



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Two Narodnichestvos
Author(s)	Iwama, Toru
Citation	スラヴ研究, 2, 1-12
Issue Date	1958
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/4929
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	KJ00000112996.pdf



TWO NARODNICHESTVOS

Toru IWAMA

I

To what extent did the thought of Lenin represent a continuation of Narodnik thought, and to what extent did Lenin's thought depart from Narodnik thought?

Russian social and political thought in the nineteenth century forms the background of the Russian Revolution of 1917. Its significance has been increased by the recent tendency to dwell on the continuity of Russian history before and after the revolution rather than the break in continuity.¹ Soviet writers and historians dwell on the important contributions to revolutionary thought of Radishchev, the Decembrists, the "men of the forties" (Belinsky, Herzen) and the "men of the sixties" (Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov). They evaluate highly these brilliant figures of Russian revolutionary history as "revolutionary democrats" in distinction from "bourgeois liberalists". To be sure, the fact shows the recent tendency to dwell on the continuity of Russian history before and after the revolution.²

But, respecting Narodniks, Soviet writers and historians emphasize the break in continuity of the Russian revolutionary history rather than its continuity. For instance, M. V. Nechkina, one of the leading Soviet historians, has concluded that the Narodniks of the seventies were not the direct heirs to the work of Chernyshevsky or Dobrolyubov.³ The same would be true of the relationship between Narodniks and Bolsheviks. There can be no doubt that the Soviet historians have considered Narodniks to be the outcasts of Russian revolutionary history. I question in the strongest way the soundness of this statement that the line of continuity, along which the Russian revolutionary ideology developed, was broken by the emergence of Narodnichestvo.

We should reexamine Lenin's opinion of Narodnik theory. Materials used here will be limited principally to his early writings, because of the fact that, during the first period of his career (1893-1900),⁴ Lenin devoted principally to the struggle against

1) E. H. Carr, *Studies in Revolution*, London, 1950, p. 88.

2) Merle Fainsod wrote in this connection: "For the Communist the only Russian intellectual history which matters is that which can be fitted into the role of a prologue to the triumph of Bolshevism. Yet even the Communist finds himself compelled to reinterpret the past, to reclaim what he has discarded, and to discard what he has reclaimed, as changing circumstances present new problems and new challenges." (*Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought*, Cambridge, Mass., 1955, p. 172).

3) M. V. Nechkina, ed., *Istoriia SSSR*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1954, p. 576.

4) Harold J. Laski, *Ulianov, V. I.*, in the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. In the first period, Laski says, Lenin was one of those who fought strongly for a socialist party free from the peasant romanticism of the narodniks and the paralyzing theory of proletarian "spontaneity" which made the "economists" futile as leaders of a revolution.

the Narodnik conception of the economic development of Russia and to the formulation of the Marxist conception of this development.

In dealing with Lenin's controversy with a group of rivals, I intend simply to transmit Lenin's ideas, without implying my own acceptance and support of his ideas or without implying my own rejection and opposition to his ideas. It is not my great concern in this essay whether Lenin's judgement of those rivals is right or not. My great concern is to address myself to the problem of explaining something of the enigma of the continuity or the break in continuity between Narodniks and Bolsheviks simply through Lenin's opinion of Narodnik theory.

II

Lenin divided the Narodnichestvo into two categories: 1) the "Old Russian Narodnichestvo" or "Peasant Socialism" and 2) the "Contemporary Narodnichestvo" or "*Mesbchanin* Socialism".¹

"Under the name of the Old Narodniks," said Lenin, "I understand, for instance, not the people who were in control of the *Notes of the Fatherland (Otechestvennye zapiski)*, but the people who *went to the people*."² In the sixties and seventies, the editorial group of the *Notes* included the poet Nekrasov, Saltykov-Shchedrin, author of *The Golovlev Family*, and so forth. Mikhailovsky took up the editorship of the *Notes* after the death of Nekrasov. He was a protagonist of the later Narodnik philosophy, which was inherited by the Social Revolutionaries of the twentieth century. The *Notes* of that time was one of those periodicals which have played so great a part in the expression of Russian thought. Chief contributors were G. Uspensky, Zlatvratsky, Karonin and so on. Anonymously and under an assumed name, P. Lavrov and other revolutionaries also wrote for the *Notes*. What did Lenin really mean by the above brief remarks on the *Notes*? It is somewhat obscure, however, I gather from his hostile criticism of Mikhailovsky in the essay "*What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats?*" that he must have alluded to Mikhailovsky and his followers. I feel sure he would not want to allude to Nekrasov or Saltykov-Shchedrin. Soviet writers and historians emphasize the conflict of opinion among the editorial group of the *Notes*. They said that Saltykov-Shchedrin and Nekrasov stood clearly in the line of the revolutionary democratic tradition of the *Contemporary (Sovremennik)* and fought the Narodnik view of Mikhailovsky.³ Such an opinion as to draw a line of demarcation between Revolutionary Democrats and Narodniks is so characteristic of Soviet writers and historians.

Hundreds of young intelligentsia "went to the people" in 1873-74. There can

1) V. I. Lenin, *Sobineniia*, Fourth Russian Edition, Vol. I, pp. 321 and 375.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 376.

3) *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, in the *Bolshaiia Sovietskaiia Entsiklopediia*, Second Edition, Vol. XXXI

be no doubt, in the above words of Lenin, that he understands these young intelligentsia under the name of the Old Russian Narodniks.

The movement to the people was originally inspired by Herzen. He was to be called the first Narodnik in the Russian revolutionary history. This is what Lenin has declared in his study "*Recollections of Herzen*".¹ Both Lavrov and Bakunin have played so great a part in the development of the movement to the people. But at the same time we must give attention to the opinion of Kropotkin. Various writers have tried to explain this movement to the people by influences from abroad: "foreign agitators are everywhere," was a favorite explanation. "It is certainly true that our youth listened to the mighty voice of Bakunin, and that the agitation of the International Workingmen's Association had a fascinating effect upon us," said Kropotkin, "but the movement had a far deeper origin: it began before 'foreign agitators' had spoken to the Russian youth, and even before the International Association had been founded. It was beginning in the groups of Karakozov in 1866; Turgenev saw it coming, and already in 1859 faintly indicated it."²

By the end of the sixties, two main groups were beginning to emerge; the propagandists who followed Lavrov and the insurrectionists who followed Bakunin. The first group emphasized that the intelligentsia should perform a primarily educational function, that they should concentrate their efforts on the development of the people's consciousness. The second group was beginning to argue that the task outlined by the Lavrists was unnecessary and even harmful: the intelligentsia should appeal to the people's feelings and not to their reason; they should destroy the existing order by unleashing the revolutionary instincts of the peasant masses. The evidence to be found in contemporary memoirs (Kropotkin's, Akselrod's, Kravchinskii's, etc.) indicates rather conclusively that by 1873-74 Lavrov's following was reduced to a small minority of the intelligentsia youth. This is also the conclusion reached by the leading authority on the history of the Narodnichestvo, V. Ya. Yakovlev (Bogucharskii).³ Yet, as Sir John Maynard rightly says, the distinction between the two schools is not between revolution and terrorism on the one hand, and peaceful persuasion on the other. Both were revolutionary, and both were terrorist, the propagandists directing their attention to a sort of punitive terrorism against oppressive and unpopular officials.⁴ Both were alike in their wholehearted opposition to the government and their

1) Lenin, op. cit., Vol. XVIII, p. 11.

2) P. Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, Boston and New York, 1899, p. 308.

3) Leopold H. Haimson, *The Russian Marxists and the Origin of Bolshevism*, Cambridge, Mass., 1955, p. 13. Sir Bernard Pares' opinion is somewhat different. The movement to the people was quite unsuccessful. "This failure," said Pares, "in the minds of the Narodniki, conduced to the triumph of Bakunin's simple theory of force over Lavrov's slower road of propaganda." Bernard Pares, *A History of Russia*, New York, 1953, p. 390.)

4) John Maynard, *Russia in Flux*, New York, 1951, p. 79.

entire devotion to the service of the peasant.

Lenin characterized the Old Russian Narodnichestvo as "Peasant Socialism". According to Lenin, Peasant Socialism was in some measure a harmonious doctrine, composed in the epoch, (1) when the development of capitalism in Russia was still weak, (2) when the petty bourgeois character of peasant economy was not yet uncovered at all, (3) when the practical side of the doctrine was purely Utopian, (4) and when the Narodniks positively shunned liberal "society" and "went to the people."¹

Both (1) and (2) are related to the economic reality of Russia after the Reform of 1861. After the official downfall of the system of serfdom in 1861, capitalist economy could not have emerged at once, nor could the serf system of economy have disappeared at once. The tempo and results of differentiation within the peasantry during the first decade after the Reform were inconsiderable. Therefore, peasantry looked to be a class, and, in reality, they acted like a class. In this way emerged the idea that socialism in Russia would be achieved through the commune (*obshchina*) and the peasantry. This is Peasant Socialism. This idea formed the basis of the views and programs of the Old Russian Narodnichestvo. Closely related with the analysis of the existing society is the method of realizing the future society mentioned above in (3) and (4). Assuming that the main revolutionary force was not the working class but the peasantry, and that the peasant land commune contained the germ of socialism,—this is purely Utopian in the words of Lenin—the Old Russian Narodniks went to the people and attempted to arouse the peasantry to a struggle against tsarism.

We must take notice of the fact that Lenin evaluates highly the revolutionary character of the Old Russian Narodniks in the method of realizing the future society. As Lenin said, the Old Russian Narodniks had the political programs for the purpose opposing to the foundation of modern society and arousing the peasantry to a socialist revolution, while the Contemporary Narodniks devised the programs in order to maintain the foundation of modern society and to patch up and reform the status of the peasantry.² The views and programs of the Old Russian Narodniks may have been erroneous and Utopian, but they had faith in a special system, in the communal structure of Russian life, hence faith in the possibility of a peasant socialist revolution. This is that inspired them and roused scores and hundreds of people to the heroic struggle against the government. This is also what Lenin has recognized.³ Here I cannot help feeling that there is an astounding contradiction between the scientific a-moralism of Lenin, which cannot endure an ethical basis for socialism, and the extreme moralism of Lenin in the appraisal of revolutionary activities.

Narodnichestvo had spent its force by the eighties. The rise of the "Will of the

1) Lenin, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 376.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 247.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 246.

TWO NARODNICHESTVOS

People" (1879), said Berdyaev, had already meant the end of Narodnichestvo.¹ The revolutionary intelligentsia were disillusioned in the peasantry and resolved to rely solely upon their own personal heroism. On March 13, 1881, Alexander II was assassinated by members of the "Will of the People". The murder of Alexander II may be described as a turning-point in the history of Narodnichestvo. The bomb that killed Alexander not only failed to bring about the triumph of the revolutionary intelligentsia but in the time of Alexander III led to a strong reactionary movement not only in the government but also among the public. Lenin said that the Contemporary Narodnichestvo of 1880's and 1890's was not Narodnichestvo at all, and that the "go-to-the people" was a true (*istinnoe*) Narodnichestvo.²

III

It is clear that Lenin regards the leaders of the *Russkoye Bogatstvo* (the *Russian Wealth*) and their followers as the Contemporary Narodniks.³ The *Russkoye Bogatstvo* was a monthly magazine published in St. Petersburg in 1876-1918. From the beginning of the nineties this magazine became an organ of the legal Narodniks. In 1892-1904 N. K. Mikhailovsky was an editor and one of the leading lights of this magazine. Such names as Mikhailovsky, N. F. Annensky, V. V. Vorontsov, S. N. Krivenko, S. N. Yuzhakov, Nikolay-on (Danielson) etc., can be seen in the early writings of Lenin as the figures of the Contemporary Narodnichestvo.

Lenin characterized the Contemporary Narodnichestvo as *Mestchanin Socialism*. He used the term "*meshchanin*" not in the popular but in the economic meaning of the word. With an application of Leninist principles to "*meshchanin*", small producers working under the system of commodity economy would have a distinctive feature of "*meshchanin*". Peasant and *kustar*, Narodniks always ranked one with another, would belong to "*meshchanin*".

Lenin pointed out the differences between Peasant Socialism and *Mestchanin Socialism*. He said as follows: (1) Now Russia was moving along the capitalist road; (2) the process of disintegration of the commune had developed rapidly and had led quickly to differentiation within the peasantry; (3) instead of the Utopian program, there now appeared the program of petty bourgeois "progress"; (4) instead of the separation from liberal "society", there now appeared the most pathetic rapprochement with it.⁴

The above (1) and (2) are related to the analysis of the existing society in Russia; (3) and (4) are related to the method of realizing the future society.

1) Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Origin of Russian Communism*, London, 1937, p. 110.

2) Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 490.

3) Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 321.

4) *Ibid.*, p. 376.

The analysis of the existing society of both Narodniks and Marxists converged on the subject of the development of capitalism in Russia. According to Narodniks, Russian capitalism was being "artificially" implanted by the tsarist government and therefore was weak and had no future; Russia could avoid the capitalist path of development by means of developing what Narodniks called "people's production" based on the peasant commune, and on agricultural and handicraft co-operative societies. For instance, respecting the *kustar* trades S. N. Krivenko says, "people's production in a majority of cases arises *naturally*, whereas capitalist industry is most often created *artificially*."¹ Similar ideas were expressed by other Narodnik writers: V. V. (V. Vorontsov) and Nikolay-on (Danielson). V. V. unequivocally defended the doctrine that the development of capitalism is "impossible" in Russia. Nikolay-on, unlike Vorontsov, emphasized futility, rather than the impossibility, of a capitalist development in Russia.²

Lenin indicates many times in his writings, that Narodniks avoid the analysis of reality, and make shift with meaningless phrases. Hence, it follows, in his opinion, that Narodniks lack, in the strict meaning of the word, the analysis of the existing society. He opposed to the idea of the "artificiality" of Russian capitalism and of the possibility of avoiding capitalism in the development of Russia's national economy. The point of departure for Lenin is his acceptance of the idea that Russia has already entered upon the road of capitalist development. The Narodnik view of the possible way of Russian economic development, as I wrote above, was based upon the doctrine that the peasant commune occupied a special position in Russian life as the most effective bulwark against the growth and development of capitalism in Russia. But, in the opinion of Lenin, the process of disintegration and the growth of capitalist and labor elements were taking place within the peasant commune, and therefore the peasant commune was not by any means a popular bulwark against capitalism but a pernicious survival of serfdom which bound the peasant to landlord and the landlord to the autocracy.

In his *Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899), Lenin sums up his analysis of the peasant commune.³ "The social-economic environment in which the contemporary Russian peasantry find themselves," says Lenin, "is that of commodity production; that is, the peasant is completely dominated by the market." He analyses it as follows. System of social-economic relationships existing among the peasantry reveals all the contradictions characteristic of all commodity production and all capitalism: competition, struggle for economic independence, competition for land (purchased or hired), concentration of production in the hands of the minority, driving of the majority

1) *Ibid.*, p. 190.

2) Solomon M. Schwarz, *Populism and Early Russian Marxism on Ways of Economic Development of Russia. (Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought, pp. 45-7.)*

3) Lenin, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 140-154.

TWO NARODNICHESTVOS

into the ranks of the proletariat, exploitation of the latter by the minority by means of merchant capital and hire of agricultural laborers. "These very contradictions," says Lenin, "irrefutably demonstrate to us that the system of economic relationships in the communal village does not represent a special system (*ukrad*), but the ordinary petty-bourgeois system." The sum total of all the economic contradictions among the peasantry is called the disintegration of the peasantry. The disintegration of the peasantry develops the extreme groups at the expense of the middle peasantry, and it creates two new types of rural population: the first is the "rural bourgeoisie", the second the "rural proletariat"; the intermediary link between these post-Reform types of the peasantry is the middle peasantry, and this group oscillates between the higher and the lower group, thus, a process characteristic of capitalist economy, that is, the process of "unpeasantising" (*raskrestianivanie*) is going on; the intermediaries are dying out, while the extremes are growing.

The method of realizing the future society, proposed by the Contemporary Narodniks (the "Friends of the People"), is of a reformist, not revolutionary nature. Lenin gave attention to the political program of the "Friends of the People". S. N. Yuzhakov, one of the "Friends of the People", wrote an article entitled "*The Ministry of Agriculture*" in the *Russkoye Bogatstvo*. He advocated in this article such measures as the reorganization of the People's Bank, the establishment of colonization department, the regulation of the letting of state lands in the interest of national economy . . . the study and straightening out of the problem of letting land. "These are contained in the program for restoring the national economy and for protecting it against the economic violence of the rising plutocracy." Later on, in his article "*Problems of Economic Development*", Yuzhakov added to the program for the "restoration of national economy" the following "elementary but indispensable measures": the removal of all hindrances that now encumber the village commune; the release of the village commune from tutelage; the adoption of communal tillage (the socialization of agriculture) and the development of the communal working up of the raw materials obtained from the soil. On the other hand, other "Friends of the People", Krivenko and Karyshev added following measures: cheap credit, *artel* form of farming, guaranteed market, opportunity to dispense with entrepreneurs' profit, invention of cheaper engines and other technical improvements and finally exhibitions, warehouses, commission agencies.¹

Of course, Lenin stood against the "program of petty bourgeois progress", and he said:

"Examine this program and you will find that these gentlemen wholeheartedly and entirely stand on the ground of modern society (that is, on the ground of the capital-

1) Lenin, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 219-220.

ist system, of which they are not conscious), and want to make shift with darning and patching the system while failing to understand that all their progressive measures, cheap credit, improved technique, banks, etc., can only serve to strengthen and develop the bourgeoisie.”¹

Thus, Lenin has concluded that these measures indicated their rapprochement with liberal society and that the Contemporary Narodnichestvo became the direct expression of the interests of the *kulak* elements. Hence the name of *Meskchanin* Socialism.

IV

I have already pointed out Lenin's differentiation between two Narodnichestvos: the Old Russian Narodnichestvo or Peasant Socialism and the Contemporary Narodnichestvo or *Meskchanin* Socialism. But at the same time Lenin emphasized that there was no essential difference between the two. He proclaimed a determined and final break with all petty bourgeois ideas and theories. In the opinion of Lenin, both Peasant Socialism and *Meskchanin* Socialism are petty bourgeois. *Meskchanin* Socialism represented the degenerated stage of Peasant Socialism, and the degeneration from the old theory to the new was inevitable. “Everywhere,” Lenin wrote, “I have tried to show that such a degeneration of the old theories was inevitable; everywhere, I have tried to devote as little space as possible to criticism of these gentlemen in particular [Lenin referred here to the Contemporary Narodniks] and to devote as much space as possible to the general and fundamental postulates of old Russian socialism.”²

Theory was not different, but times have changed. In the times of the Old Russian Narodniks the disintegration of the commune and the differentiation within the peasantry was inconsiderable, but in the times of the Contemporary Narodniks these changes were rapidly developing. In spite of the changes of historical reality, the Contemporary Narodniks clinged to the old theory, which remained in ruins. They dreamed to realize a socialist society through the commune and the peasantry, but, in fact, their ideas and tactics became the direct expression of the interests of the *kulak* elements. Consequently the revolutionary character of the old theory has faded away from their heart. Lenin called it “degeneration”.

To be sure, we shall not find so a wide difference between the Old Russian Narodniks and the Contemporary Narodniks, respecting their philosophy, their analysis of the existing society and their future society. But respecting the method of realizing the future society the two are entirely different each other. I am strongly convinced that Lenin himself felt the importance of this difference.

1) *Ibid.*, p. 220.

2) *Ibid.*, pp. 268-9.

TWO NARODNICHESTVOS

Lenin accused the Contemporary Narodniks of their loss of revolutionary faith.

“Indeed, what were the ideals of the first Russian Socialists, of the Socialists of the epoch which Kautsky so aptly described when he said :

‘ when every socialist was a poet and every poet socialist ’ ?

Faith in a special social system, in the communal structure of Russian life ; hence faith in the possibility of a peasant socialist revolution ; that is what inspired them and roused scores and hundreds of people to the heroic struggle against the government. And you [Lenin referred here to the Contemporary Narodniks] cannot reproach the Social-Democrats with not being able to appreciate the enormous historical services these excellent people rendered in their day and with not being able to respect their memory profoundly. But I ask you, where is that faith now ? It is no longer exist. . . .”¹

Loss of revolutionary faith roused Lenin’s indignation. I feel an extreme moralism of Lenin in his righteous indignation. In this connection, Lenin pronounced a hostile criticism on the rapprochement with liberalism of the Contemporary Narodniks. Lenin said :

“ As for the fathers and their ideals it must be said that however erroneous and utopian the theory of the Old Russian Narodniks may have been, they, at all events, were absolutely opposed to such ‘ modest beginnings of liberalism ’ .”²

Under the influence of the Contemporary Narodniks, a majority of the intelligentsia turned away from the futile pursuit of revolution and, in large numbers, dedicated themselves to the “ small task ”, known as *abramovshchina*, from the name of one of the initiators of the movement, Y. A. Abramov, the modest task, of aiding the people of the villages in their day-to-day existence. Krivenko told a story in this connection. Young men lived in a village of South Russia. They were ready to try a systematic effort for spreading ideas of freedom and revolt among the masses of the peasants. They often spoke of the European institutions and the International Workingmen’s Association. In the same village lived a young German called Schmidt. He had no warm sympathy for the peasants, but introduced the technical improvements of vine growing into the village. Twenty years had passed. Now Herr Schmidt was winning reputation among the peasants, but the propaganda of the young men had died from the memory of the peasants.³ Krivenko certainly showed his tendency to defend the aims of the *abramovshchina*, by comparing the success of the work of Herr Schmidt with the unsuccess of the propaganda of the young men. But the opinion of Lenin is quite different in the appraisal of this story. He believes that there is a fundamental difference in the directions of the

1) *Ibid.*, pp. 245-6.

2) *Ibid.*, pp. 239-240.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 260.

activities between the two. To use the words of Lenin, the young men wanted to destroy a building, but on the contrary Herr Schmidt wanted to reinforce a building. In a word, the young men were revolutionaries, but Herr Schmidt a reformist. It was characteristic of the Contemporary Narodniks, said Lenin, that they could not understand a fundamental difference between the two.¹

Lenin went so far as to declare that the Contemporary Narodnichestvo was not the Narodnichestvo at all in the old customary meaning of the term. He said:

“The program of the *Russkoye Bogatstvo* is not Narodnichestvo at all (in the old customary meaning of the term), and his success and the great extent to which it has spread has been achieved by vulgarising Narodnichestvo, by transforming social-revolutionary Narodnichestvo, which is sharply opposed to our liberalism, into uplift opportunism which is becoming merged with liberalism and which represents only the interest of the petty bourgeoisie.”²

The Old Russian Narodniks had no doubt whatever as to the possibility and practicability of an immediate transition to socialism. Lavrov, one of the most conservative of the Old Russian Narodniks in this respect, believed in a great deal of preliminary education and propaganda among the masses. But even he considered that such a program would not take more than two or three decades. Great contempt was manifested for any idea of intermediate stages on the road to socialism. It may be said that all the Old Russian Narodniks, including Bakuninists, Lavrists and Tkachevists, were alike in their faith in the imminence of revolution. They also believed overwhelmingly that it was highly undesirable for Russia to pass through a Western European bourgeois and parliamentary stage. Tkachev, a more extreme figure, developed in the 1870's the theory of the preventive revolution. He observed a capitalist development in Russia, and his theory, therefore, was to seize power in Russia before capitalism and hated bourgeoisie could become strong and could obtain a constitution and a parliamentary regime.

The old tradition of Russian revolutionary thought had no desire to tolerate a capitalist stage in the development of Russia. It seems to me, Lenin's approval of revolutionary faith and his hostility toward rapprochement with liberalism indicate a germ of his turning to the old tradition of Russian revolutionary thought. Berdyaev called Lenin's turning to the old Russian revolutionary tradition “a Russification and orientalizing of Marxism”.³ He often exaggerates the specifically Russian aspects of Bolshevism, but no student of Russian history will be tempted to ignore the grain of truth which it contains.

1) *Ibid*, p. 261.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 257.

3) Berdyaev, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

Professor Geroid T. Robinson of the Russian Institute at Columbia University gave me a comment on my essay *Lenin's Opinion of Narodnik Theory*. He said: "According to my reading of Lenin's writings, he was *not* consistent in his belief in the imminence of *socialist* revolution in Russia. Down to 1897, I believe he took the view that a considerable further development of capitalism would first be necessary; and often after that, he spoke of a *long period* of capitalist development that would come *after* the *democratic* revolution in Russia, and *before* the *socialist* revolution there." Lenin later rejected in many of his writings after 1897, and in his action in 1917 and after, the doctrine of Marx that each society pass through a *full development of capitalism*, *before* the socialist revolution can take place. And Professor Robinson emphasized, Lenin's most influential writings, and his most important actions, from the early 1900's onward, were devoted to freeing the socialist movement from the "inevitability", the binding "laws" and "stages", that play so large a part in the writings of Marx and Engels.¹

Professor Robinson's comment gives much evidence of original thought. Leninism has two aspects: the first is "*law-aspect*", the second "*will-aspect*". Though not exclusively, he makes an attempt to understand Leninism in terms of *change* from *law-aspect* to *will-aspect*. The transition period of Leninism from *law-aspect* to *will-aspect* is understood in the end of the 1890's. In my opinion, however, the evidence to be found in Lenin's early writings down to 1900 indicates rather clearly that Lenin has already accepted *will-aspect* in company with the dominating *law-aspect*. Lenin wrote an essay "*What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats?*" in 1894. It contains not only scientific economic analysis but also youthful ethical emphasis. The extreme moralism of Lenin is expressed principally in his approval of revolutionary faith and his hostility toward liberalism.

It is from *law-aspect* of Lenin's ideas that he struck a vital blow at the Narodnichestvo *in general*. But at the same time it is from *will-aspect* that he approved the revolutionary method of realizing the future society adopted by the Old Russian Narodniks, and that he attacked strongly the program of petty bourgeois progress proposed by the Contemporary Narodniks.

In conclusion, there is a certain continuity between the Old Russian Narodnichestvo and Bolshevism by Lenin's acceptance of *will-aspect*, but there is not any continuity between the Narodnichestvo in general and Bolshevism by Lenin's acceptance of *law-aspect*. This depends upon the changing equilibrium between *law-aspect* and *will-aspect*. Therefore, we should avoid a hasty generalisation, however, in considering the extent to which Leninism was a novelty in Russia, and the extent to which it was

1) Professor Robinson's Comment on my essay "Lenin's Opinion of Narodnik Theory", June 19, 1956.

the heir of Narodnichestvo, it seems to me the idea of “*two Narodnichestvos*” is of outstanding importance.