

Soviet Studies

Vol. X

October 1958

No. 2

BOLSHEVIKS AND THEIR ALLIES AFTER 1917: THE IDEOLOGICAL PATTERN

Introduction

THE Petrograd coup on 7 November 1917 and the series of more or less similar coups that followed throughout the country, brought to power in Russia the Bolshevik Party, 'a party of a new type', designed and trained by its creator and leader in such a way as to achieve as complete as possible a domination over the life of the country. Yet the victorious and now dominant party was by no means in all respects such as Lenin would have wished. One of the most important aspects in which the party differed from Lenin's idea was its lack of ideological unity. Far from being single-minded in matters of ideology, the party members exhibited a remarkable variety of views; the differences ranged from those of emphasis to serious conflicts of outlook.

Moreover, the Bolshevik party was not running the country alone. In the civilian, military and economic administration, as well as in the field of propaganda, the Bolsheviks made use of persons and groups ideologically alien to themselves, but possessing the particular skills required for this or that function, who were for whatever reason prepared to collaborate with them. In those days recognition of the practical usefulness of such persons or groups was accompanied by a certain degree of toleration for their general views.

However, despite this toleration of heterodoxy within and without the party ranks, there was the ever-present tendency to impose the official ideology, and the obstacles in the path of those who might wish to give expression to a coherent system of unorthodox views were many and often insurmountable. It is therefore difficult to discover exactly what went on in the minds of those who made up what might be called the class of Lenin's collaborators, i.e. all those who had some position of power or influence in the apparatus of the Bolshevik dictatorship in its widest sense.

Nevertheless, certain trends and tendencies of thought are clearly distinguishable. They were mostly continuations of pre-1917 ideological traditions and their sub-divisions. There were the various branches of the Marxist tree: Leninism, Bogdanovism, Social-Democratism, and the singular offshoot of Makhayevism; there were Populism in its two main forms, radical and moderate (Neo-Populism), and Anarchism; there was the ideology of industrial managers and technicians—Technocratism; the etatist ideology in its new form of National Bolshevism; and finally the eccentric development of religious thought, Fyodorovism. In what follows we shall briefly consider in turn the roots, the main representatives and variations, the institutionalized forms (if any) and the fates of these ten trends of thought. No attempt is made to deal fully with Leninism, only such aspects of it being stressed as illuminate its distinction from the other Marxist trends.

Leninism

The officially prevailing ideology was, of course, Leninism. In an article on the occasion of Lenin's fiftieth birthday in 1920, Stalin described Leninists as that group of Marxists which 'switches the centre of gravity of the problem from the outward recognition of Marxism to its implementation, its transmutation into life. Designing ways and means of realizing Marxism which correspond to circumstances, changing these ways and means when circumstances change—that is what this group principally pays attention to', he wrote.¹ Accordingly, the complex of accepted ideas of this group contained a small number of basic propositions of Marxian social philosophy in a dogmatic and slogan-like form, and a large body of Lenin's ideas on organization and tactics for the conquest and maintenance of power by the party—an exposition of which falls outside the scope of this article. According to Stalin, many practitioners of Leninism did not particularly love theory; the practitioners (he said) tended to brush the theory aside.²

When they did interest themselves in theory, it was Leninism rather than Marxism. The writings of Lenin himself, Stalin, Zinoviev and other Leninists were concentrated on current political problems which were analysed in terms of Lenin's organizational and tactical principles and of past experience in their application. When other subjects were treated, they were also related to the central subject of power—the famous demand for 'party-ness' in philosophy, literature, etc.³). Virtuosity in political thinking and practice contrasts sharply with the crude and elementary ideas and forms in other fields. In education their attention was concentrated on liquidating illiteracy and on the

superficial acquisition by broad masses of the people of the current Leninist slogans⁴ (Krupskaya was made the head of the 'Political Enlightenment' department of the Commissariat of Education); in the arts—such things as pulling down old monuments in the principal towns and replacing them by statues of revolutionaries quickly produced on government orders (known officially as 'monumental propaganda'!);⁵ in literature—the propagation of Demyan Bedny's utilitarian verses. Economic problems were treated, apart from the political, from a peculiar technological point of view—the technician and the bookkeeper personified for the Leninists economic wisdom.⁶ In accordance with the guiding principle of Leninist ethics—'morality is what serves the destruction of the old society of exploiters, and the uniting of all toilers around the proletariat which is creating the new society of communists'⁷—practical morals were thought to be best based upon considerations of political expediency.

It was this system of ideas that largely dominated the Bolshevik party training and party propaganda in Lenin's lifetime, and still more so after his death. As Stalin consolidated his power, the ideological field was ever more exclusively occupied by the basic tenets of Leninism until, in the thirties, merged with National Bolshevism and hero worship, they produced Stalinism.

Bogdanovism

The second strongest ideology (in the degree to which it was able to express itself, in the influence it had upon official policy and in the organizational facilities at its disposal) among the former revolutionaries after 1917 was undoubtedly Bogdanovism in the broadest sense. This seems to be the most appropriate name for the trend of which A. A. Bogdanov (Malinovski) was the leading representative and which had originated in the realization, at the beginning of the century, by some of the leading young Marxists that the 'revisionists' both in Russia and abroad were right when they attacked orthodox Marxism for its philosophical insufficiency. This realization prompted Bogdanov and his friends to seek a better epistemological foundation for the Marxian system, and they believed they had found it in the teaching of Mach and Avenarius. This Russian brand of a blending of Marxism and Empirio-criticism found its first literary expression in a symposium 'Essays in Realistic Philosophy', published in 1904.⁸ Between 1904 and 1909 the adherents of this ideology vigorously pursued their theoretical investigations, finding more and more obsolete elements and gaps in the Marxian doctrine, and trying to replace them and fill the gaps by modern ideas or by products of their own thought. Thus, apart from several related epistemological systems (Bogdanov's

Empiriomonism, P. S. Yushkevich's Empirio-symbolism), they developed a new logic instead of the obsolete Marxian dialectics (Ya. A. Berman), a new ontology (Bogdanov's Tectology, or 'universal organizational science' with extensive sociological content), ethics (S. Volski's 'Philosophy of Struggle'), and finally, a new religious teaching (A. V. Lunacharski and M. Gorki). The new trend was extended to literary criticism by V. M. Shulyatkov, Lunacharski and P. I. Lebedev-Polyanski, and to the study of history by M. N. Pokrovski. At the same time all these people considered themselves as Marxists and Social-Democrats, and most of them were among the leading members of the Bolshevik faction; so much that Plekhanov held Bogdanovism to be the official philosophy of Bolshevism, and accused Lenin of philosophical indifference and betrayal of Marxism.⁹ After 1909 Bogdanovism (in the broad sense in which we are here using this term) was the official ideology of the 'Vperyod' sub-faction, and after the latter's disintegration, of its Geneva group. After the break with the Leninists, the attention of Bogdanov, Lunacharski and their followers was concentrated on problems of creating, in conscious opposition to the existing bourgeois culture, a distinct 'proletarian culture'. Lunacharski and Lebedev-Polyanski nursed in the emigration a group of talented 'proletarian poets' from among genuine workers.¹⁰

In 1917 most Bogdanovists (notable exceptions being Bogdanov himself and Gorki) again joined the Bolshevik party. Their leader in the party was Lunacharski, who entered the Bolshevik government as Commissar for Education. Lunacharski's popularity was such that he was apparently the only person—apart from Lenin and Trotski—whose appointment as People's Commissar was greeted with applause at the second congress of Soviets. The Commissariat of Education (or rather, 'Enlightenment'—*prosveshcheniye*) had to control and direct all the cultural activities in the state apart from those directly controlled by the party. Lunacharski summarized his views on the main problems confronting him in a pamphlet entitled 'Cultural Tasks of the Working Class', which was published by the VTsIK.¹¹

'The socialist culture of the future will be a culture of the whole of mankind', he wrote, 'not of a class, . . . harmonious, . . . of a classical type, where the content . . . developing itself in a healthy organic process receives a completely fitting form. The culture of the struggling proletariat is a sharply isolated class culture built on struggle . . . of a romantic type, where the content, being tensely determined, runs ahead of the form, because there is no time to care for a sufficiently . . . perfect form for this stormy and tragic content'. Common to both cultures was the struggle for the ideal, 'for the blossoming of collectivism of the mass life not on the principles of compulsion or of

herdlikeness . . . but . . . on a completely new principle of an organic, or rather, super-organic, free and natural fusion of personalities in a super-personal unity'. The achievements of the proletarian culture so far were: first, the Marxian method; secondly, the gains in the political struggle; thirdly, the achievements in the economic struggle—trade unions and co-operatives; and the fourth form of proletarian culture was the struggle for enlightenment. For further successes the working class had to produce many specialists in intellectual and other cultural work, to create its own intelligentsia. But intellectuals of a non-proletarian background could also join in performing this noble task.

Four days after the seizure of power, on 29 October 1917, Lunacharski issued a declaration on the policy to be pursued by his Commissariat. The main reforms announced included the creation of a comprehensive school system in which schools of all levels, from primary to the university, would be integrated; all schools were to be taken over by local government bodies.¹² In accordance with the original Bogdanovist impulse—to supplement Marxian thinking with modern ideas—the Commissariat of Education under Lunacharski and Pokrovski (who was appointed Deputy Commissar) embarked upon a policy of compulsory introduction into the cultural life of modernist principles: co-education, free education (Dalton Plan) and pupil's participation in the school administration, the labour principle, election of schoolmasters,¹³ etc. The department of Higher Education Establishments abolished all educational requirements for matriculation and opened universities and institutes to everybody of sixteen years or over, abolished all degrees, diplomas and state examinations, introduced the participation of students' representatives in all governing bodies, abolished the old faculties of law and replaced them by new faculties of social sciences, established Workers' Faculties, etc.¹⁴ The theatres were soon in the hands of the modernist producer V. Meyerhold in Moscow and Gorki's friend the actress M. F. Andreyeva in Petrograd. In poetry, the Futurists had the full backing of the authorities and were allowed to pose as a quasi-official trend.¹⁵

When Stalinists finally prevailed in the party leadership, Lunacharski was dismissed from the post of Commissar for Education in 1929, but a radical change in educational policies came only in 1932 when Zhdanov was put in charge of cultural matters and began introducing that blend of Leninism and National Bolshevism which became typical of the cultural aspects of Stalinism. Pokrovski, who had dominated historical research and teaching (as the head of the historical section of the Communist Academy, of the Historical Institute of Red Professorship, the Central Administration of Archives, the Society of Marxist Historians, and finally, after the 'integration' of the Academy

of Sciences in 1929, of its Institute of History) remained a deputy commissar for education until his death in 1932.

Apart from the Commissariat of Education, the main organizational centre of Bogdanovism was the so-called *Proletkult*, where the dominant influence was that of Bogdanov himself. Bogdanov's views on the proletarian culture differed from those of Lunacharski. Proletarian culture for him was identical with the culture of the future socialist society. The creation of a proletarian culture was a condition for a real proletarian revolution (in Lenin's view, on the contrary, it was much easier to bring about a 'cultural revolution' after a successful political one), or rather, the most important part of the revolution itself. In its content the proletarian culture must be creative rather than destructive. Cultural organizations of the proletariat must be independent of its political or economic organizations.¹⁶ 'Proletarian Cultural and Education Organizations' (*Proletkult*) were set up in 1917 before the Bolshevik coup. In his declaration on policy after the coup, Lunacharski said that 'the spontaneously created cultural and educational class institutions of workers, soldiers and peasants' were to enjoy full autonomy and be independent both of the central state authorities and the municipal authorities. At a conference convened by Lunacharski in 1918 a Central Committee of the *Proletkult* was elected with the Bogdanovist F. I. Kalinin as Chairman; after his death a few months later, Lebedev-Polyanski took over the office.¹⁷ The organization, which had several tens of thousands of members, managed to maintain its independence until 1919, when it was subordinated to the Commissariat of Education as one of its departments and had to co-ordinate its work with the department of extra-mural education headed by Krupskaya.¹⁸ The direction of the *Proletkult* was transferred to the Central Council of Trade Unions in 1925, and it was abolished altogether in 1932.

There were other forms of organized Bogdanovism. Influenced by Bogdanov's ideas on the organization of social experience, two leading members of the *Proletkult*—P. M. Kerzhentsev and A. K. Gastev—concentrated their energies from the early 1920s on the problems of scientific organization of productive work. Gastev, who had founded and was in charge of the Central Institute of Labour, thought that the first task was to educate in people the will to organizational work; this could be done by first concentrating on the study and organization of the simplest operations, such as blow and pressure. Thus the Institute would be able to train a generation of instructors who would act as 'older brothers' to the rest of the proletariat and help to bring elements of organization into its work. Kerzhentsev, on the other hand, insisted that the main problem was not the organization of the work

of an individual but the organization of a whole enterprise, and, further, a planned shaping of the state's policy in its administrative and economic aspects. The concept of scientific organization of labour became identical for him with the concept of building up socialism. Socialism was for Kerzhentsev essentially the scientific organization of labour. In 1923 he and his followers founded the League of Scientific Organization of Labour to counterbalance Gastev's Institute, and after a few weeks it claimed several tens of thousands of members.¹⁹ Like the *Proletkult* itself, the Institute and the League were not abolished until the 1930s.

Another theory of a Bogdanovist kind (supplementing Marxian by modernist ideas) was the Winged Eros theory on the relations between the sexes in the new society put forward by another prominent member of the *Proletkult*, Alexandra Kollontay. She did not advocate, as is often supposed, promiscuity, but held that individuals should be able to associate with different people of the opposite sex for different purposes and according to the attraction of their different traits.²⁰ Like all Bogdanovist tendencies, this one was gradually suppressed during the 1930s.

Social-Democratism

In the election to the Constituent Assembly at the end of 1917 there were three main Social Democratic lists: those of Plekhanov's 'Unity' group, the official Menshevik party (consisting of former Internationalists and most of the 'revolutionary defencists'²¹) headed by Martov and F. Dan, and the group of Defencist Social-Democrats headed by A. N. Potresov. This division was symbolic; throughout the years of Lenin's rule there existed three main Social-Democratic trends among the former revolutionaries, reaching far beyond the limits of the three dwindling party groupings.

The first, Plekhanovist, trend was primarily concerned with the Marxian teaching. Its adherents were mainly engaged in collecting, editing, commenting on and popularizing the writings of Marx, Engels and Plekhanov, as well as in applying their theories to particular philosophical, sociological, literary and artistic problems. They wanted to preserve and propagate the ideas of their teachers in their entirety and purity, thus differing from both Leninists and Bogdanovists. The most prominent representatives of this trend were D. B. Ryazanov, L. I. Akselrod, A. M. Deborin and I. K. Luppol. Ryazanov joined the Bolshevik party, and most of their followers were also in the party. The main organizational centres of Plekhanovism were the Marx-Engels Institute, founded by Ryazanov in 1918, and the Philosophical section of the Socialist (later Communist) Academy established in 1919.

The second, Martovist, trend was not so much interested in Marxian theory itself as in its practical realization through a proletarian socialist revolution. Inasmuch as they thought that the social basis of Lenin's rule was the working class, and that the Leninists—though in a more or less wrong and often quite unpleasant way—were laying the foundations of a socialist order, they were prepared to co-operate with and to defend the Leninist revolution.²² In this sense, adherents of the Martovist Social-Democratic trend were not only the members of the official 'Centrist' Menshevik party (many of whom, perhaps the majority, joined the Bolsheviks in 1919-21), but also many Bolsheviks who had never had any connections with the official Menshevism. Those who took the Marxian teaching seriously, and wholly accepted it, believed in the historic mission of the proletariat and considered it their duty to make the proletariat fulfil its mission—all these should perhaps more properly be regarded as Martovists, even if they had always been in Lenin's party. They usually had little understanding of problems of power, and equally little interest in them. They were usually dissatisfied with Lenin's terroristic methods as applied to themselves, but justified them in relation to others. Those of them who were in the Menshevik party or who were in the more or less organized oppositions within the Bolshevik party (such as the Democratic Centralism Group or the Workers' Opposition) tried to impress upon the Leninists the necessity of concessions to themselves in order that they should be able to co-operate more effectively.

The third, Potresovist, trend began as a rejection on moral grounds of the principle, shared by Plekhanov and Lenin, of amoralism in politics and of Martov's accommodating attitude, for reasons of expediency, towards immoral practices of which he in principle disapproved. After the 1905 revolution it developed into a rejection of the official party view on the workers' legal organizations as merely a tool for furthering the party's ends. This was the starting point of the policy of 'liquidationism'. During the world war 'liquidationism' became 'defencism'. In 1917 and after the Bolshevik coup, quite logically, the problems of preserving and regaining democratic freedoms came to the forefront of Potresov's and his friends' political thinking. They had no illusions about the Leninist policy and sharply attacked the Martovists for having such illusions. They also recognized the reasons for the latter's illusions—the Martovists' clinging to the obsolete concepts of Marxist propaganda (Potresov's impression of the Menshevik conference in December 1917 was summarized in two words—'Dead souls!'). Reformist in their approach to practical problems before 1917, they were tempted to try the same approach under

Lenin, particularly after the introduction of the NEP. They were mostly concentrated in co-operatives, then also in the trade unions and economic organs (V. G. Groman was one of the key figures in Gosplan). Even among the Bolsheviks there were people with almost Potresov's views, e.g. G. I. Myasnikov and his group. But not all Potresovists considered the reformist approach appropriate in conditions of Lenin's rule; many placed their hopes on a more or less distant new anti-Bolshevik revolution.²³

The fate of these three Social-Democratic trends was similar. Their respective leaders died (Plekhanov 1918) or emigrated (Martov, 1920; Potresov, 1925) and the trends themselves were broken up in 1930, the former as a result of Stalin's intervention in the philosophical discussion of that year and the latter two in consequence of the Menshevik trial. Some adherents of these Social-Democratic trends were able to work in the Society of Old Bolsheviks or the Society of Former Political Hard Labour Prisoners and Exiles until these societies were dissolved in 1935.

Makhayevism

The flooding in 1917 and after of the ranks of the Bolshevik party with large numbers of unskilled workers, soldiers, agricultural labourers and urban *déclassés* greatly strengthened yet another ideology that had for long existed on the fringes of the party—Makhayevism. This ideology was given a systematic form by a former Polish Social-Democrat, Makhaiski (J. W. Machajski)²⁴ while in banishment in Siberia in 1898–1900,²⁵ though the anti-intellectual bias which was fundamental to it had been known in Russian Social-Democracy from its earliest beginnings. Another theorist of Makhayevism was E. Lozinski.²⁶

Makhayevist theory was an attempt, starting from the basic conceptions of orthodox Marxism, to find an answer to the question of the place occupied in the social organism by the intelligentsia. In Makhaiski's view, knowledge is a kind of means of production, and its possession by the intelligentsia means that the latter is a separate social class. In the process of production and distribution the intelligentsia appropriates a part of the surplus value; hence it is an exploiting class. This is the main thesis of Makhayevism. The interests of the intelligentsia are therefore opposed to the interests of the proletariat and the 'Socialist' phraseology of the intelligentsia is merely a device in the struggle for its own interests. It wants to use the proletariat for the socialization of the means of material production, which would then be managed by the intelligentsia without interference from the capitalists. But the intelligentsia does not want to 'socialize knowledge',

the means of intellectual production; rather, they want to preserve it in their own monopolistic possession. Thus Socialism is the 'class ideal' of the intelligentsia, which wants to replace capitalists and to concentrate in its hands all means of domination over the proletariat. The proletariat, on the other hand, must strive to 'socialize knowledge' by removing the inequality of opportunity for acquiring it, and the practical way to this is the abolition of inheritance of any property. The proletariat must also make it impossible for the intelligentsia to appropriate surplus value—by a levelling of incomes. Everybody must receive the same remuneration for his work.

We do not need to go here into the Makhayevist views on the organization and tactics which the proletariat should adopt in order to achieve a Makhayevist revolution—they are basically syndicalist. But it is interesting to note that, until such a revolution, they expected the 'hungry masses' to be tempted to use every opportunity to destroy as much as possible of 'those cursed goods which they endlessly create and which are always taken away by the masters', and approved of such destruction. And the seizure of power by the proletariat would be used for seizing the property of the educated society, of the 'learned world'.

It is easy to see to what extent Makhayevist ideas influenced the thinking and behaviour of a large section of the Bolshevik party after 1917. They were the core of all the 'intellectual-baiting' tendencies. Moreover, they greatly influenced early Bolshevik legislation and party policy, whatever the explanations given at the time for various measures may have been. The first law on inheritance abolished inheritance altogether and merely provided (as a temporary measure until the full development of social security schemes) for a limited use of an estate for the maintenance of the unemployed relatives of the deceased.²⁷ The attempts to introduce a maximum salary for party members not exceeding the earnings of a skilled worker were also, at least partly, due to the influence of Makhayevist ideas, as was the policy of the resettlement of workers into the houses and flats of the bourgeoisie and intellectuals, and vice versa. The Makhayevist cultural nihilism and vandalism were also characteristic of the outlook of many party members.

The Makhayevist trend was fashionable in the party, despite half-hearted reproofs from the party authorities, until 1936, when Stalin declared that the intellectual-baiting of the Makhayevists must no longer be applied to the new Soviet intelligentsia.

Anarchism

Anarchism was formally recognized by the Bolsheviks as an allied political trend during the 1917 revolution and the first period after

the seizure of power. Anarchists, who in 1917 organized themselves in the Federation of Anarchist Groups, joined several Soviets and were influential in one of the most important of them—in Kronstadt, where they were as active as the Bolsheviks in undermining the authority of the Provisional Government. They took an active part in the latter's overthrow—there were four Anarchists in the Military Revolutionary Committee in Petrograd—and in the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly. The squad of sailors which dispersed the Assembly was commanded by an Anarchist, V. Zheleznyakov. Individual Anarchists went further and worked in the organs of the new regime (for example, A. Ge was a member of the VTsIK, later vice-chairman of the Cheka in Pyatigorsk). But the Anarchists' attitude towards the Bolsheviks was necessarily ambivalent, and already in 1918 some of them turned against the Bolshevik dictatorship while others continued to co-operate during at least a part of the Civil War (N. I. Makhno). Anarcho-Syndicalists (whose main theorist in Russia was D. I. Novomirski) in particular tried to co-operate with the Bolsheviks in what might be called the Martovite fashion, that is, co-operating in practice while offering ideological opposition. Until his death in 1921, Prince P. A. Kropotkin, the theorist of Anarcho-Communism, was one of the main living 'personifications of the Revolution', as it were, and as such he was useful to the Bolsheviks from the propaganda point of view. Anarchist organizations were finally suppressed in 1921, following the Kronstadt uprising, and only in the Society of Former Political Hard Labour Prisoners did a group of 'Communist-Anarchists' (led by A. A. Karelin) survive until 1929-30.²⁸ Some theoretical and historical work was permitted to several leading Anarchist theorists (A. A. Borovoi, N. K. Lebedev) until the early 1930s.²⁹ Indeed, as late as 1926, one Anarchist writer claimed that 'the October Revolution gave impetus to the Anarchist movement. A number of interesting trends and tendencies appeared in the stormy stream of Anarchist ideas under the impact of the colossal events'.³⁰

Anarcho-Syndicalist tendencies were, however, felt far outside Anarchist organizations, and many members of the Bolshevik party shared Syndicalist views. The Workers' Control in industry, as practised during the period of War Communism, was in fact unsuccessful workers' administration, and its enthusiasts were clearly Syndicalists. The Workers' Opposition, with its demand for a Congress of Producers which would administer the national economy, was rightly branded at the tenth party congress in 1921 as an Anarcho-Syndicalist deviation. But despite the tenth congress such views lingered throughout the 1920s.

Radical Populism

Radical Populism, like Anarchism, was at first a fully recognized political ideology. It was the official ideology of the party of Left Socialist Revolutionaries which had broken off from the Socialist Revolutionary party in the autumn of 1917 and allied itself with the Bolsheviks. The Left SRs took an active part in the October coup (there were fourteen Left SRs among the sixty-six original members of the Military Revolutionary Committee in Petrograd, and P. I. Lazimir was its first chairman; Izmailov was chairman of the Committee of the Baltic Fleet), and a few days after the coup they entered into the coalition government with the Bolsheviks. This co-operation on the part of the Left SRs ensured to the Bolsheviks the support of a considerable part of the peasantry, whose most radical spokesmen they were. Their main concern was the partition of the landlords' estates; otherwise the policies they advocated were very similar to the Bolsheviks', especially the latter's Left wing.

The official coalition ended in 1918; the Left SRs were unable to swallow Lenin's opportunism over the Brest-Litovsk treaty, resigned from the government (though remaining in such state organs as the Cheka, where Aleksandrovich was Dzerzhinski's deputy) and organized a plot which was intended to renew the war with Germany through the assassination of the German ambassador. When this plot misfired, the party attempted to seize power in Moscow (in July), but failed and disintegrated. In 1920, however, they began once more to function openly, reviving the journal *Znamya* where they advocated 'dictatorship of the masses as against dictatorship of a party' and the formation of a trade union co-operative organization of the peasants. The movement was suppressed by 1922, but while it existed it was supported by some of the leading intellectuals—the famous poets Blok and Esenin, the literary critic and publicist Ivanov-Razumnik, etc.

In 1918 some Left SRs, led by N. Kovalskaya, A. Ustinov, A. Kolegayev and (prior to his death in Switzerland) the veteran Populist revolutionary M. A. Natanson, organized a 'Party of Revolutionary Communism' which accused the Bolsheviks of disregard for human personality, of 'being interested in the people's belly rather than in their spirit',³¹ and of Taylorism in industry; they were against the use of armed detachments for food procurement, and advocated the speedy formation of agrarian and factory communes. The party approved of the Bolshevik foreign policy, tried to co-operate with them as far as possible, and in 1920 joined the Bolshevik party. Another SR group which attempted direct co-operation with the Bolsheviks was the so-called Minority of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, who broke off from the main party in 1919, fearing—like the official Menshevik

party—a victory of the Whites which would bring back the landlords. They published a journal *Narod* and the group was better known under this name. They tried at the same time to co-operate with the Bolsheviks and to compete with them ideologically—in this again resembling the official Menshevik party. The group disintegrated in 1922. Yet another group of Radical Populists—the Maximalists—who had split off from the SR party in 1904, also co-operated with the Bolsheviks after October, and had representatives in the VTsIK. It disintegrated in 1920 and the majority joined the Bolshevik party.

After 1922 the former Left SRs (e.g. M. Spiridonova), the Maximalists and other former leading revolutionary Populists (e.g. N. A. Morozov), were merely permitted, so to speak, to 'personify the Revolution' in the Society of Former Political Hard Labour Prisoners and Exiles.

Neo-Populism

Neo-Populism was essentially a continuation of the Liberal Populism of the 1880s and 90s. The mass of statistical material collected by Zemstvo statisticians made possible a new approach to the problems of peasant life. Abstract ideological schemes as well as theories based on the study of entirely different societies (foreign or urban) waned in the face of the abundant factual information about the actual conditions of Russian peasants and the processes taking place in the peasant economy.³² A new complex of ideas gradually emerged, centred around the concept of the Peasant Labour Economy (*trudovoye krestyanskoye khozyaistvo*) worked out by A. N. Chelintsev,³³ A. V. Chayanov³⁴ and others.

The future of Russia, according to the Neo-Populists, lay in the future of her largest social class—the peasantry. The peasants were much more than just the object of care and help by the intelligentsia, as the Liberal Populists had tended to regard them. They were the subjects of continuous change in the internal organization and functioning of individual peasant economies, and this autonomous process was as much as anything else determining the social change in Russia. The Neo-Populists therefore saw their task as the continuous detailed analysis of the development of peasant economy, elucidation of its needs and assistance in their satisfaction. The intelligentsia's place was side by side with the peasantry, but if it wished to find this place it should free itself from all the usual ideological aberrations based on ignorance and prejudice.³⁵

The main strongholds of Neo-Populism were the agricultural co-operative organizations and the Central Statistical Administration which was in the hands of former Zemstvo statisticians until 1929.

Its academic centre was the Agricultural Academy (near Moscow), where Professors Chayanov, N. D. Kondratyev and others organized in 1920 a Seminary for Agricultural Economics and Politics which was later (1927) transformed into a Research Institute and joined by Professors Chelintsev and Makarov who returned from the emigration. Frustrated during the period of War Communism, the Neo-Populists saw in the NEP the dawn of a new life. But the collectivization of agriculture put an end to the agricultural co-operatives and the academic work was stopped in 1930, when all leading Neo-Populists were arrested in connection with the so-called case of the Peasant Labour Party.

Technocratism

Technocratic tendencies in Russia can be traced back to the last quarter of the 19th century. The swift progress of industrialization during the 1880s and 90s created a large category of industrial specialists—technical and commercial managers of big capitalist concerns. These soon acquired an influential position in the business world, and played an active, often leading, role in the organizations of various branches of industry (the mining industry of the South, oil and steel, etc.). Their main central organization was the Council of the Congresses of Industry and Commerce; another important form of organization of industrial specialists was the various voluntary societies for the promotion of industry and trade.

The most brilliant spokesman of the technical intelligentsia was the great scientist D. I. Mendeleev. In the last years of his life he recorded in print his views on a wide range of subjects of philosophical and public interest, from epistemology to economic and educational policy, thus developing a complete ideology of what might be called Russian Technocratism.³⁶ Mendeleev was primarily interested in raising the wealth and well-being of Russia through the development of her industries. This could best be achieved through the application of scientific methods and a determined government policy of protection and encouragement. The form of government is relatively unimportant. Mendeleev urged like-minded people—whom he calls realists (in contradistinction to both idealists and materialists) and gradualists—to abstain from ‘politics mongering’ (*politikanstvo*) and to concentrate on concrete practical work, making use of such opportunities as exist. The advance of science and technology, training scientifically-minded and patriotic public figures and organizing and expanding Russian industry, were for Mendeleev the tasks worth undertaking.

The World War marked a new stage in the development of technocratic trends. As in the other belligerent countries, the government and the people of Russia realized in 1915 that the war they were fighting could not be conducted successfully unless measures were taken to adjust the country's economy to the abnormal conditions. The result was the creation in 1915-16 of special councils and committees for the state control of economic life, as well as of institutions of an unofficial character—the War Industries Committees. All these institutions employed in their headquarters, regional and local branches a great number of specialists of various kinds. Invested with wide powers (as were the officials of the Special Councils and their branches), or anticipating for themselves and for the social groups they represented a great increase in influence and social importance after the war (as did the personnel of the unofficial bodies), they engaged not only in the immediate work of mobilizing the war effort, but also in deliberation as to the ways the Russian economy should go in the years to come, and long-term economic planning: 'and it is here' wrote one of them, Professor Sirinov, 'that the whole might of the industrial public initiative has displayed itself, it is here that they have touched upon issues of enormous state importance.'³⁷ Another active member of the Moscow War Industries Committee, Professor V. I. Grinevetski, wrote a book, *The Post-war Prospects of Russian Industry*,³⁸ which in fact served as the basis for all subsequent economic planning.

The impact of the February revolution on both the official and the unofficial bodies was two-fold. On the one hand, wherever possible they were called upon to replace the old bureaucratic machinery which had been destroyed; on the other hand, all these institutions, as well as new combinations of them—the Economic Council and the Supreme Economic Committee in Petrograd, Supply Committees in the provinces and districts—were flooded by representatives of the so-called 'revolutionary democracy' whose interests were directed towards 'deepening Revolution' rather than towards the positive work of guiding the Russian economy. Any productive work was made all but impossible by this 'revolutionary democratic' majority. The democratic idea was never particularly attractive to the technical intelligentsia, and the failure of democracy in 1917 must have made even those who had tended towards it doubt the validity of the democratic premises, and strengthened the elite-ist tendencies in their thinking.

It was with such views that the majority of these 'bourgeois specialists' found themselves in the service of the Bolshevik state. With his usual acute sense of reality, Lenin advanced the theory that the capitalist economy, in its monopolistic stage, creates forms of economic management which precipitate socialist practice; it was

therefore not necessary to destroy the apparatus of the economic management of the country, but simply to take it over. How this was done in practice is described in detail by L. N. Kritsman and G. V. Tsyperovich.³⁹ Ministries, together with their experts, were subordinated to the *collegia* of the People's Commissariats. War-time institutions for the regulation of the national economy were transformed into Chief Administrations (*Glavniye upravleniya*, or for short, *Glavki*) of the respective branches. Some of the Chief Administrations were created out of former monopolistic associations of industrialists. In those branches where there had been no monopolistic development, or it was incomplete, it was made compulsory. Instead of the expected increased prestige and influence in public affairs, which would have corresponded to the importance of their function as managers of the national economy, the technical intelligentsia found that they were merely tolerated as a necessary evil under the new regime. Yet the very fact that their declared political enemies could not do without them must have further strengthened their belief in the social value of their class. Isolation from the political life of the country was another factor stimulating the development of their class consciousness. The official Leninist policy of suspicion, and the open hostility of the Makhayevist elements, made it extremely difficult for them to reconcile themselves to the Bolshevik regime. Hence their hopes that it might be succeeded by a system under which they would not have to fear interference with their work either from the party commissar or from the Works' Council, though they heeded Mendeleyev's reminder that in Russia it was often preferable not to be too outspoken, indeed not to talk about one's views at all unless there was a compelling reason to do so. The old technocratic ideas were thus strengthened by the conditions of life and work under Lenin.

The main organizational centres of technocratically-minded specialists were the State Planning Commission (*Gosplan*) and the Supreme Council of the National Economy, as well as the various societies of engineers and technicians; the main academic centres were the Moscow Technical High School (of which Grinevetski had been the director) and the Thermo-technical Institute set up in 1921. The most outstanding individual representatives of the group were specialists in fuel and power—P. I. Palchinski (who had been the virtual head of the Central War Industries Committee, and the Deputy Minister of Trade and Industry in Kerenski's government), L. K. Ramzin (who organized and headed the Thermo-technical Institute) and I. G. Aleksandrov (the future builder of the *Dneproges*). They took the leading part in working out the GOELRO plan of electrification and in the subsequent economic planning and management,

developing further the ideas put forward by Mendeleyev and Grinevetski.

Organized technocratism was eliminated in 1928-30 in connection with the Shakhly and Industrial Party trials, when many leading people were shot or imprisoned and others reduced to purely technical functions.

Fyodorovism

The teachings of the humble librarian of the Rumyantsev Museum in Moscow and universal erudite N. F. Fyodorov,⁴⁰ who died in 1903, very strongly influenced the thinking and the activities of many of the intelligentsia, mostly from among 'bourgeois specialists', and it seems appropriate to name after him the trend of which he was the outstanding theorist.

The mainspring of Fyodorov's thinking, which permeated all his writings, was an irreconcilable attitude to death, and he developed a consistent all-round theory of the conquest of death, beginning with a liturgic theology,⁴¹ through a 'projectivist' system of philosophy,⁴² to practical suggestions for a course of action. Fyodorov held that the hostile attitude of men and nations towards one another is a result of the pressure upon man of the menacing, death-bearing forces of nature; that every man is chiefly concerned with his own preservation, and that owing to this men's energies are divided and therefore insufficient to solve the great problem of ruling nature. The social order arising out of this egoism is founded upon the separation of the conscious and directing functions from the executive ones, and thus arise the distinctions of class and social standing. For Fyodorov, the ideal social order should rest upon a unity of consciousness and action; there should be no class distinctions, no coercion by military or police. In such an ideal regime every man would do his duty fully aware of the tasks with which he is faced.⁴³

Fyodorov believed that the special task of scientific activity under such a regime would be to study the deadly forces of nature with the aim of turning them to the benefit of man. Once man has learned to rule nature and so to do away with hunger and all other wants, the causes of discord between men will automatically disappear. Mankind could then concentrate all its forces upon the common task of regulating the nature of the earth and even of the cosmos. Fyodorov believed that in the ideal regime armies should still exist, but for the purpose of regulating the forces of nature rather than for the destruction of man by man.

This belief in the aims of science leads Fyodorov to what he considers to be mankind's supreme task—the resurrection of all ancestors.

He regarded as immoral the positivist theory of progress, which builds the welfare of the future generations upon the sufferings of the past. 'One must live not for oneself (egoism) and not for others (altruism), but with everyone and for everyone; this is the union of the living (sons) for the resurrection of the dead (fathers)'. Fyodorov contended that even the materialists cannot prove it is impossible to resurrect the dead, and therefore they have no right to shirk the task. 'Put the engine together, and consciousness will return to it', he says. According to him, the disintegration of the body and the dispersal of its particles are not an obstacle to its reconstitution, since it is impossible for the particles of the body to go beyond the limits of space.⁴⁴

Fyodorov's views appealed to the enthusiasts both of revolution and of science. They were very widely shared, and even Marxists could accept many of Fyodorov's ideas as a logical development of some remarks in Marxist literature on the proper purpose of philosophy and on life in a classless society. But the source of these ideas and the very name of Fyodorov were usually unknown.⁴⁵ It was suggested already in the twenties⁴⁶ that several of Fyodorov's plans were fulfilled in the Soviet Union, e.g. the bringing together of knowledge and action, or various technical plans. Fyodorov had spoken of regulating the weather and thus ensuring good harvests; of utilization of solar energy and the electro-magnetic energy of the earth; of interplanetary travel, etc.;⁴⁷ and all these ideas were taken up and vigorously pursued in the early years of the Soviet power. There was even an attempt to create Labour Armies.

Even Fyodorov's central and most exalted idea, that of conquering death and resurrecting the dead, found followers. The most prominent of them was Krasin, who at the funeral of Karpov publicly stated his belief that science would achieve the resurrection of the dead.⁴⁸ It is worth noting that Krasin spoke of the resurrection not of all the dead but only of the most valuable ones—doubtless under the influence of the elite-ist thinking of both the Leninist and the technocratic trends. The great poet V. Mayakovski also believed in bodily resurrection, and his vision of it also bore elite-ist traits.⁴⁹ M. Gorki was more cautious: 'I do not know whether death is really forever un-eliminable, I see no limits for the creative forces of reason and will . . . I have no reason to assume that man's perception and thinking apparatus will always remain as it is now . . .'⁵⁰ A concrete step towards realizing the task of resurrection was made by the famous scientist Academician Vernadski, who created the theory of the biosphere as a separate sphere in the structure of the earth.⁵¹ According to this theory, matter drawn by living organisms into the biosphere and assimilated is not lost after the disintegration of a particular organism, but retains certain

peculiar characteristics and therefore remains in the biosphere (Fyodorov had only pointed out that it remained in space).

The main organizational centre of Fyodorovism was the Commission for the Study of the Natural Productive Forces of Russia. It was set up by the Academy of Sciences in 1915 as a part of the war effort, but it was intended that it should expand its work on a large scale in the post-war period. The initiative had come from Vernadski, who was appointed Chairman of the Commission and held this post in 1915-17 and 1926-30.⁵² The scope of the Commission's work was very broad and soon after the Bolsheviks came to power it began co-operating with the Bolshevik Government. Some of the enthusiasts of the Commission's work might even have expected their dreams to be more easily realizable under the new regime, which promised to give every encouragement to the most extravagant plans (the electrification plan, the prospecting for iron ore in the region of the famous Kursk Magnetic Anomaly, etc.). The Commission retained its semi-independent character until 1929, when it was, together with the rest of the Academy of Sciences, integrated into the Communist administrative system.

Another branch of organized Fyodorovism was the Local Studies movement. Fyodorov taught that in the future ideal society 'all social work will be accompanied by the study of the corresponding region of the world'.⁵³ Extremely difficult material conditions in the large cities in the years of the Civil War forced many scientists to seek refuge in small towns or even in villages. Many of them soon found themselves heading groups and societies for local studies.⁵⁴ The number of institutions for local studies rose from 160 in 1917 to 516 at the beginning of 1923, including 231 societies and circles and 285 museums. In 1921 the Commissariat of Education convened the first All-Russian conference of societies for local studies and in January 1922 a Central Bureau for Local Studies was set up by the Academy of Sciences. In 1923 the publication began of a special magazine *Krayevedeniye* (Local Studies).⁵⁵ The local studies movement flourished throughout the 1920s until in 1931 it came under the direction of local Party and administrative organs; the organization was finally suppressed during the Great Purge.

Although organized Fyodorovism was thus eliminated by the early thirties, many Fyodorovist ideas on the control of nature were incorporated into the official Stalinist ideology.

National Bolshevism

The ideology of National Bolshevism first manifested itself in General Brusilov's appeal in October 1917 to the national-minded

people to save the country from disintegration, to preserve its independence and territorial integrity, if necessary without and against the government. The government of the day was Kerenski's Provisional Government, but it was obviously irrelevant for Brusilov and like-minded people what government there was, and when the Soviet government proclaimed early in 1918 the slogan of the 'Socialist Fatherland in danger', even Purishkevich (who was in prison) expressed his willingness to serve the Bolsheviks in whatever capacity they would find suitable.⁵⁶ Allied intervention in the Civil War enhanced these sentiments, and the majority of former officers who were commanding the Red Army (S. S. Kamenev, Brusilov, Admiral Altfater, etc.) adhered to the ideology of National Bolshevism.⁵⁷ This ideology was given a systematic expression by two former prominent Constitutional Democrats—Professor N. A. Gredeskul in Russia and Professor N. V. Ustryalov in the emigration in Harbin—in 1920.⁵⁸ Arguing against P. B. Struve, who was irreconcilably anti-Bolshevik, Ustryalov claimed that it was Struve himself who, in the famous symposium *Vekhi*, taught Ustryalov and his generation to disregard the various 'people-loving' ideologies of the intelligentsia and to hold the State in high esteem as a value in itself, irrespective of who was governing at the moment. In the emigration Ustryalov's followers started a *Smena vekh* (Change of Landmarks) movement of reconciliation with the Soviet Government. One of its most prominent adherents was the author Count Aleksei Tolstoi, who in 1922 published an open letter to the veteran Populist leader N. Chaikovski, in which he spoke of the Soviet power as of that 'real . . . power which alone is now defending Russian frontiers from violation by neighbours, maintaining the unity of the Russian state and, at the Geneva conference, alone defending Russia from possible enslavement and conquest by other countries'.⁵⁹ Early in 1923 he returned to Russia.

With the beginning of the NEP period a new element entered the ideology of National Bolshevism—the idea that Russia was following the course of the French revolution and entering a period of 'normalization'. The economic policy of War Communism had always been considered by National Bolsheviks to be harmful,⁶⁰ and now they rejoiced at the picture of Soviet Russia being 'like a radish—red outside and white inside'.⁶¹ Their hope was that Krasin and other business men would eventually replace the 'utopians' in the leadership of the party.

There was a concomitant to the Great Russian National Bolshevism in a number of similar movements among other nationalities. Local nationalisms were blended with the Bolshevik demagoguery which offered 'self-determination' to all and sundry. Often these minority

National Bolsheviks were given responsible positions in the Soviet administration in their respective territories.⁶² An interesting link between both varieties of National Bolshevism was provided by the well-known ethnographer, V. G. Bogoraz-Tan, who saw in the Bolshevik revolution the realization of his passion for free and full development of every nationality and ethnical group, however small in numbers. He was the moving spirit in the Committee for Assistance to the Peoples of the North (established 1924) and the Institute of the Peoples of the North, which both survived until the Great Purge.

In the 1920s and early 30s, the National Bolsheviks among the non-Russian nationalities were largely in control of the educational and cultural policies of their respective republics. But in turn most of them were accused of 'bourgeois nationalism' and by one means or another removed from positions of influence. Great Russian National Bolshevism was at first felt by the Communists to be much more alien, and was often branded as chauvinism, but in 1934 it was revived by Zhdanov, and in the following years became one of the main components of Stalinism.

Conclusion

The Great Purge of 1937-38 put an end to all remnants of organized heterodoxy, physically eliminated most heterodox thinkers, and silenced the rest. The revival of controversy in the 1940s was confined to artistic and scientific problems. Where practical activities (such as the study of natural resources or local studies) were carried on which in the past had been connected with the different trends, they were now cut off from their ideological origins. Only the thaw after Stalin's death produced a few tentative moves towards reviving some of the old trends, together, of course, with some attempts at fresh thinking.

S. V. UTECHIN

London School of Economics and Political Science

¹ *Pravda* no. 86, 23 April 1920, cit. in B.S.E. (1st ed.) XXXVI, col. 317.

² Stalin, *Ob osnovakh leninizma*, 1924, cit. *ibid.* col. 398. He went on to blame them for this, but the relevant point here is the fact that they disliked theory.

³ Cf. 'Partiinaya organizatsiya i partiinaya literatura', Lenin, *Sochineniya* (3rd ed.) VIII, 386-90.

⁴ Sometimes 'cultural' ones: cf. Lenin's words 'You can only become a Communist when you have enriched your memory with a knowledge of all the wealth produced by mankind'.

⁵ I. S. Smirnov, *Iz istorii stroitelstva sotsialisticheskoi kultury v pervy period sovetsskoi vlasti, okt. 1917-leto 1918* (2nd ed.) Moscow 1952 pp. 212-27.

⁶ Cf. Lenin's slogans 'Socialism is Soviet power plus electrification of the whole country' and 'Socialism is accounting'.

⁷ Lenin, *Sochineniya* (3rd ed.) XXX, p. 411.

⁸ *Ocherki realisticheskovo mirovozzreniya*, St. Petersburg 1904.

- ⁹ *Dnevnik sotsial-demokrata* no. 1 p. 21; no. 2 pp. 11, 15; no. 3 pp. 11, 24; no. 9 p. 17.
- ¹⁰ Cf. *Lit. Ents.* vol. VI, 632.
- ¹¹ A. Lunacharski, *Kulturniye zadachi rabochevo klassa*, Moscow 1918.
- ¹² Cit. in N. I. Boldyrev, *Direktivny . . . o narodnom obrazovanii . . . 1917-47*, Moscow 1948 pp. 10-11.
- ¹³ *Narodny Komissariat Prosveshcheniya 1917-20. Kratkiy otchet*, Moscow 1920 pp. 24-9 (hereafter cited N. K. P.)
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 8-16.
- ¹⁵ G. Struve, *Soviet Russian Literature, 1917-50*, Norman, Oklahoma 1951 pp. 17-8; A. Mechenko, 'Protiv sub'ektivistskikh izmyshlenii o tvorchestve Mayakovskovo', *Kommunist* 1957 no. 18 p. 73.
- ¹⁶ Art. 'Bogdanov', *Lit. Ents.* I, cols. 527-9.
- ¹⁷ On the activities of the *Proletkult*, viz. the art. 'Proletkult' *ibid.* IX, cols. 309-10; G. Struve, *op. cit.* pp. 24-6; M. Slonim, *Modern Russian Literature*, New York 1953 pp. 265-6; V. V. Gorbunov, 'Borba V. I. Lenina s separatistskimi ustremleniyami Proletkulta', *Voprosy istorii KPSS* 1958 no. 1 pp. 29-39.
- ¹⁸ N.K.P. p. 42.
- ¹⁹ I. N. Shpilrein, 'Nauchnaya organizatsiya truda' in *Obshchestvenniye nauki SSSR 1917-27*, ed. by V. P. Volgin et al., Moscow 1928, pp. 64-6.
- ²⁰ A. Kollontay, 'Dorogu krylatomu erosu' in: A. Borisov, *Kakim dolzhen byt kommunist?*, Moscow 1925 pp. 120-31.
- ²¹ Martov in *Voprosy s-d politiki*, Berlin 1920 p. 4.
- ²² *Ibid.* pp. 4-8; Dan, *ibid.* pp. 8-12; Potresov, *V plenu u illyuzii*, Paris 1927 pp. 35-59; St. Ivanovich, in *Krestyanskaya Rossiya*, I, Prague 1922 p. 39.
- ²³ St. Ivanovich, *5 let bolshevizma*, 1922 pp. 144-57.
- ²⁴ One of his pen-names was Makhayev, hence Makhayevism.
- ²⁵ A. Volski (i.e. Makhaiski), *Umstvenny rabochi*, Part 1—*Evolutsiya sotsialdemokratii*; Part 2—*Nauchny sotsializm*, both publ. in Geneva in 1905.
- ²⁶ Viz. his *Chto zhe takoye nakonets intelligentsiya?* (What, after all, is the intelligentsia?), St. Petersburg 1907. A good account of this ideology has been given by R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik in his article 'Chto takoye "makhayevshchina"?' (What is 'Makhayevism'?), written and first publ. in 1907, reprinted in his book *Ob intelligentsii*, 1910. Cf. also L. N. Syrkin, 'Makhayevshchina' in *Krasnaya letopis* 1929 no. 6 (33) pp. 184-212 and 1930 no. 1 (34) pp. 117-145.
- ²⁷ *Dekrety o nasledovanii i darenii*, Moscow 1918 pp. 3-4.
- ²⁸ Ya. Yakovlev, *Russki anarkhizm v Velikoi Russkoi Revolyutsii*, Petrograd 1921; B. Gorev, *Anarkhizm v Rossii*, Moscow 1930, pp. 100-39.
- ²⁹ E.g. the collection of essays edited by Borovoi under the title *Mikhailu Bakuninu 1876-1926. Ocherki istorii anarkhicheskovo dvizheniya v Rossii*, Moscow 1926, with an enthusiastic dedication to Bakunin.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 339.
- ³¹ N. Kovalskaya, *Programma partii rev. kommunizma v populyarnom izlozhenii*, Moscow 1919 p. 19.
- ³² N. Makarov, 'Russkaya ekonomicheskaya mysl v voprosakh selskovo khozyaistva', *Krest. Rossiya*, IV 1923 pp. 124-5.
- ³³ Cf. Ya. Anisimov, 'Chelintsev', *B.S.E.* (1st ed.) LXI, cols. 119-20.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.* cols. 107-8.
- ³⁵ This account of the Neo-Populists' views is partly based on articles by S. S. Maslov, Chelintsev and others in *Krest. Rossiya*, I-IX, Prague 1922-24.
- ³⁶ *Tolkovy tarif* (The Tariff Explained), 1892; *Mysli o razvitiu s-kh. promyshlennosti* (Thoughts on the Development of Agriculture), 1899; *Zavetniya mysli* (Cherished Thoughts), 1903-5; *K poznaniyu Rossii* (On Knowing Russia), 1906; *Mysli o poznanii* (Thoughts on the Theory of Knowledge), 1909, all publ. in St. Petersburg.
- ³⁷ Quoted by Pogrebinski in 'Voyenno-promyshlenniye komitety', *Istoricheskiye zapiski*, 1941 no. 11 p. 176.
- ³⁸ It was published in 1919 in Kharkov, where its author was with the Whites, and re-issued after his death in 1922 in Moscow.
- ³⁹ L. Kritsman, *Geroicheskiy period velikoi russkoi revolyutsii*, Moscow 1925; G. V. Tsyperovich, *Sindikaty i tresty v Rossii i v SSSR*, Leningrad 1927.
- ⁴⁰ Viz. *Filosofiya obshchevo dela. Stati, mysli i pisma* N. F. Fyodorova, vol. I, Verny 1906, vol. 2, Moscow 1913.
- ⁴¹ Cf. A. Ostromirov, *N. F. Fyodorov i sovremennost*. Ocherki, Vyp. 2, Harbin 1928, the section 'Bogosloviye obshchevo dela'.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, the section 'Proektivizm i borba so smertyu'.
- ⁴³ Cf. N. A. Setnitski, *Kapitalisticheski stroi v izobrazhenii* N. F. Fyodorova, Harbin 1926.

⁴⁴ This sketch of Fyodorov's ideas is largely based upon the account given in N. O. Losski, *History of Russian Philosophy*, New York 1951.

⁴⁵ This was undoubtedly partly due to the fact that Fyodorov had published his articles anonymously, cf. Losski, p. 76.

⁴⁶ By Setnitski in his book *O konechnom ideale*, cf. Losski, p. 79.

⁴⁷ Losski, p. 78.

⁴⁸ Viz. Olminski in *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya*, CVIII, pp. 149n-150n.

⁴⁹ R. Yakobson, in *Smert V. Mayakovskovo*, Berlin 1931 pp. 25-8.

⁵⁰ Cit. in Ostromirov, *op. cit.* p. 14.

⁵¹ *B.S.E.* (2nd ed.) VII, 500.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Losski, *op. cit.* p. 78.

⁵⁴ S. F. Oldenburg, 'Krayevedeniye' in *Obshchestvenniye nauki SSSR 1917-27*, p. 163.

⁵⁵ I. Kryazhin, 'Krayevedeniye', in *B.S.E.* (1st ed.), vol. SSSR, cols. 1222-3.

⁵⁶ Avksentyev, 'Patriotika' in: *Sovremenniya zapiski*, no. 1.

⁵⁷ Antonov-Ovseyenko, 'The Red Army', *The Communist International* no. 24 [1923] p. 32.

⁵⁸ V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya* (3rd ed.) VIII, 526; IX, 571; Ustryalov, *V borbe za Rossiyu*, Harbin 1920.

⁵⁹ 'Izvestiya', 1922, cit. in *B.S.E.* (1st ed.) LIV, p. 445.

⁶⁰ N. Ustryalov, *Pod znakom revolyutsii*, Harbin 1925 p. 25.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* p. 15.

⁶² Cf. Walter Kolarz, *Russia and Her Colonies*, 1954.