

RUSSIAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY AND THE GORBACHEV REVOLUTION

Kichitaro KATSUDA

THE PARADOX OF THE REVOLUTION FROM ABOVE

The Soviet Union is currently undergoing kaleidoscopic changes, because the fire of the “de-communizing revolution” of Eastern Europe has spread there as well.

On Feb. 7th, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made two historical decisions: to abandon the communist dictatorship and to accept political pluralism. This means a farewell from Leninism. Perhaps Gorbachev judged that if he adhered persistently to the communist dictatorship, as the Chinese Communist Party did, he would repeat another Rumanian tragedy. Moreover, it can only be a logical contradiction to subjugate the people under the communist dictatorship, while inspiring and encouraging “democratization” and “glasnost” as the two pillars of Perestroika.

Looking back upon Russian history, elections for the Constituent Assembly were held just about two weeks later after Lenin’s Bolshevik coup d’ état. It was, until that time, the sole free and truly democratic election ever held in 1000 years of Russian history. However, the result was a total defeat of the Communist Party (Bolshevik). Out of a total of about 700 seats, the Communist Party won only 175 seats, and the left-wing SR (the Social Revolutionaries), the party which had formed a coalition with the Communist Party, won 40 seats, the Kadets (Constitutional Democratic Party) took 17 seats, while the Mensheviks won 16 seats. The right-wing Social Revolutionaries occupied the majority with 370 seats. The “Vox populi” had fiercely attacked the authority of Lenin.

Faced with such a situation, Lenin ultimately suppressed and dismissed the Constituent Assembly by force. The history of Soviet Russia shows that “violence comes first.” Communism began its history by choking off democracy and the “Vox populi.”

Now, however, history has turned over a new leaf. Gorbachev, who belongs to the third generation of the Revolution, is indemnifying the “original sin” committed by grandfather Lenin. It wouldn’t be surprising, if Lenin’s statues were to be removed, and the name of the Communist Party and the name of the Country too, be changed in the future. Today the Soviet Union is now thus becoming an “ordinary country.”

Gorbachev convened the people’s Deputy Congress on March 15th and assumed the post of the President in a highhanded method. He should have appealed directly to a democratic national

election, since the new President is vested with strong powers. The following anecdote is now popular in the Soviet Union: "What is the difference between the United States and the Soviet Union? In the United States, Gorbachev could become President without demur, obtaining the overwhelming support of the people. But, he can't in the Soviet Union." Such a kind of joke is in circulation because Gorbachev is unpopular among people in the Soviet Union due to the economic setback and decline of the standard of living, while enjoying such popularity as to be called "Gorbie" in the Western countries.

THE POSSIBILITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY SLIDING DOWN AND BECOMING A MINORITY

Gorbachev hastened to obtain the post of the President by the indirect election of the People's Deputy Congress. In this way, he has placed the army under his direct command and was vested with the authority to declare war and national mobilization as well as the power to proclaim martial law and a state of emergency in a specific region so long as he has the consent of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the pertinent Republics. It may be well said that President Gorbachev has obtained the position of potential dictator. He was forced to do so because the Soviet Union is now facing the critical situation: namely the disintegration of the Empire. The confusion and chaos that hang over the country are caused, in short, by the fact that the Communist Party has been losing the capability to govern. This is because, in the final analysis, the "loyalty" of the people to the Communist ideology and "reliance" on the Party have vanished, while the "fear" of the state power is also now gradually disappearing in the mind of people. If truly free and democratic elections were to be held among plural political parties in the future, the Communist Party would probably slide down to a minority just as it did in the elections held for the Constituent Assembly 73 years ago.

Anticipating such a critical situation, Gorbachev has abandoned the sinking obsolete ship of the Communist Party and changed to the new "Presidential ship" to prolong and enhance his own authority.

Though he has changed to this new "Presidential ship," the storm and raging high tide are showing no signs of calming down. The storm means the national economic catastrophe, and the high tide means nationalism, which is spreading like wildfire throughout the Empire. The road ahead of the new President is a thorny one instead.

President Gorbachev advocates Perestroika, Democratization and Glasnost, and upholds the idea of "human and democratic socialism." However, the higher the ideas he upholds, the more conspicuous becomes the gap between them and the disastrous conditions of the national economy.

It is an ironical scene.

On the other hand, "Democracy" means, first of all, the independence and autonomy of their own nations for minority races and nations that were forcefully incorporated into the last colonial Empire on earth, the Soviet Empire. It was natural for the Georgian people to have demonstrated, upholding such slogans as "National independence is the touchstone of Perestroika!", though they were suppressed with bloodshed on April 9th, last year.

THE SOVIET UNION HAS ENTERED A PERIOD OF CONFUSION ON THE WAY TO DEMOCRACY

It would not be too much to say that the present situation is at the stage in which the "great reforms from above," worked out in the name of Perestroika, may well foment "revolution from below." That is to say, the energy and hope of people activated by the "reforms from above" have led people to expect further more reforms, and the large gap between these "excessive expectations" and the "actual level" of the reforms, in contrary, may boil up frustrations and create the danger of driving people to violent anti-government activities. A sort of the "sociology of revolution", which Tocqueville suggested from the historical studies on the French Revolution, teaches us a dialectical metamorphosis of mass psychology.

Though a dictatorship can be born over-night, it takes a long time for democracy to root in. It may be said that the Soviet Union has entered the period of confusion in moving communist autocracy to "democracy."

Incidentally, what an odd paradox is the present situation! Absolute commands right from above are necessary in order to terminate the "command economy" of totalitarianism and create a free market system. By similar implication, the enhancement of the strong powers of the President are essential in order to plant democracy into the soil of the Soviet Union.

However, these paradoxes and contradictions have been characteristic features of Russian history itself. Kliuchevsky, a great historian of Imperial Russia, in discussing the Westernization-modernization from above of Peter the Great, wrote: "The Reforms of Peter the Great were a result of the struggle between despotism and the inactivity of the people. Peter tried to induce voluntary activities in the society by means of power, which, however, turned people into slaves. The coexistence of despotism and freedom, and of enlightenment and slavery of mind... This has been the mystery that still has not been cleared up in our country in the two centuries since Peter the Great."

CHANGING RUSSIA

As the proverb says, "Seeing is believing," it was really useful for me to have had an opportunity

to visit the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe recently to see the real conditions of the fall of communism. Empty store shelves, a long queue of people lining up just to buy soap in the Gum department store, poor and useless toilet paper and soap in the first class hotels for foreigners, "fillet of beef" as hard as stone offered in restaurants, vegetable salads containing only cucumbers, slum quarters in the Trechiakov district just south of the majestic Kremlin Palace, potholed roads, men and women wearing poor clothes, dirty old cars, taxis with windows so dirty that you could hardly see outside, crowds of people with dark expressions and sour faces... Those scenes seemed to suggest that the national economy is at the brink of catastrophe, and that the people's life has been completely exhausted.

Looking at the bare and naked reality of the people's life in the Soviet Union, we could understand the true motivations that had prompted Gorbachev to undertake "reform from above" in the name of Perestroika.

Looking at the history of Russia, Alexander II also resolutely carried out "reforms from above," first issuing the order to emancipate serfs in spite of fierce opposition from the landowning nobles. He successively enforced a series of modernization reforms such as education reform, justice reform and local government reform (though some said that they were incomplete). He had to do so because Russia had been defeated by the allied forces of England and France in the Crimean War at the end of the reign of Nicolas I. Alexander II carried out the emancipation of the serfs, turning down the resistance of the privileged nobles, because people were caught by the sense of crisis that Russia would slide down to be another obsolete Turkish Empire. A remark made by the Tsar that, "Rather than waiting for a revolution from below, it would be better to introduce reforms from above," revealed the hidden motivation behind his "extensive reforms from above."

I have been writing several times that the same can be said about Perestroika today. Because of the defeat of Soviet Russia in "World War III", that is, the so-called Cold War that lasted for 40 years, clever and open-eyed Gorbachev might not have had any other choice but to enforce Perestroika, turning down the resistance of the Nomenklatura (red aristocracy). He perhaps perceived the possibility that otherwise the system might be overturned by a "revolution from below."

CONTRASTING REFORMS IN CHINA AND EASTERN EUROPE

Meanwhile in China, the policies of the "Four Modernizations" and an "Open Economy" have been adopted under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, and his extensive agricultural reforms produced remarkable results. In short, economic reforms came first in China. However, the rigid communist dictatorship continues in the political sphere under leaders who belong to the first gener-

ation of the Revolution.

The situation is opposite to that of the Soviet Russia. Gorbachev, who belongs to the third generation of the Revolution, is carrying out political reforms one after another, anticipating the coming crisis of his country. However, the economic reforms have come to a standstill and the standard of living of the people is not rising at all. Rather, the scarcity of goods has been aggravated since Perestroika began and inflation has risen to more than 10%, perhaps 15%, though the government claims that it is 7.5%. Western economists estimate that if a market economy is incorporated and advanced, the resulting inflation would be catastrophic in the future, bankruptcies of firms in the red would ensue one after another; finally as many as 20 million people could be thrown out of work. It may be natural for the citizens of Moscow to look tired and to have dark expressions.

When I visited the Soviet Union more than ten years ago, I was impressed by touching the high morale of the people in various occasions. At that time, unexpectedly, very few accepted any tip that I offered. But it's different now. They come close to tourists, somewhat wistfully. Taxi drivers hang around the front gates of the hotels for foreigners, and charge a ridiculous fare, especially in dollars! It costs 150 rubles for a 30-minutes ride from the hotel to the airport. That is 70% of the average monthly income of the people (200 to 240 rubles). It also costs 20 dollars for about a one hour tour in Moscow, which is more than twice the average monthly income in terms of black-market prices on the street. It was the same also in the case of restaurants managed by Cooperatives, so it is not surprising that to the eyes of the common people, the introduction of "capitalism" and a "market economy" seem to be chances for unfair profits and for allowing black-marketeers to make money.

Things are the opposite in Eastern Europe. In Poland, economic reforms, the so-called "Balcerowicz reforms" have been implemented and the people are forced to sacrifice a lot with wage freezing, in order to get the catastrophic inflation under control. People's lives are by no means easy there. Even the soap and toilet paper provided in hotels for foreigners are just as poor as in Moscow. However, the expression of people in the street is unexpectedly brighter. You can hear voices laughing everywhere. They are also kind to foreigners. It was the same also in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The self-confidence and pride of the citizens in creating their own democratic governments after liberating themselves from communism may be making them so.

THE POSSIBILITY OF SPIRITUAL RERESTROIKA

Nietzsche said "God is dead. He died for love for men." The god who has died most recently is, of course, the false god of communism. Now it is a time when even the opening article of the

“Izvestiya” (dated April 20, 1990) comments on the historical role the apostle Lenin played in quite cool and sometimes cynical tones. The day might come in the future when the Lenin Mausoleum is removed.

I cannot but feel that a kind of vacancy has been created in the minds of intellectuals and people of Russia after the death of this false god. People who go to church are increasing more and more in order to, assumably, fill the spiritual hollowness. The ones who came to church several years ago were only poor-looking old women. On the morning of Sunday, April 8, I rushed to the Elokhovskaya church, the “living church” which is located on the Stankevich street near the Kremlin.

The cathedral was jammed full with probably more than a 1000 faithful. It was just like crowded trains in the rush hour. Surprisingly, there were many young men and women, including couples with babies. Approximately 60% of people belonged to the younger generation. “Upper class women” wearing very high quality fur coats were also there. What sounded, following the bass and tenor of praying priests, was a beautiful chorus from the choir. Then all the faithful sang in chorus, which seemed to shake the cathedral. It was an impressive scene. It seemed to illustrate the way of coexistence of the collectivistic mind and metaphysical spirit, which is peculiar to the Orthodox Church. “Each person cannot be saved without being together with everybody” as Khomyakov, a Slavophile philosopher in the middle of 19th century, put it. It seemed fundamentally different from the individualistic or rather solipsistic mind and tendencies of Protestant theology and churches.

Religion was despised as the “opium of people” (Marx) and as “low grade vodka” (Lenin) and was persecuted fiercely in Russia. Because of the persecution, the blaze of true and pure faith is now burning in the Russia of Perestroika. Ironically enough, there may be no room for such blazes of pure faith in the overly tolerant climate of the Western societies. In the near future, I expect, religious faith would become the spiritual prop to support the civil society internally and the secular Perestroika begun by the politician might be deepened to become a spiritual Perestroika to lead the moral recovery of Russia.

THE VIOLENCE ON THE COURSE OF HISTORY

The essay which appeared in the afore-mentioned “Izvestiya”, written by Volobyev and entitled “Lenin and Our Historical Destiny,” raised the following questions: “Didn’t Lenin and the Bolshevik, under his leadership, commit violence toward Russian history by shifthing the direction of the development of history from the “normal” course to unknown road of socialism, which was covered with enormous misery and suffering ? Is Lenin responsible for a number of disasters which attacked the people, and if guilty, to what degree ?”

The Soviet communism which Lenin constructed is now economically at the brink of bankruptcy. Replacing the central command economy, the Soviets are trying to incorporate capitalism or a competitive market economy by way of grafting it on. It is as if they are trying to clear up the bitter experiment of socialism of the past 70 years and to learn again about the “normal” history and about the historical process of the development of capitalism and liberal democracy.

PLEKHANOV'S PROPHETIC CRITICISM ON LENIN

Looking back on the time when Lenin appeared on the stage of revolutionary history, Russian capitalism was still hanging at a low and immature state. Menshevik theorists keenly criticized the Bolsheviks, saying that it was thoughtless to try to construct “socialism” immediately at once under such circumstances and that such an attempt would go against the teaching of Marx. Plekhanov, who was called the “Father of Russian Marxism”, was among them.

In 1906, the congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, the predecessor of the present CPSU, was held in Stockholm and at the conference a fierce argument broke out between the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, concerning the land nationalization policy which Lenin insisted on. Plekhanov expressed his concern that such a policy would not abolish the slavery of peasants to state authority and, on the contrary, would allow “the old and semi-Asian order” of Russia to continue to exist.

Moreover, he raised the name of Wang Yang-Sun, a famous statesman of 11th century China who tried to let the state own all the land and the state-bureaucrats administer and manage all production, and bitterly ridiculed the policy of Lenin as “a plan of followers of Wang Yang-Sun in Russia.” He said that the gears of history of Russia might “be turned into reverse by an extremely strong force.”

Plekhanov then concluded his criticism on Lenin by saying, “We do not want <Kitaishchina> (China-ism, Chinese mentality).” In short, he worried about a resurgence of the old “oriental despotism” which had been contained in Lenin’s Bolshevik programme. Doesn’t the criticism of Plekhanov against Lenin sound very much like a prophecy, looking back on those days from the viewpoint of the present day ?

THE ESSENCE OF STALIN'S REVOLUTION FROM ABOVE

According to the rationale of Marx, a socialist revolution, so to speak, must be coming up on the schedule of history only when capitalism is fully developed and matured. The productive powers would increase and the industrialization would be advanced to the marginal point which the productive relationships of capitalism would allow. Then an overwhelming majority of

proletariat would plunder a handful of bourgeois, seize their economic power and nationalize it, making all wealth public-owned. Thus the "proletarian dictatorship" would be established and march forward straight towards the realization of a communist society, the last stage of socialism. These were the "laws of historical development" of Marx.

However, Russia, which actually succeeded in the "socialist revolution" thus upholding the banner of Marxism, was still an agricultural country with an immature capitalism. Demographic statistics of 1913 shows that 82% of the whole population were peasants and farmers. Therefore, ironically enough, the Communist Party itself had to enforce the "primary accumulation of capital" and the full development of industrialization that accompanies it, the very process which had been supposedly completed by the bourgeois, the "enemy of proletarian class", a long time before the revolution. Thus the Communist Party was forced to be the surrogate of the bourgeoisie, reigning over the popular masses and was forced to enforce the industrialization and modernization from above in very exploitative and oppressive way in order to complete the process of the "primary accumulation of capital."

Stalin, who became the "executor" of the proletarian dictatorship, suppressed the resistance of the peasants mercilessly, held down the standard of living of people to a low level and applied severe labour policies, as the early capitalists had done to the proletariat. These were the realities of the second "revolution from above."

At the same time, what was born in this process was a rigid system of exploitation and oppression by the totalitarian state bureaucracy. The Communist Party and the state bureaucrats under its control directed, administered and managed all the nationalized productive facilities and governed and exploited the proletariats and peasants who worked there. Such a system must have been no different from that which Plekhanov had denounced, "a plan of the followers of Wang Yang-Sun." It must have been seen as the revival or atavism of the old Russian "Asiatic constitution" in the eyes of Plekhanov and the Mensheviks.

THE END OF THE "STATE SOCIALIST" SYSTEM

Engels also discussed from a different angle what such an overpowering and exploitative socialism should become. In a letter to Bebel dated on Jan. 18th, 1884, he mentioned about the authoritarian and exploitative socialist system governed by the bureaucrats in the name of "state socialism." "If you want to study a model of state socialism, see the Java Islands," he wrote. "There, the Dutch government has organized all the production finely in a socialistic way based on the old and communistic village community system and holds the sales of all the products in their hands very skillfully. They apply about 100 million marks for the salaries of the bureaucrats and

military and moreover, they earn a net income of 7000 marks every year.”

These remarks of Engels have significant implications today 70 years after the Russian revolution. For the management of a colony, the Dutch government set themselves at the top of a kind of communistic village community which had existed traditionally from ancient times in the Java Islands. Using colonial bureaucrats, they organized and managed the production and sales in a socialistic way with the system of central command economy, utilizing the traditional community system. As the result, they spent 100 million marks to maintain the state bureaucracy and military, and additionally, earned 7000 marks to “pay the interest of the creditors of Holland,” which may be read as “for the interest of Nomenklatura.” Thus, Engels said that the system of oppression and exploitation that reigned over the Javanese people was nothing less than “state socialism.” The central command economy system of Soviet socialism may be said to be an extended version of the “state socialism” used to manage colonies, which Engels spoke of. And now, the experiment of Lenin who, in the wording in the essay of Volobyev again, “committed violence to Russian history by forcibly shifting the direction of the development from the “normal” course to the unknown road to socialism covered with enormous sufferings and misery” has come to a dead lock and the system of “state socialism” is now dying on the road.

AVOIDANCE OF CAPITALISTIC CIVILIZATION

I cannot but hastily trace back the development of Russian intellectual history of the 19th century, since the space of this paper is running short. The conclusion in advance should be as follows: In the Western countries, the development of a capitalist economy and the formation of civil society and its ethos, and also the progress of liberal democracy and its institutions, went together in parallel. On the other hand, what was characteristic of the Russian intellectual history was that democracy had an anti-capitalistic, anti-bourgeois and anti-liberal nature from its beginning. Looking back from the historical heights, most of the Russian Intelligentsia at that time seemed to be visionaries who tried to achieve socialism directly, rejecting the “normal” development of history that followed the course of Western history and skipping the stage of “capitalistic-bourgeois” civilization.

Gertsen (Herzen), one of the Zapadniki (Westernizers), who gave a tremendous influence on the Russian Intelligentsia, spoke bitterly in a section of his “Diary” as early as 1844: “The commercialism of the West and the industrialism of the present day are an infectious tumor of syphilis that contaminate the blood and bone of our society.” He later exiled himself to the West, observed the bare facts of Western societies and wrote after 1848 a series of remarkable critiques of Western civilization. Together with de Tocqueville, he was a pioneer as a sharp critic of the mass

society, taking almost a century in advance the same theme of *Rebellion of the Masses* by Ortega y Gasset. Gertsen observed that the “philistinism” covering the mass society was the “final shape” of Western civilization. Similar bitter criticisms of Western bourgeois civilization can be also found in the many writings, letters and diaries of his compatriots.

The Russian democracy that had just come to life turned toward the socialist ideology from the very beginning. Gertsen himself was disappointed with process of the February revolution of 1848, and returned to Russia “spiritually” to construct a historical philosophy of Narodnichestvo. The Russian intelligentsia, of course, raised voices of vehement protests against czarism. However, they were mixed with voices of social protests against the capitalist economy and bourgeois culture which were beginning to rise in Russia.

“CONSCIENCE—STRICKEN NOBLEMEN” WHO CURSED BOURGEOIS CIVILIZATION

It may be said that among the intelligentsia of the 19th century, the only one to give a positive evaluation to capitalism and liberalism was Botkin, who was the son of a major merchant. It is interesting enough, however, that Belinsky, who was the founder of atheistic socialism and the model for Dostoevsky’s character Ivan Karamazov, uttered the following comments just before his death, as if he had been influenced by Botkin: “The internal process of civil development in Russia will begin from the time when the Russian nobles transform themselves to bourgeois.”

However, in the situation of that time, Belinsky’s remark uttered on his death bed was wiped out by the loud voices of the socialist intelligentsia, who chanted in union the idea of anti-bourgeois and anti-capitalism. The “liberal” speeches and actions of Granovsky and Turgenev resulted in bitter ridicule, not only from the socialist intellectuals of the left, but also from the conservatives, who were in line with the slavophiles, such as Dostoevsky. Many of the slavophiles also expounded the idea that by firmly maintaining the Obshchina, the “social disaster” of the mass emergence of poverty-stricken proletariat such as in the West could be avoided, and they inclined to a sort of rural socialism.

A complex social psychology of the falling land-owning class can be smelled behind the criticisms, opposition and curses against capitalism, liberalism and bourgeois civilization common to the Russian intelligentsia. At the same time, they were the people who harbored a guilt-complex, in that they believed that they had obtained their educations at the cost of the blood, sweat and tears of the peasants who were suffering in dire poverty. In later years, Mikhailovsky, a theorist of Narodnik socialism, called them “conscience-stricken noblemen.” He pointed out that the intelligentsia was imbued with the socialist ideology due to their social psychology as sons of landowning noblemen who had been suffering with a guilt-complex for the poverty-stricken narod

in slavery.

"CONSCIENCE-STRICKEN BOURGEOIS" WHO SUPPORTED REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS

Liberal thought and movements were very weak in Russia. It has a causal relationship with the political spiritlessness and languishment and also with prematured reactionarism of the Russian bourgeoisie. It is a fact that Russian capitalism had gotten on the track of development since the 1870's through the inflow of massive foreign capital and the cordinal protection of the state. It may be said that it was an artificially forced culture of capitalism. Thus a group of big bourgeois appeared also in Russia after the 1880's. Many of them became patrons of science and art, and donated funds for hospitals, universities and academic publishers. For example, the Trechiakov brothers built a world-famous museum in Moscow, and Stanislavsky, a son of the Alekseev family, established the "Art Theater."

However, those Westernized big bourgeois were separated by a deep ditch from the world of peasants and common people where they too were recruited from. Instead of trying to win human rights against the absolute monarchy, just like the third class at the time of French Revolution did, they regularly "paid their respects" to the state bureaucrats of Petersburg and tried to obtain subsidies and protections from the state. They needed various favors from the state, such as protective tariffs. This is, of course, a common feature among the bourgeoisie of underdeveloped countries. At the same time, this was also because the fourth class had already emerged and begun to intimidate them.

In 1885, a famous strike broke out in the Morozov spinning factory in Nikolsk village. K. Skalkovsky, who was then a high government official and critic, wrote: "So soon have the ideologies of Marx and the International infiltrated into the environment of the factory workers in our country." The ideal of liberal democracy that was supposed to be represented by the new bourgeoisie had lost its vitality and was in the state of withering to death.

Of course, not all of the Russian bourgeois made compromise with czarism, becoming emasculated and being satisfied with the material benefits obtained by approaching the bureaucrats of Petersburg. High-spirited and independent bourgeois sought for a realization of political freedom, but they ended up to cooperate with various socialist factions. Yelpatyevsky, a writer who visited Ufa in the 1870's, pointed out that the big merchants in the region secretly sheltered terrorists and gave them monetary aid and that among the sons of those big merchants in later years, such a famous terrorist as Sazonov appeared. The man who supported Lenin's underground organization and offered abundant sum of money to the Bolshevik movement when the winter season had come upon the revolutionary movement due to the setback of the 1905 revolution was

Savva Morozov, a famous capitalist of the large spinning industry. Incidentally, he committed suicide in 1910.

Thus the "conscience-stricken bourgeois" eroded by a similar social psychology as that of "conscience-stricken noblemen" of the past, appeared on the eve of the Russian Revolution.

THE REVENGE OF HISTORY

I shall conclude in haste. Gertsen discussed as follows: The latest universal and humane ideal, that is, socialism was the intellectual product of many years of historical difficulties in the West. However, this ideal may be realized not by the bourgeoisified West, but by the nonbourgeois Russia swiftly and successfully. This is because backward countries can learn from the historical experiences of the advanced ones. Backward Russia has the special privilege to be able to progress while watching in advance the deadlock of the first-starters, the Western capitalist countries, and avoiding the impasse into which those countries have fallen. Gertsen argued from such a standpoint against liberal economists who expounded the idea that it was Russia's fate to repeat the "normal" historical course that the Western countries had already taken. In short, he insisted that because it was a latecomer onto the stage of history, Russia could anticipate and avoid the bog of bourgeois philistinism or meshchanstvo of the West, and could advance directly to socialism without going through the historical stage of bourgeois development.

Gertsen's theory of Narodnik socialism was built upon such historical and philosophical considerations as the privilege of late-comer countries.

With similar implications, Chernyshevsky also wrote in his *Critique of the Philosophical Prejudice against Communal Ownership*: "History cherishes the youngest grandson just like an old woman does." Dobroliubov also said, "It was fortunate for us to come late upon the stage of history behind other countries."

However, we have now a broader perspective of history after 70 some years since the Russian Revolution, and have learned something from the historical experiences of a century or one-and-a-half centuries from the time of Gertsen, Chernyshevsky, Plekhanov and Lenin. Perhaps we no longer think that "history cherishes the youngest grandson just like an old woman does." Rather, we tend to consider that the Goddess of history sometimes behaves mercilessly and treats cruelly. Isn't she bitterly retaliating against the country that tried to skip the stages of "normal" historical development? Russian intellectual history of the 19th century seems now to be receiving the cold judgment of the Goddess.

A remark by Bulgakov, who got over the Marxism of his young days just the same as Berdiaev did by philosophies of Kant and Dostoevsky and who later became an excellent theologian of the

Russian Orthodox Church, comes to mind with a prophetic tone: “Revolution is a spiritual child of the Intelligentsia. Accordingly, the history of Revolution has been the historical judgment on the Intelligentsia.” (from *Vekhi* in 1909)

(Written on May 5th)

この講演原稿は、1990年9月21日～同24日まで、ポーランドの首都ワルシャワ郊外のプルトゥスク城 (Pultusk Castle) で開催された「ソ連・東欧の脱共産化に関する会議」のために執筆したものである。出席者はポーランドのワルシャワ大学を始め、チェコ、ハンガリー、ブルガリア、ソ連の各大学の教授たち、西側は米、英、独、スウェーデン、日本で、全部で約30名が参加した。