the general wishes to see the private as indistinguishable from one another like buttons on a uniform.

But hope is always last in line for the firing squad: there is no such darkness in which there is not at least one photon of light. Lucifer is frozen in the center of Hell not because he is anti-light, absolute darkness, but because he contains a smaller (though not zero) amount of light than everything else (for his very name speaks of this, testifying at least as a memory of the remnant, however minimal, of light within him – such is the Neoplatonic continuity of monotheism). Nothing and no one is hopeless – not even, for example, Cthulhu. If one looks closely at him, it is easy to see that he is not a negation, nor even so much a caricature of a human, but rather a clumsy counterfeit. "...My extravagant imagination offered simultaneous pictures of an octopus, a dragon, and a human caricature... A pulpy, tentacled head surmounted a grotesque and scaly body with rudimentary wings..." (Lovecraft, 1928/2016, p. 9).

Such a jumble of organs is an imitation of human universality. Only, Cthulhu as depicted by Lovecraft is not a 'folded' but a 'crumpled' subject, an explication of Lovecraft's irrational aversion (a committed racist, as is known) to rational beings from other regions of the Universe. And these beings (and here is another testament that there is no error that does not contain at least an atom of truth) will also be those who, according to Ilyenkov's definition, universally transform nature, both external and their own (1974/2010). Lovecraft attempts to describe something infinitely alien to humanity, but describes only something infinitely alien to racism, Nazism, and any chauvinism – namely, that a rational being can have a different skin color, a

different number of limbs, a different sensory apparatus (1928/2016). Therefore, remembering the bitter words of Ernst Bloch, spoken about the events of the 1930s in Germany – "We handed over hell and heaven, berserkers and theology to the reaction without a fight" (1935/1991, p. 60) – we must say that Cthulhu cannot be handed over to the reaction without a fight (and add, in jest, that today the prototype of the Bright Cthulhu is the figure of the Flying Spaghetti Monster).

Even if Cthulhu can be wrested from the reaction, it is clear that 'dark' crystallization is not inevitable. The 'bright' one - the tiger's leap under the free sky of history – requires heeding another part of Ilyenkov's definition of a rational being. One cannot help but notice that this definition erases not only any chauvinism but also anthropocentrism and speciesism (the 'pride of speciesism'). But does managerialism not remain there, exploitation for the sake of reason – conscious 'transformation'? Does a kind of chauvinism of reason towards the non-rational, the pre-rational, not persist there? To be convinced of the falseness of such a suspicion, it is enough to recall what 'to transform' means for the Spinozist Ilyenkov.

Again and again, with delight, underline the main point in Spinoza's texts, for example, these words from *The Ethics*: "He who has a body capable of a great many things has a mind whose greatest part is eternal" (1677/2005, p. 381). Ilyenkov deciphers them thus: "...The more singular things our active action encompasses and the deeper and more comprehensively we determine our body to act according to the form of external bodies themselves, the more we become an active component in the infinite chain of cause-and-effect relations of the natural whole, the more the power of our thinking increases, the less that 'from the specific structure' of our body and brain is mixed into 'ideas,' making them 'confused and inadequate' (ideas of imagination, not of 'intellect'). The more active our body is, the more universal it is, the less it introduces 'of itself,' the purer it reveals the true nature of things" (Ilyenkov, 1974/2010, p. 53).

A rational being acts more intelligently and thinks more effectively the more it conforms its actions to the totality of cause-and-effect relations of the natural whole. 'To universally transform' is not to break or pierce, much less 'to remake everything in my own way,' but to take into account and harmonize: it is a consequence of consensus, not decree; it is a general assembly where all that exists – the rational, the pre-rational, and the pre-living – has an equal right to vote. Consequently, a rational being is not a 'valve' through which ratio is injected 'from above' into the immanent, but a 'tentacle' that arises in nature and which, as Benjamin says, "without exploiting nature, is able to help it deliver those creations that sleep in its womb as embryos" (1940/2021, p. 211). And even before this thought was formulated in the Theses, its prototype-foreboding arose in the essay on Leskov: "The righteous man is the protector of every creature and at the same time its highest embodiment" (Benjamin, 1936/2000, p. 361).

Conclusion

Before concluding, it must be emphasized once more: human beings are directly constituted by their political life. The shift towards either 'dark' or 'bright' crystallization occurs through the sorting of variants in the confrontation, struggle, and risk undertaken by concrete (social) classes, groups, and individuals – through the realm of the political, which today, unfortunately, most resembles a desert with rare oases. The negative trajectory of events has a higher probability because subjectivity is founded on a eudaimonistic dilemma, an 'impossible' choice between

the happy solitude of the thinking Self and the bustle of the external world, on a condition that blocks awareness of the total aggregate of cause-and-effect relations within the natural whole. Almost without exception, the time of rational beings is almost always occupied by random and private necessity, except for rare moments of catharsis. 'Dark' crystallization – while it too is always a 'sum,' an aggregate of causal relations, circumstances, decisions, a harvest of dragon's teeth sown in the past for the future – always consists in anti-universality, in particularization, narrowing, and opposition to the whole; or rather, in the constitutive distortion for it, where the whole is either denied or a part is presented as the whole. (For a consistent egoist, their interest is sincerely equal to the entire cosmos; the subjective is 'objectively' equal to the objective).

Nevertheless, the possibility of 'bright' crystallization is also contained within these same, our present circumstances. If it occurs, its primary distinction will be preserved flexibility: 'dark' crystallization is a 'sum' that solidifies – the particular loses sight of the universal, encloses not into a monad, which by definition senses everything that happens in the universe, but into a mere separate entity (Leibniz, 1714/1982). The consequence and simultaneously the cause of 'bright' crystallization will be a different subjectivity, grounded by a new society and grounding it in turn. It will be capable not of losing itself in coincidence with the whole, but of adding its uniqueness to the whole; it will be a singular 'monad,' not opposing the whole but embodying it. Flexibility is constitutive of the nature of a rational being that transforms universally and is therefore potentially capable of transforming on the basis of a 'universal,' 'cosmic' consensus. But currently, this universal potential is in a 'fold' with the eudemonistic dilemma: it is merely a seed of the future in the past and present. The task, therefore, is twofold: to 'reassemble' not only society but also the subject; to remember not only the 11th Thesis but also the 3rd "that circumstances are changed by men and that the educator must himself be educated" (Marx, 1888/1955, p. 2). This future flexibility and connectedness begin already today. The risky struggle for the future requires individuals to remember the whole, and the movement towards wholeness will form an integral personality for whom Nikolai Fedorov's idea of universal kinship will not be merely an item in a global archive but will become the foundation of life and thought (1906/2000).

References

- Benjamin, W. (1936/2000). *Rasskazhchik [The Storyteller]*. In Benjamin, W. *Ozareniya [Illuminations]*. Moscow: Martis. [in Russian]
- Benjamin, W. (1938/2015). *Bodler [Baudelaire]*. Moscow: Ad Marginem Press. [in Russian]
- Benjamin, W. (1940/2021). *O ponyatii istorii [About the Concept of History]*. In Benjamin, W. *Devyat' rabot [Nine Works]*. Moscow: RIPOL classic / Pangloss Publishing Group. [in Russian]
- Benjamin, W. (1982/2002). *The Arcades Project*. New York: Belknap Press. [in English]
- Bloch, E. (1935/1991). *Heritage of our Time*. University of California Press. [in English]
- Cixin, L. (2006/2016). *The Three-Body Problem*. Tor Books. [in English]
- Fedorov, N. F. (1906/2000). *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 tomakh [Collection of works in 4 volumes]*. Moscow: Traditsiya. [in Russian]
- Freud, S. (1920/2006). *Po tu storony printsypa udovol'stviya [Beyond the Pleasure Principle]*. In Freud, S. *Izbrannye sochineniya v 10 tomakh [Collected works in 10 volumes]*. Moscow: Firma STD, Vol. 3. [in Russian]
- Ilyenkov, E. (1974/2010). *Dialekticheskaya logika: Ocherki istorii i teorii [Dialectical logic: Essays on its history and theory]*. Moscow: USSR. [in Russian]

Kant, I. (1781/2007). Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by Marcus Weigelt. London: Penguin Books. [in English]

Leibniz, G. (1714/1982). Monadologiya [Monadology]. In Leibniz, G. Sochineniya v 4 tomakh [Works in 4 volumes]. Moscow: Mysl, 1982. Vol. 1. [in Russian]

Lovecraft, H. (1928/2016). The Call of Cthulhu / Zov Ktulku. Moscow: ACT. [in English and Russian]

Marcuse, H. (1955/2023). Eros and Civilization. A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud. Routledge. [in English]

Marx K. (1888/1955). Tezisy of Feiervakhe [Theses on Feuerbach]. In Marx K., & Engels F. Sochineniya [Works]. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. [in Russian]

Scheler, M. (1921/2010). On the Eternal in Man. Transaction Publishers. [in English]

Spinoza, B. (1677/2005). Ethics. Translated by Edwin Curley. London: Penguin Books. [in English]

Tagore, R. (1910/2010). Gitanjali (Song Offerings). London: Penguin Modern Classics. [in English]

Tyutchev, F. (1865/1984). Sochineniya v 2 tomakh [Works in 2 volumes]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. [in Russian]

Conflict of interests

The author declares no conflict of interest

Information about author/ Автор туралы ақпарат/ Информация об авторе

Vladislav Sofronov – Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Moscow Institute of Psychoanalysis, 34 Kutuzovsky Avenue, building 14, 121170, Moscow, Russian Federation. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8209-020X>, e-mail: deepredminded@gmail.com

Владислав Софронов – философия ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, Мәскеу Психология Институты, Кутузов даңғылы, 34 үй, 14 ғимарат, 121170, Мәскеу қ., Ресей Федерациясы. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8209-020X>, e-mail: deepredminded@gmail.com

Владислав Софронов – кандидат философских наук, доцент, Московский институт психоанализа, Кутузовский проспект, дом 34, строение 14, 121170, Москва, Российская Федерация. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8209-020X>, e-mail: deepredminded@gmail.com

Мақала туралы ақпарат / Информация о статье / Information about the article.

Редакцияға түсті / Поступила в редакцию / Entered the editorial office: 15.02.2026

Рецензенттер мақұлдаған / Одобрено рецензентами / Approved by reviewers: 27.02.2026

Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации / Accepted for publication: 14.03.2026