Second thoughts

During the polemics between Vremia and its rivals, the conservative nature of pochvennichestvo became more prominent. Dostoevsky renounced his earlier flirtation with the radicals, and Grigor'ev and Strakhov hardened their anti-nihilist views. In spite of their new-found unanimity about the harmfulness of radical tendencies in Russia, the three principals of pochvennichestvo were soon to differ in their approaches to Russian nationality and the question of Russia and the West. All three had always, in any case, retained a certain individuality regarding these matters, and changing political, social, and economic conditions in the decades following the reforms were conducive to second thoughts about Russia and its place in the world.

Dostoevsky's dalliance with Chernyshevsky in 1861 and 1862 had proven a source of considerable vexation to Grigor'ev. He had left St Petersburg for Orenburg in June 1861 and from there had levelled a flood of criticisms against the Dostoevsky brothers and a number of Vremia's contributors, making it clear that he regarded himself as the guardian of the purity of Russian nationality. At the beginning of June 1862, he returned from Orenburg, where he had led a lonely and dissolute existence. In spite of his deteriorating health and his state of depression on his return, he settled down to repair his ruined fortunes. He published frequently in Vremia and supplemented his income by translating Italian librettos for the Russian opera. By the end of the year, he was living in an orderly flat and, according to Strakhov, was even affecting a certain dandyism in dress.

Grigor'ev was at this time completely absorbed in the operas of Aleksandr Serov and the plays of Ostrovsky. He also exercised extensive influence on a circle, to which Serov belonged, that had formed around A.A. Potekhin. Grigor'ev had enormous faith in Serov as a national artist, and the critic's death was a severe blow to the composer. Shortly before he died, Grigor'ev in a debtor's cell urged Serov to ignore the sceptics and to write a great national opera that could serve as an example to other composers.

At the beginning of 1863, F. T. Stellovsky, a publisher and music store proprietor, decided to finance a weekly social, literary, theatrical, musical, and artistic journal called Iakor' (The Anchor); he appointed Grigor'ev editor-in-chief. Grigor'ev took on the editorship as the 'last serious gambit of my life.'

It began badly: on a trip to Moscow to round up contributors, the sight of his home city so demoralized him with nostalgia that he spent all his money and returned to St Petersburg having done nothing for the paper. In spite of this setback, Iakor' appeared at the end of March 1863. Grigor'ev at first worked feverishly to make it a success, elated once again to control fully the editorial policy of a journal. He also edited a satirical supplement to Iakor' called Osa (The Wasp). Neither met with any real success except in the theatrical world, and Grigor'ev soon lost interest in them. Although he remained the official editor of both journals until his death in September 1864, he had virtually ceased to take an active part in their publication by the beginning of that year. For a brief period, however, he took advantage of the opportunity to express his ideas without any editorial constraints.

Grigor'ev conceived of the main tasks of Iakor' on two separate planes negative and positive. He believed that many of the contemporary programs for solving Russia's problems, based as they were on the concept of material progress, were false. The negative, or critical, task of his journal was 'to draw attention to these false notes wherever they are heard, without fear or hesitation: here is our critical, negative and, consequently, defined task, -because with us, in general only our negation is defined.' For this critical function, the satire of Osa provided the most useful weapon. Grigor'ev cautioned, however, that satire, unless used carefully, could undermine the faith of the masses in literature and journalism. Satire was effective only when something positive, 'a living faith in the idea of truth, beauty and order, an ardent sympathy for the ideal,' was visible through its negation. Grigor'ev left no doubt that this elusive ideal was to be found in nationality, the exposition of which constituted the positive task of Iakor'. 'We know one thing only: that we have a positive haven (pristan'), -nationality, with its historically typical features -a profound faith in its power -and an anchorage in the continuous bond of its traditions. We put down our anchor in this
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havens. The positive side could not, Grigor'ev argued, be as clearly defined as the negative: 'It would be unjust to demand from us greater definition than from the other "native soil" tendencies which are related to us. As with all of them, our positive task is more a feeling than a definite, theoretical idea the difference is that we had, and have, a unique claim -that is, the greatest freedom and spontaneity of feeling in comparison with them.' Grigor'ev declared the solidarity of his journal with Den' and with Vremia but wished Iakor' to be less exclusive than the former and bolder and more definite than the latter. Iakor' sought neither to reconcile East and West, nor to reverse the reforms made by Peter. Great as was his respect for Slavophilism, Grigor'ev continued to differ with it on several points. First, he conceived of nationality as an organic phenomenon in which elements from before and after Peter were combined. Second, he saw the 'people' not as just the 'old nobility' (boiarstvo) and the 'steppe peasants,' but as all the strata of Russian society as a whole. As he had as a 'young editor " he believed that the merchant class best embodied this integrated nationality. Iakor' rejected the Slavophile ideal of the past and turned instead to literature and art as the source of a new ideal, even though the Slavophiles judged literature and art to be rotten and false.

While sharing Vremia's profound faith in the people, Grigor'ev felt that the tendency of Dostoevsky's journal was inadequate in a number of respects. He believed that the reconciliation of the principles of the westernized elite in Russia with the principles of the common people was primarily a national endeavour without universal significance. Dostoevsky, in contrast, viewed this synthesis as the universal reconciliation of the fundamental principles of East and West, and hence of the peoples of East and West. Grigor'ev felt also that Vremia inadequately understood the national ideal, because it had not fully accepted the importance of Orthodoxy: 'Apart from our sincere belief in the highest dogmatic essence of Orthodoxy we believe in its enormous, historical significance ...In spite of all its numberless schisms, which indicate among other things the full vitality of its fluids, Orthodoxy is a vigorously alive phenomenon, and like everything alive is strongly united with its essence. The life of the land may have deviated from the norm on many points but, all the same, it stubbornly adhered to its spiritual independence, to its collective and national mores.'

Although in his organic criticism he had done much to foster it himself, Grigor'ev had been uncomfortable with the psychological interpretation of nationality in Vremia. By the end of 1863, Dostoevsky, as will be seen, had also begun to conceive of Russian nationality in religious rather than psychological terms. Both men had by this time accepted the view of Orthodoxy that the Slavophile A.I. Koshelev had encapsulated in the late 1850s: 'Nationality alone does not give us universal significance ...Only faith can ...create something organic...With Orthodoxy, our nationality has world significance. Without Orthodoxy, our nationality is empty.' Grigor'ev's view that Orthodoxy was a universal principle destined to replace a moribund Catholicism may have influenced the formation of Dostoevsky's later religious outlook.

In Iakor', Grigor'ev firmly adhered to his belief in localism. He published one of his own letters to Strakhov from Orenburg; in it he had defended the Siberian historian Shchapov as a phenomenon as important as Ostrovsky and pointed out that the two men had much in common. An unsigned leading article, perhaps not written by Grigor'ev but, nevertheless, expressing his views, upheld the right of Ukrainian nationality to a life of its own. Grigor'ev drew no separatist conclusions from his doctrine of localism. He was a cultural federalist and a political decentralist who believed in regional self-administration but not in political separation. The idea that cultural nationalism could lead to demands for political independence appears never to have occurred to him.

He expressed his spare political views in another leading article in Iakor'. The government, he reasoned, was about to undergo not a political but a moral change. By this, he meant that the bureaucracy and the big landowners were losing their grip on the nation's administration and that a period of free and immediate intercourse between the tsar and his people was beginning. Grigor'ev was a true conservative in that he rejected any form of political restraint on the monarch. The liberal slogan 'liberty, equality and fraternity' was to him a formula for despotism. He stressed the importance of giving freedom and land to the nation's 'lesser brothers'; he entered the debate about legal reform with a demand for public and legally correct court procedures; he advocated, as did the Slavophiles, freedom of expression and conscience. Like Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev expected social relations to be based on love and mutual respect; it was a moral, and not a political, revolution that he hoped for in Russia, a revolution based on Christian love and Orthodox brotherhood.

Grigor'ev brought to the pages of Iakor' an acute sensitivity to the nature of the period through which the nation was passing. 'In it, this murky epoch which we are experiencing, everything is a struggle, a struggle of thought with fact.' He returned to the central theme of the
native soil movement, the separation of thought and life. Consciousness was divided; the real and the ideal lived in separate spheres, filling the age with a sense of spiritual incompleteness. Wholeness would be restored only when thought again emanated immediately from life. Iakovov was an important phenomenon in the history of pochvennichestvo. It challenged the national-psychological foundation on which the doctrine of Vremia had been built. It also undermined the balance between the two sources of the native soil movement - romantic idealism and indigenous religious sentiment. This balance, which in Vremia had been weighted towards the idealist concept of an integrated, universal culture, tipped steadily after 1863 towards Orthodox messianism. The earliest manifestations of the shifting values of pochvennichestvo appeared in Vremia's successor, Epokha.

During the first year and a half of Vremia's publication, relations with the censorship committee were surprisingly untroubled. The conciliatory tone of Dostoevsky's journal must have compared favourably in the eyes of the censor with the acrimoniousness of Den and the subtle enmity of Sovremennik or Russkoe slovo. The first discordant note was struck only in the spring of 1862 with the submission to the censor of an article entitled 'The Press Laws in France.' The Ministry of Internal Affairs felt compelled to inform the Ministry of National Enlightenment, which was in charge of the censorship, that this article contained a series of acute comparisons and judgments which purposed to incite the reading public against the existing censorship order. The Ministry of National Enlightenment was not to be bullied by a rival ministry, however, and the article duly appeared in print, almost certainly with cuts and emendations. A second, more serious clash with the censor soon followed. During the summer of 1862 at the height of the St Petersburg fires, the editors submitted to the censorship committee two articles that defended the students against charges of incendiarism. Both articles were suppressed on the direct order of the tsar. These incidents may have alerted the police to the possible harmfulness of the tendency of Vremia. Censorship surveillance was in any event being tightened over all journals in 1862, and Vremia found itself under closer watch.

It must nevertheless have come as a complete shock to Mikhail Dostoevsky when, in April 1863, Vremia was suppressed for an ostensibly loyal article entitled 'The Fatal Question' and signed 'Russkii.' The article, which was written by Strakhov, dealt with the Polish revolt, a subject about which Vremia had been almost completely silent previously. Strakhov's purpose in the article was to uncover the reasons underlying the rebelliousness of the Poles. In his view, the Poles considered themselves to be on a level with the most civilized of European nations and so were 'roused against us ... as an educated people against a less educated, or even entirely uneducated, people.' Strakhov maintained that the Poles justifiably claimed to be Europeanized; their pride reflected the long history of their self-styled role as the civilization of eastern Europe. Nevertheless, he regarded Polish civilization as an unhealthy phenomenon that ultimately weakened its people because it was artificial and did not harmonize with the fundamental elements of Polish national life. Russia, in contrast, appeared to be barbaric but contained the seeds of a 'great and fruitful spirit' that was free of alien elements and promised a truly independent development. 'In European civilization,' Strakhov concluded, 'in a borrowed and external civilization, we bow to the Poles; but we would like to believe that in national, fundamental, healthy civilization, we surpass them or at least can claim not to bow to them or to any other people.'

Possibly anticipating a snag with the censor, the editors had submitted with the article a lengthy explanation of Russkii's intentions. The first part of the article, the explanation ran, showed how the Poles and Europeans viewed the Russians; the second part demonstrated that while Russians were a people full of the forces of civilization though a y evening, the civilization of the Poles had 'death at its very roots.' The censorship committee judged the article favourably; one member went so far as to welcome it as a useful tool of propaganda against the Poles. The piece appeared in print in April and, to the astonishment of all concerned, was immediately greeted by a blast from one Peterson, who in Katkov's Moskovskie vedomosti accused 'Russkii' of virtual treason and maliciously demanded to know why the author had been afraid to admit to his real identity.

At this crucial juncture 'The Fatal Question' may have become a pawn in the struggle between the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of National Enlightenment over control of the censorship committee. The former ministry insisted on an explanation from V.A. Tsee, the chairman of the committee. Tsee unwisely attempted to exonerate Vremia. He assured the ministry that Mr Dostoevsky's journal was scholarly, moderate in comparison to other journals, and devoted to serious and useful subjects. He apologized for the article on behalf of the censorship committee and recommended that no serious measures be taken against Vremia since such action could disaffiliate the 'best and most loyal part of our public, the opinion of which it is impossible not to
value.\textsuperscript{22} P.A. Valuev, the minister of the interior, perhaps on the grounds that loyalty was surer for the testing, disregarded Tsee's advice and on 26 May 1863 proscribed \textit{Vremia} for its 'harmful tendency.'\textsuperscript{23} Valuev had already dismissed Tsee, whom he considered deficient in 'ability, intellect, frankness and honesty,' two days previously.\textsuperscript{24} In so disposing of a journal it had considered harmful since the summer of 1862 and in firing a salvo in its committee to wrest control of the censorship committee from the Ministry of National Enlightenment, the interior ministry had scored a double victory.

Strakhov appealed unavailingly to Katkov and to Aksakov to intercede with the ministry and to petition on behalf of \textit{Vremia}. A. V. Nikitenko, who was a member of the St Petersburg censorship committee, felt, however, that the suppression of the journal provided the enemies of Russia with a stick with which to beat a tsar too sensitive to withstand a bit of criticism.\textsuperscript{25} Although he personally disapproved of Strakhov's article, he worked steadily in the committee along with the poet F.I. Tiutchev, who was a close friend of Grigor'ev, to defend it. Nikitenko knew and liked Mikhail Dostoevsky and was aware that he had been financially ruined by the proscription of his journal.\textsuperscript{26} It appeared that Katkov, too, was having second thoughts. As early as May, he had prepared an account of the affair in which he exonerated Strakhov. So anxious was he to have \textit{Vremia} rehabilitated that he refused to publish the May number of \textit{Russkii vestnik} until the censors had approved his explanation.\textsuperscript{27} It finally appeared at the beginning of July.

On 15 November 1863 Mikhail wearily petitioned for permission to publish a monthly journal named \textit{Pravda}. The authorities temporized, and Mikhail, who was on the verge of desperation, had to watch the precious period for new-year subscriptions slip by. On 11 January 1864 he submitted another impassioned plea in which he pathetically detailed his financial plight and swore his intention to serve Russia through the new journal. It would, he declared, reveal to its readers those 'great possibilities concealed in Russian life which promised a great future and which were treated so negatively by society and writers. Permission was at last granted on 27 January 1864, and \textit{Epopka}, so renamed because someone else held the copyright on the name \textit{Pravda}, was launched.\textsuperscript{28} No reference was made by the authorities to the 'harmful tendency' of \textit{Vremia}, but \textit{Epopka} was subjected to severe restrictions. The editor was obligated to 'preserve an irreproachable tendency,' and 'appropriate supervision for the discharge of this obligation' was imposed.\textsuperscript{29}

It was not the closeness of government supervision that most damaged \textit{Epopka}, but the long delay in getting permission to publish it in the first place. A joint issue of the new journal for January-February 1864 appeared only on 21 March, when the hope of gaining subscriptions was slight, and the periodical consistently ran a few months late. By April, \textit{Epopka} could boast only 1,900 subscribers. By the time it ceased publication in February 1865, the number had fallen to 1,300. It is true that \textit{Epopka} was not the only Russian journal to experience a dramatic decline in subscriptions at this time. Most of its competitors faced a similar crisis, but the left start imposed on \textit{Epopka} by the authorities made its road doubly arduous.

The climate in which \textit{Epopka} had to function differed remarkably from that in which \textit{Vremia} had operated only a few months before. Disillusionment, dissension, and pessimism had replaced the optimism and camaraderie among the intelligentsia of the early days of \textit{Vremia}. The government had taken measures to check and control the enthusiasm for change that had swept the nation almost from the moment it had initiated it. The tiny flame of constitutionalism which had burned among the Tver gentry was unceremoniously smothered, the best representatives of the radical intelligentsia had been arrested, steps had been taken to reimpose authority in the universities, and the censorship was tightened. The Polish revolt in 1863 sparked a wave of chauvinism in the public which tended more and more to associate even moderately progressive ideas with treason.

A new mood in journalism prevailed as well. Katkov's \textit{Russkii vestnik}, which until the end of 1861 had, for all its stridency, remained a moderate voice, abandoned its more liberal tone in the face of the nihilist threat within and the Polish menace without. The conservative gentry, which had at first been stunned into silence by Emancipation, had found a voice in the journal \textit{Vest'}, which openly campaigned for the reconsolidation of gentry privileges. The reform movement lost its momentum as the Russian public settled into the new structures and relationships created by the Emancipation reforms. Indifference and apathy replaced enthusiasm among the informed public.

The situation of the intelligentsia had also changed as a result of the Emancipation reforms. Though many limitations on their activity still remained, opportunities for a more satisfying interaction with society and the organs of administration were opening up to the intelligenty. The Emancipation and its accompanying reforms provided the professionalization of Russian life with considerable impetus and contributed to the breaking up of the homogeneity of the intelligentsia. With the growing
importance of public opinion as a political force, writers and journalists, too, were finding ways to exert an influence on public policy. The painful inception of the modernization of Russian social and political life was already beginning to mitigate the alienation of the intelligentsia, themselves the creatures of modernization. All of these changes did not make the intelligentsia any less idealistic, but it did blunt the visionary edge of their idealism. As one historian has pointed out, in the post-Emancipation period an integrated 'dramatic culture' gave way to a specialized culture of 'small perspectives.' None of this precluded extremism from either the right or the left. On the contrary, it probably encouraged the growth of extreme views. But such extremism now appeared remote from the more sober concerns of the new order, which encouraged a policy of 'small deeds.'

The circumstances of *Epokha* also differed markedly from those of *Vremia*. The close supervision of the censorship committee made it more difficult to present a defined and consistent tendency. Dostoevsky lamented this misfortune to his brother, Mikhail, and regarded the failure of *Epokha* to evolve a clear tendency as its greatest weakness. Of greater significance for the fate of *Epokha* was the fact that Fedor was able to exert very little influence on the new journal in its early days because of his first wife's illness, which ended in her death in April 1864, and his own ill health, which confined him to Moscow. His letters to Mikhail at this time conveyed his feelings of helplessness. 'From here, it is impossible to collaborate in Petersburg ... Here I could only write stories, and I cannot even do that.' Mikhail was also despondent: 'Yes, brother, I very much sense the extent of the damage of your absence for the journal.' These fears were not unjustified. In Fedor's absence, the influence of the other members of the editorial board was enhanced. Strakhov emerged as the most powerful voice of the journal through his monthly 'chronicle.' Dmitrii Averkiev, who had played only a minor part in *Vremia*, published frequently in *Epokha*. He was already exhibiting some of the more reactionary tendencies of his later years, and at least on one occasion Dostoevsky insisted that Averkiev's articles be signed so that they could not too readily be confused with official editorial policy.

A further calamity soon descended on *Epokha*. On 10 July 1864 Mikhail Dostoevsky, the only *pochvennik* with a modicum of business acumen, died, leaving a wife and children in desperate straits. Fedor Dostoevsky faced the crisis squarely. With A.U. Poretsky as the new nominal editor, he launched a colossal effort to make a success of *Epokha*. He borrowed 10,000 rubles from his aunt, with which he expected to purchase popularity by attracting better contributors. After Mikhail's death most of his brother's energies were absorbed by the financial and production side of the journal which once again deprived him of the opportunity to express himself regularly in its pages. Only on the literary side of the journal was his presence felt, with the publication of his *Notes from the Underground*.

Fate continued to toy with *Epokha*. On 25 September 1864 Grigor'ev suddenly died. His death struck at the very heart of *pochvennichestvo*. Not only had he originated it but also he had remained its principal ideologue. Without the nagging of Grigor'ev and with the reduced role of Fedor Dostoevsky, the contributors to *Epokha* began to speak more as individuals than as representatives of a tendency. Differences, which had always existed, now emerged more strongly. After the failure of *Epokha* and the dispersal of the original *pochvenniki* these differences became even more pronounced.

The basic principles of *pochvennichestvo* were not lost in *Epokha*. Dostoevsky's notebooks for the period testify that he still regarded the disease of Russia to be the separation of thought and life. We are *pochvenniki* because in the tint place we believe that nothing comes into the world abstractly (outside real, historical life) and by leaps ...Your path to the attainment of the universal human ideal seems wrong to us; for in order to outlive former ideas and to master and *acquire* new ideas, inclinations and aspirations, one has really to live, through real life, and not just through the mind and general thinking ... And in order to have a real form, i.e., to live truly, it is necessary to live according to the self, to the soil, the land, etc. and to experience everything in practice ... We believe that our, uniquely our, Russian ideal of the soil is incomparably higher than the European ... but that it will also restore the whole of humanity to life.

Everything useful in life derived not from theory but grew out of practical experience. Progress depended as before on the development in Russia of an 'organic, independent life based on the soil' because 'everything living came into being and lived of itself.'

Dostoevsky's insistence that nothing comes into the world 'by leaps' was a reaffirmation of his anti-revolutionary gradualism. The source of all beneficial change remained, for the *pochvenniki*, the autonomous workings of social life, free from all external coercion. Revolutionary change represented the principal threat to the normal and organic unfolding of Russian nationality. It was for this reason that the *pochvenniki* stoutly...
upheld in Epokha the new all-class institutions of local self-government, the zemstva, created in 1864. They regarded such institutions, which drew all the social estates together in a common endeavour, as the most effective organs for the dissemination of civic education in the masses and the reconciliation of class differences.37

The idea of Russian universality did not recede in Epokha. Dostoevsky reasserted his view that the future of Russia lay not with the Slavophile ideal of withdrawal and interiorization but with the broad penetration of Russian nationality into general European culture. Russia had still to shake off its 'centuries' long seclusion' and widen the 'circle of its independent activity both in economic and spiritual relations.38

The idealist underpinnings of pochvennichestvo, which had received growing prominence in Vremia as Dostoevsky turned his back to the radicals, become a dominant feature of Epokha. Strakhov, in his old role of N. Kositsa, set the tone. 'Impoverishment of the ideal, that is the obvious disease with which our era is afflicted.'9 He went on to repeat the arguments against materialism and utilitarianism already made in Vremia. The philosophy of utility was inadequate because it failed to take into account the aesthetic and ethical concerns of men. To act morally, even though such action was opposed to one's immediate interests, was a source of greater satisfaction and enjoyment for man than was an act inspired by motives of utility only. Further, luxury did not guarantee the maximum happiness for an individual. Aesthetic pleasure transcended the enjoyment derived from satisfying one's physical needs. If guided only by considerations of utility, human endeavour was too narrow and fruitless. The highest aim of life was not to be happy, but to follow one's own innate nature according to one's own ideal.36

Given these views it is not surprising that the polemics with Sovremennik and Russkoe slovo continued even more vigorously in Epokha than they had in Vremia. Although the quarrel turned on such fundamental questions as the relationship between thought and action, the relevance of Western experience to the future of Russia, and the very nature of that future, the actual exchange between the contending parties was trivial and even mindless. It consisted of satirical, but none-too-clever, verses, plays about martlets and other maligned creatures, and degrading personal invective. Much of the little time remaining to Dostoevsky for journalism was absorbed in a barren obsession with out-quipping his opponents. He attempted to take advantage of the disagreement between Sovremennik and Russkoe slovo over Turgenev's Fathers and Children. Pisarev proudly accepted the name nihilist and welcomed Bazarov, the hero of the novel, as an accurate portrayal of the 'realist.' Antonovich of Sovremennik, who was more sensitive and less talented than Pisarev, considered Bazarov to be a slanderous caricature of the young radicals. Dostoevsky jocularly referred to the 'schism in the nihilists' (raskol v nizilistakh) but to little practical effect.41

The views expressed in Epokha on questions of art, literature, and criticism were also unchanged from those of Vremia. Continuity was assured by the publication in Epokha of Grigor'ev's articles on the organic links between literature and life, his unfinished but absorbing memoirs of his childhood and youth, and, after his death, his letters of 1861 to Strakhov from Orenburg and of 1857-8 to E.S. Protopovova, the wife of the composer Aleksandr Borodin, from Italy. In Epokha's manifesto for 1865, Dostoevsky again remarked on the many signs in literature of the growing independence of Russian life.

The question of art remained at the heart of pochvennichestvo in Epokha. For the pochvenniki the crisis of the modern world was rooted in the breakdown of aesthetic sensibility. Consciousness had become an illness that divided men from the immediate sources of the life of the spirit or from the 'living life.' Men had ceased to know 'immediate (neposredstven nye) sensations' and knew everything only abstractly. Only through art could the organic link between life and thought be restored. Dostoevsky wrote, 'We concern ourselves with art primarily in order to declare our respect for the organic manifestations of the life of the spirit which the moralists want to ignore.'42 Aesthetic intuition, the conduit between the ideal and the real, remained in pochvennichestvo the substitute for the religious intuition of Slavophilism.

In spite of the many similarities between Vremia and Epokha a number of differences also soon became apparent. These differences, which for the most part represented shifts in emphasis rather than new positions, reflected the changes in Russian conditions that had occurred by the mid-1860s. In Epokha less stress was placed on reconciliation, though the idea was by no means abandoned. Rather, the contrast between Russia and the West was pointed up more sharply and there appeared a greater scepticism about the capacity of the educated to merge with the people. Even more striking was the almost complete cessation of hostilities with Den' which accompanied the decisive break with Sovremennik and Russkoe slovo. The sympathies of Vremia had in general lain with the 'progressive' journals in spite of the fundamental differences that separated them. Only towards the end of its short life had it begun to shift towards the nationalists. Epokha, on the contrary, leaned towards the nationalist journals and cut itself off from the radicals entirely.

Strakhov took the lead. He had always been critical of Dostoevsky's
ambivalence towards the radicals and disapproved of his forays against
Den'. Now, with Dostoevsky preoccupied with family and business
affairs and experiencing doubts about the adequacy of some of his own
convictions, Strakhov was presented with the opportunity to lead the
journal in directions he considered desirable. A few years after the
collapse of Epokha, Strakhov wrote, 'As pochvenniki, Apollon Grigor'ev
and Dostoevsky asserted constantly that they were not Westernizers and
not Slavophiles...I decided that it was necessary to identify myself
directly as a Slavophile.' This assertion should not be taken too literally.
Strakhov's interests reached far beyond Slavophilism, and his indiffer-
tence to political and social concerns separated him from his Slavophile
contemporaries. But neither was he an enduring pochvennik because
ultimately he did not believe in the possibility of reconciliation. It is
true that as late as 1868, when his The Poverty of Our Literature was
published, he still accepted Grigor'ev's interpretation of Russian
intellectual development since Karamzin and went on to assert that
Slavophilism, westernism, and even nihilism were necessary elements in
the making of Russian culture. The Poverty of Our Literature turned
out to be the fullest expression of Strakhov's pochvennichestvo, but it
represented as much a tribute to Grigor'ev as it did a statement of his own
convictions. The foundations of the more exclusivist notion of the
'struggle with the west' which he later adopted were already evident in
his contributions to Epokha.

Strakhov adopted as his own the idea that Western civilization was in a
state of decline and decay. It was, of course, an old idea which stemmed
from the early Slavophiles and especially from Shevyrev and Pogodin,
but the concept had plenty of vitality left. In a somewhat different
context Herzen had recently in his 'Ends and Beginnings' repeated the
notion that western Europe had exhausted itself and concluded its
mission, and Russia alone remained fresh and strong. Whereas Herzen
was referring to the relative potential of the socialists in Russia and the
West, Strakhov had in mind the respective capacity of Russians and
Europeans to complete the work begun by the German idealists. With the
idealists, he maintained, Germany had ended its intellectual mission. The
Germans were themselves incapable of understanding their own great
philosophers and had been distracted from the road to full intellectual
development by the exigencies of their political life.

A like disease, Strakhov believed, had paralysed the movement of
thought in the rest of western Europe. Western writers and philosophers
had pressed the European idea to its limits, but it remained inadequate, as

the pessimism of a Proudhon or the materialistic vacuity of a Feuerbach
aptly illustrated. 'In this way, western criticism, as it seems to us, has
fully revealed itself; it has reached its end, has uncovered all its
mysteries, has disclosed its inner content.' Russia alone, he concluded,
still concealed 'its intellectual forces.' If the West had exhausted its
intellectual and moral resources, there was little to be gained by parroting
its senescent convulsions. Instead, Russia should shake off the influence
of Europe and evolve its own intellectual and spiritual life.

Like the Slavophiles, Strakhov imagined that the enemy was within as
well as on the borders of Russia. St Petersburg remained Russia's most
Western comer and lived in splendid and arrogant isolation from the rest
of the nation. Strakhov emphasized that the initiative in the matter of
fostering the national spirit had passed from St Petersburg to Moscow
and hinted at a pending confrontation between the contrary principles of
the two capitals. Averkiev was even more blunt in predicting a war
between 'so-called' civilization and fundamentally Russian principles, a
war to be fought between St Petersburg and Moscow. Such a spirit of
confrontation was foreign to Grigor'ev's conception of nationality and
alien to Dostoevsky's idea of reconciliation. They had envisaged the
absorption of Western principles into the Russian ideal and not a head-on
collision between two contradictory and irreconcilable ideals.

Strakhov attached considerable importance to the Polish rebellion in
fastening the evolution of Russian national consciousness. He believed
that during the bloody uprising, abstract ideas and detached feelings had
given way in Russia to real ideas and feelings. Events displaced
opinions, and flesh-and-blood persons superseded abstract concepts. 'A
feeling for our nationality awoke and spoke within us more and more
distinctly,' he wrote. 'This was a correct and inevitable reaction of the
national organism.' In Strakhov's view it was Den' that had guided
Russia through the Polish crisis. Aksakov's journal was 'without a doubt
the most remarkable, the most profound and important phenomenon in
recent years.' He began to align pochvennichestvo with the Slavophile
camp and finally declared that 'Slavophilism has conquered.' It is
possible,' he asserted, 'to dispute particular conclusions of the
Slavophiles, but the truth of their basic viewpoint is indisputable, and it
appears that the time is not far off when it will be accepted by almost
everyone.'

The surrender to Den', which Strakhov had engineered, manifested
itself in Epokha in a number of different directions. Aksakov's journal
was suddenly championed as an authority in most matters, from railway
construction, through the definition and history of nihilism, to the need
Danilevsky's theory was designed for the Russification of Jews and Germans living within Russian borders. The latter point was inspired by Aksakov's theory of religious assimilation. Since he believed that religion was the basis of nationality, Aksakov maintained that diverse ethnic groups could live within one nation only if they professed a common religion. It was impossible, he argued, to be a Russian citizen and yet to be a Jew, Moslem, Catholic or Lutheran. This rationale for Russian imperialism was directed, interestingly enough, against Katkov's Moskovskie vedomosti, in which the case had been made that a Russian Lutheran or Russian Catholic could very well be a loyal citizen. Strakhov joined Aksakov in condemning any such notion. He felt that foreigners should Russify because in their Russification he saw the 'guarantee of a more proper spiritual life ...and their own wellbeing.' Neither Aksakov nor Strakhov was recommending forced Russification. Each hoped to use persuasion in order to strengthen Russian national or religious consciousness among the non-Orthodox peoples of the empire. Strakhov went so far as to contend that non-Russians were in no danger of cultural suppression because 'there is no people in the world so tolerant toward strangers as the Russian people.'

Strakhov edged away from pochvennichestvo and nearer to Slavophilism in another crucial respect as well. In his opinion, only the narod had retained its instinctive nationality since the reforms of Peter. In separating themselves from the soil, the educated had sacrificed their national instincts. This concession struck at the very nub of the native soil movement. Grigor'ev and Dostoevsky had staunchly maintained that since no group could lose its nationality, fundamentally Russian instincts remained to the educated. The veneer of Europeanism among the educated had for many years concealed their innate nationality from them, but without being conscious of it they had remained Russians in spite of their efforts to Europeanize.

Strakhov's retreat from pochvennichestvo and his homage to Aksakov were motivated less by a complete conversion to Slavophilism than by the desire to create in Russian journalism a broad nationalistic and idealistic front. His primary concern was the ethical consequences of the growth of materialism in European philosophy. As a Hegelian, Strakhov believed that the western European phase of philosophical development had passed and that the initiative in advancing the cause of the Spirit belonged now to Russia. His journalistic activity was inspired by the wish to force Russians to accept their great responsibility to civilization. Moreover, Strakhov's nationalism remained outgoing and not inward-looking as was that of the Slavophiles. In August 1864 he wrote that the Russian cause was the cause of civilization and humanity because Russian religion, history, and social structure were necessary elements in the history of mankind. His Hegelianism had taught him, however, that historical change was the product of the clash of ideas and not their simple reconciliation.

Strakhov's evolution as a conservative nationalist continued after the collapse of Epokha in 1865. Zaria, which Strakhov edited from January 1869 to the spring of 1871, was the last Russian journal to carry the marks of pochvennichestvo. It was financed by V. V. Kashpierrev who, according to Strakhov, was a child of Vremia and Epokha. Kashpierrev wanted to establish a Slavophile journal that was, nevertheless, independent of early Slavophilism. Many former contributors to Vremia and Epokha reassembled in the office of the new journal. Dostoevsky, who was abroad for reasons of financial prudence, made little impact on Zaria although he corresponded regularly with Strakhov about it and even contributed his story 'The Eternal Husband.' In spite of the high quality of some of its contributions, Zaria was not a success, largely because of the weighty solemnity that Strakhov imposed on it. It was a serious journal with very little frivolity to enliven its pages.

The links of Zaria with the two earlier journals of pochvennichestvo were tenuous. Strakhov loyally popularized Grigor'ev's organic criticism in his own critical articles. The same anti-nihilism and idealism that had characterized Epokha were also a feature of the new journal. But the basic idea of pochvennichestvo, reconciliation, was conspicuously absent. This was due in large measure to the ideological domination of Zaria by N. Ia. Danilevsky, whose Russia and Europe, which first was serialized in Zaria, fully embodied the tendency of the journal: 'Our journal considers itself to be organically linked to the opinions and to the spirit of this article, in which, although it was begun, planned and even half written before the idea of a new journal arose, [our]journal, nevertheless, found a firm basis for its position in literature, recognized it as the best, unexpectedly broad and full expression of our tendency and deliberately adhered to its essential views.'

Danilevsky's Russia and Europe rested on a theory of cultural-historical types that involved the adaptation of biological methods of classification to history. Danilevsky argued that there had been ten types in history. Each type existed autonomously in accordance with its own internallaws. 'The principles of the civilization of one cultural-historical type,' he insisted, 'cannot be transmitted to another type. Every type works [its civilization] out for itself.' Danilevsky's theory was designed...
Dostoevsky believed that Russian conservatism was characterized by egoism. All of the manifestations of western European social life, including socialism, were products of Catholicism. The Russian principle was defined by Orthodoxy which was characterized by love and embodied in Russian fraternity. It was this religious view, which had been with him in a confused form since his return from exile, that emerged at last to dominate his outlook from 1864.

For Dostoevsky, socialism represented the most extreme development of individualism and embodied the greatest social atomization. Only in true Christianity were freedom and unity reconciled because only through Christianity could the individual understand that the greatest act of freedom was to sacrifice the ego to the all:

After the appearance of Christ as the ideal of man in the flesh, it became as clear as day that the highest, final development of the personality must reach the point at which man discovers, knows and believes with all the strength of his nature that the supreme use that man can make of his personality, of the fullness of the development of this goal, is to eliminate this ego, to surrender it wholeheartedly and selflessly. And this is the greatest happiness. In this way, the law of the ego joins with the law of humanism, and in their mingling, both the ego and the all mutually annihilate one another, and at the same time, each one also attains separately the pinnacle of its individual development.

Here is Christ's paradise. The whole history of mankind...is only the development of, struggle for, aspiration toward and attainment of this goal.

But if this is the final goal of mankind, then it follows that man on attaining it completes his earthly existence. So man on earth is being, only developing being, consequently, not finished, but transitional.

This entry in Dostoevsky's notebook for 1864 marked his conversion to the Christian conception of history and historical development which characterized his mature works.

The original subtleties of the gradual cultural synthesis present in Dostoevsky's thinking on his return from exile gave way in 1864 to a sweeping theodicy. In the new scheme, a society developed from a primary, patriarchal order, through civilization, which represented a retreat from the spontaneity and unity of patriarchal society into egoism and atomism, to Christianity, which saw a return to spontaneity and wholeness as an act of freedom. Dostoevsky believed that Russian Orthodoxy was the key to the final act of man's earthly evolution and that the Russian people were the bearers of true Christianity. Consequently, his faith in the universality of the Russians was reinforced. He wrote that the pochvenniki did not seek to narrow the horizons of nationality or limit the scope of the people. They did not do so because they were Christians and the 'first tenet of Christianity is the community of the law for all, the community of the ideal, all are brothers.'

Under the influence of his grand new theological design, Dostoevsky redefined the tendencies in Russia as three only: westernizer, Slavophile, and realist. Pochvennichestvo apparently had, at least for the time being,
been subsumed in Slavophilism. But like Strakhov, Dostoevsky wanted to define Slavophilism more broadly: 'The Slavophiles do not believe in any of the European institutions, not in one of the conclusions of Europe-for Russia. They reject constitutional, social and federalist mechanistic doctrines. They believe in Russian principles and are convinced that they take the place of both constitutions and socialism of themselves, carrying within them the embryo of Russia's own truth and, of course, having the right to live and to develop independently, just as the West lived and developed independently.'

Dostoevsky rejoiced that the 'Westernizer idols have been smashed' but worried that Russian society lacked a conservative moral attraction that it could 'love, respect and idolize.' Katkov, he concluded, could not provide such an attraction. Aksakov remains. Dostoevsky became increasingly aware of his affinity for Slavophilism. In 1866, he wrote to Katkov that he 'was, and apparently win always remain, by conviction a real Slavophile, except for some tiny disagreements.'

_Epokha_ collapsed financially early in 1865, and Dostoevsky began his strange odyssey of gambling and destitution in the spas and capitals of the West. One of the principal themes of his novels in this period was the consequences for the individual of separation from the native soil. Some of his characters were driven to commit unspeakable crimes, others to suicide. All of his heroes suffered spiritual death. Some, like Raskolnikov in _Crime and Punishment_, were resurrected through suffering and renewed contact with the soil; others, like Stavrogin in _The Devils_, perished spiritually and physically. Nihilistic youth was pictured by Dostoevsky as irredeemably degenerate. In these novels, the soil was plainly identified with Orthodox Christianity, the principle of Russia, which stood in stark contrast to the atheism of the West and of the Western principle in Russia. The contrast between Russia and the West predominated in these novels over the theme of universal reconciliation.

But Dostoevsky's _pochvennichestvo_ was far from dead, and his 'tiny disagreements' with the Slavophiles were to set him apart from them for the rest of his life. On his return to Russia in the summer of 1871 after four years in western Europe, Dostoevsky was reunited with many of his former friends. In the intervening years a number of these friends had become associated with the more reactionary circles of Russian society. In January 1873 Dostoevsky took up the editorship of _Grazhdanin_, a journal published by Prince Vladimir Meshchersky, a stupid and vulgar retrograde with pretensions to ideological leadership. Although Dostoevsky worked energetically at his new job and created a new literary form with his 'Diary of a Writer,' which first appeared in _Grazhdanin_, he became increasingly uncomfortable in the company of the contributors to the journal. In March 1874, he finally resigned on the grounds of ill health.

While editing _Grazhdanin_, he had also been working on a new novel which he offered to Katkov for publication in _Russkii vestnik_. Katkov, who had just signed a contract to publish Tolstoy's _Anna Karenina_, was unable to accommodate him. Dostoevsky was, therefore, pleased to be approached by Nekrasov, his old friend of the 1840s and enemy of the 1860s, who was by now the editor of _Otechestvennye zapiski_, the leading radical journal of the 1870s. In spite of some anxiety that his old rivals would try to compromise his most fundamental convictions, he agreed to submit his _A Raw Youth_ to Nekrasov's journal. As Konstantin Mochulsky has said, 'It is impossible to explain this rapprochement with Nekrasov's group simply as opportunism: a reversal took place in Dostoevsky's ideas; after his collaboration with Meshchersky, he realized that his path was not with the reactionaries.'

Dostoevsky's decision to collaborate with a populist journal was in fact not a reversal at all but merely a renewed emphasis on earlier themes. The rapprochement was made possible because the hard-nosed materialism and westernism of nihilism, which had so alienated Dostoevsky in the 1860s, had given way to the humanism and quasi-religious faith in the people of populism in the 1870s. These changes within the radical camp restored Dostoevsky's belief in the possibility of reconciliation.

It is clear from the notebooks for _A Raw Youth_ that Dostoevsky wanted to explore in his novel the relationship between the predatory (khishchnyi) and the humble (smirnyi) types that Grigor'ev had first discovered in Russian literature. The main character, Versilov, a member of the gentry and an educated man, is a disillusioned idealist of the 1840s. He is torn between a profound need to believe in the native soil and his fatal attraction for the ideas of the West. Versilov is the literary heir of those characters Grigor'ev had in the 1850s identified as predatory types. Sofia Andreevna, Versilov's peasant mistress, and Makar Dolgoruky, her legal husband and Versilov's former serf, now a pilgrim who wanders throughout Russia collecting alms for the construction of a church, embody two aspects of the humble type. Sofia Andreevna, who is characterized by her 'humility, submissiveness, self-abasement and at the same time firmness, strength, real strength,' stands for the soil itself, the Russian land. Her husband, Makar, is the embodiment not of the official church but of the real Orthodox religiosity of the people. The fates of these three are inextricably
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interwoven. Drawn by his passion for a certain Princess Akmakhova, Versilov rejects Sofia Andreevna and Makar Ivanovich and is driven finally to the brink of murder and suicide. Only his mystical love of life saves him from the same fate as Stavrogyn. Versilov does not perish but is resurrected and reunited with Sofia Andreevna. His betrayal of the land had marked him too deeply to permit his complete reconciliation with it. Yet it is precisely in this reconciliation, as Versilov is aware, that the future of Russia is contained. He declares to his son, the 'raw youth': 'The people's truth will unite with ours, and we will go forward together. The time is coming.'

Juxtaposed to the story of Versilov is that of the raw youth Arkady, the illegitimate son of Versilov and Sofia Andreevna. He arrives in St. Petersburg from Moscow, where he has been educated, to join his 'haphazard family.' His single motivating idea is to become a Rothschild. His ideal is, however, undermined by other ideals that he meets in the capital: by socialism and by his father's own high ideal. Arkady survives these conflicts to emerge with a fresh faith in the possibility of a new life. 'My fair life,' he concludes at the end of the novel, 'has altogether gone, and a new one has scarcely begun.'

Dostoevsky's own conviction that the young people of Russia would emerge from their experiences prepared for the new life was reflected in the raw youth's transformation. The optimistic outcome of A Raw Youth was quite different from the one of general destruction and despair with which Dostoevsky had concluded The Devils a few years before.

The promise of a higher nationality in Russia—based on a synthesis of the universal culture of the educated and the principle of the native soil—which was held out to Russians in A Raw Youth would have pleased Grigor'ev. Dostoevsky, as earlier, went on to apply his belief in the universality of the Russian people to the reconciliation of East and West. In the notebooks for the novel, Dostoevsky makes Versilov say to Makar Ivanovich, 'Europe will give us science, and we will give Christ to them; in this is Russia's whole purpose.'

Versilov believes in an aristocracy of merit, 'The best men of Russia,' he declares, 'ought to unite.' He expected that the gentry, which was best suited by education to act as the guardian of the highest ideals, could constitute the bulk of this aristocracy of merit. But the gentry had not only national but also universal significance because 'Peter the Great made us citizens of Europe, and we bear the universal amalgam of ideas.' The Russian idea was the universal reconciliation of ideas, and the 'Russian cultural type is the universal human type' and the 'bearer of the world ideal.'

It is evident from Diary of a Writer, which Dostoevsky began to publish in 1876, that Versilov was speaking for Dostoevsky. Many of Dostoevsky's old ideas from Vremia and Epokha were recycled in Diary but in a new, religious guise. In the 1870s Dostoevsky had lost none of his faith in the powers of Russian literature to lead Russians to the great truth contained in the common people. He still believed that the return to the soil by the educated had been foreshadowed in the works of the great Russian writers. The educated had learned that they had to 'bow before the people and await everything from them—both thought and form.' However, the people had to 'accept from us those many things which we brought with us.' The educated neither could nor should seek to annihilate them selves before the people. Dostoevsky believed that it was better that the two halves should go their separate ways than that the educated sacrifice the wonders they had learned in the West. Among these wonders were science and all the other fruits of world civilization. Most precious, however, was the idea of the 'brotherly love of all peoples' which was the product of 150 years of Russian contact with the West. Through the reforms of Peter the Great Russians 'came to understand our universal mission, our individuality and our role among mankind.' Only Russia was truly universal because only Russians had acquired a faculty for 'revealing and discovering in every European civilization, or more correctly—in each of the individuals of Europe, the truth which they possess.'

Dostoevsky renewed his attack on the 'cosmopolitans' for dismissing Russian nationality. They were incapable of understanding that only it was truly universal. 'Consequently, if the national, Russian idea is, in the last analysis, no more than universal, all-human unity, then surely our entire interest consists in all of us, having left off our disputes, becoming Russian and national as quickly as possible.'

A new element had entered Dostoevsky's political thinking since the days of Vremia. The Slavophile doctrine had come to mean for him a union of the Slavs, with Russia at their head, a union that would utter the new word of brotherly, universal reconciliation. Dostoevsky's later pan-Slavism was uncharacteristic of earlier pochvennichestvo. The 'young editors' had concentrated specifically on Russian nationality. While interested in the fate of other Slavs, Grigor'ev had never believed that their future rested on union with Russia. Vremia and Epokha had not specifically opposed pan-Slavism but had shown surprisingly little interest in the rest of the Slav world. Even after his conversion to pan-Slavism Dostoevsky was reluctant to raise the rest of the Slavs to equality with the Russians. His reluctance was fatal to the spirit of pochvennichestvo which had always valued the greatest possible cultural
diversity and local autonomy. And in the event these values, which had been threatened as early as 1863 by the Polish rebellion, were too weakly entrenched in his mind to resist the growing attractions of Russian imperialist expansion.

_Pochvennichestvo_ began as a theory of literature, and it was fitting that its last words should have been pronounced at a literary tribute to Russia's greatest poet. The honour paid to Pushkin in June 1880 by the Society of the Lovers of Russian Literature at the unveiling in Moscow of a monument to the great poet was as much a triumph for Apollon Grigor'ev, who, after Belinsky, had done more to foster the Pushkin cult than anyone else in Russia, as it was for Pushkin himself. It was a remarkable oversight that not one of the speakers, who owed so many of their ideas to Grigor'ev, paid posthumous homage to their former friend and mentor. Dostoevsky's celebrated speech was, with minor changes of emphasis, little more than a reiteration of thoughts Grigor'ev had expressed, no less well, in the late 1850s and early 1860s. Ivan Aksakov, who in 1865 could find nationality only in Boltin, Fonvizin, Griboedov, and Gogol', and one or two other writers since Gogol', announced during the Pushkin ceremonies in 1880 that Pushkin was the 'first true, great poet in Russia, and the first truly Russian poet and for this reason was national in the highest sense of this word.' Grigor'ev, who had devoted half his life to this very proposition, would have been delighted by the unexpected conversion of the leader of Slavophilism.

Dostoevsky opened his famous speech with the contention that in Aleko, the hero of the poem 'The Gypsies,' Pushkin had created the prototype of the character who, detached from the people, wandered unhappily in search of universal ideals. Onegin, he continued, was a further development of the same type. Here was, of course, the predatory type that Grigor'ev had discovered in Pushkin and elsewhere in Russian literature in the 1850s. Tatiana, Dostoevsky argued, was the first genuine and beautiful characterization of the Russian woman, the incarnation of Russian beauty. She was a type drawn from the Russian soil, from life itself. Dostoevsky went on to single out Lisa from Turgenev's _A Nest of Gentlefolk_ as a creation worthy of Tatiana, the original. Grigor'ev had expressed exactly the same opinion about Tatiana in 1859 and had also linked Lisa with Tatiana, although he felt the former was not fully comparable to the latter.

Greatest of Pushkin's virtues, according to Dostoevsky, was his ability to reincarnate (perevoploshchat'sia) an alien nationality in himself. Pushkin was the first to grasp that the true strength of the Russian national spirit was its aspiration towards 'universality and all-embracing humanitarianism.' Peter's reforms prepared Russians for their universality; Pushkin made them conscious of it.

In his 'Explanatory Word Concerning the Address on Pushkin' published in _Diary of a Writer_ in August 1880, Dostoevsky compounded the interest on his debt to Grigor'ev by explaining that the type of Aleko and Onegin created by Pushkin had given birth to a host of similar characters, including Lermontov's Pechorin, Gogol's Chichikov, and Turgenev's Rudin and Lavrety. This article provided Dostoevsky with one of his last opportunities to declare his indebtedness to Grigor'ev. A few months later, in January 1881, he died, depriving _pochvennichestvo_ of its last articulate and committed voice.

Although many of its ideas lived on in the thought of its former adherents, _pochvennichestvo_ lost its coherence as a movement with the folding of _Epokha_ in 1865. The disintegration began with Grigor'ev's death late in 1864. As the founder of the movement, he had also served as the guardian of its purity. After his death, the differences among the main contributors to _Vremia_ and _Epokha_ began to emerge unchecked.

The second thoughts of the _pochvenniki_ also reflected important changes in Russian social life. The Emancipation reforms had moved Russia further along the path of westernization than most conservative nationalists would willingly admit. In 1861 the ideals of the _pochvenniki_ still appeared to be within the bounds of reality and could be associated with changes actually taking place. But the new forms and attitudes created by the reforms ultimately pointed not towards a conservative organic utopia, but towards a modern contractual and pluralistic society.

The tension between Russia and the West was resolving itself in favour of the west. The _pochvenniki_, therefore, retreated from determinism into voluntarism and abandoned their optimism that the desired future would simply evolve out of the present. Dostoevsky's implacable hostility towards nihilism and Strakhov's 'struggle with the West' underscored the emphasis the _pochvenniki_ now placed on will as the driving force of history. The growing forces of Russian imperialism, too, took their toll as national exclusiveness and pan-Slavism gradually displaced Grigor'ev's original conception of the fullness of the universe.

In spite of its demise as a movement not all of _pochvennichestvo_ was lost. One Russian conservative _intelligent_ who for a short time fell under the influence of the _pochvenniki_ was K.N. Leont'ev. Leont'ev was charmed by Grigor'ev whom he described as a 'Slavophile of a special sort; he was so to speak, an expansive and immoral Slavophile.' Leont'ev admired Grigor'ev for seeking out poetry in Russian life itself.
and not in the ideal. His ideal was the 'rich, expansive and passionate life of Russia' extended to its 'most extreme limits.' Leont'ev also found Grigor'ev to be a better and more Russian critic than Belinsky.

It is not surprising that Leont'ev, an aesthete, should have discovered a kindred spirit in Grigor'ev, who viewed the universe entirely through art. But Leont'ev's admiration for Grigor'ev extended also to his philosophy of nationality and aligned him for a time with the legacy of Vremia. In November and December 1870, a two-part article signed N. Konstantinov and entitled 'Literacy and Nationality' appeared in Zaria. N. Konstantinov was, of course, Leont'ev. In the article, Leont'ev extolled pochvennichestvo as a more comprehensive and realistic continuation of Slavophilism. The positive tendency of Vremia, which, he argued, had arisen as a reaction to the radical ideology of Sovremennik, was wider than in the rival organs of Slavophilism. Every step that educated society had taken since 1856 along the path of Europeanism brought it closer to the consciousness of its own profound Russian nationality. The Europeanized section of the population, Leont'ev continued, had mastered the higher (philosophy) and the lower (temporal-practical) fruits of universal consciousness. The common people had preserved that which was uniquely Russian. The fruits of civilization, garnered by the educated, when filtered through the national and local forms of Russian life and preserved by the people, would attain a 'level of novelty and originality which would completely renew an undoubtedly ageing world.'

Leont'ev's was a classic statement of pochvennichestvo. He insisted that each people should develop its own nationality to its fullest extent because in doing so it best served the growth of universal civilization. He implied that the educated members of society constituted an integral part of Russian nationality but, nevertheless, urged that the common people be allowed to determine their own educational needs. Like the pochvenniki, he maintained that the key to the attainment of natsional'nost' (he used the word) in Russia was literacy.

Leont'ev concluded with one of the central ideas of pochvennichestvo, reconciliation: 'And, indeed, in the harmonious combination of our general European, Conscious principles with our elemental principles of the common people lies the salvation of our national independence. In absorbing European [culture] it is necessary to use all our powers in order to remake it in our own Image as the bee remakes the pollen of flowers into a wax which does not exist outside of Its body.'

Leont'ev's pochvennichestvo proved to be only a transitory phase in his intellectual development. Soon he began to fear that the Europeanism he had applauded in his articles of 1870 threatened the colourful diversity of the Slav nations which he cherished. He turned instead to an extreme and pessimistic philosophy of cultural exclusiveness. By excluding Western influences from Russia, he hoped to delay the inevitable moment of cultural homogenization which he saw as the consequence of progress and modern nationalism. He buttressed his reactionary views about progress with a conception of Orthodoxy that was rooted in feelings of dread and awe.

Leont'ev was the last to embrace the principal tenets of pochvennichestvo more or less whole, however briefly in his intellectual development. But the legacy of the pochvenniki lived on among the nationalist intelligentsia. Grigor'ev's organic criticism, which had become the hallmark of the literary outlook of all the pochvenniki, was admired by, among others, Aleksandr Blok. Of Grigor'ev he wrote: 'But did those of loftier repute than he, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, possess such authority? No they did not. Grigor'ev ranks with them. He was the only bridge which stretches across to us from Griboedov and Pushkin: rickety, suspended across the awful abyss of intelligentsia stagnation, but the only bridge.'

Latterly, in his Nobel Prize lecture, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn spoke in the language of organic criticism and reassigned to literature the position and mission earlier accorded it by Grigor'ev and Dostoevsky.

The pochvenniki contributed more than a theory of literature to Russia's intellectual heritage. They confirmed and transmitted to later conservative nationalists the romantic tendency to view national diversity as the natural cultural condition of man. In the 1880s, for example, the philosopher V.S. Solov'ev turned Grigor'ev's notion of the fullness of the universe against the exponents of Russian imperialism. It was a use of which Grigor'ev would have approved. 'Nationality,' Solov'ev wrote, 'is a positive force, and every people has the right to an independent (from other peoples) existence and to the free development of their national peculiarities. Nationality is the most important element of natural-human life, and the development of national self-consciousness is a great step forward in the history of mankind.' Other Russian nationalists among the intelligentsia also stressed the relativism of historical development and the separate paths of cultural nations.

A further significant and lasting contribution made by the pochvenniki to Russian thought was the systematic critique to which they subjected Russian radicalism. The critique turned on the theoretical and unhistorical nature of radical thought, and especially its cosmopolitanism and reliance on Western models; the materialist and determinist tendencies of...
the radicals; their instrumentalism with regard to the \textit{narod} and popular education; and their revolutionism. In 1904 N.M. Sokolov in his \textit{Ideals and Ideas of the Russian Intelligentsia} underscored the foreignness of Russian radicalism when he complained, in the spirit of \textit{pochvennichesto}, that the radical intelligentsia believed that there was 'no truth higher than the truth that only the Europeans know.' And the lonely eccentric N.F. Feodorov was not alone among the nationalists when, in the idealist vein of the \textit{pochvenniki}, he asked an eager young radical who was longing to sacrifice his own comfort in order to further the material level of the people, 'But what if material well-being is no more important to those for whom you are troubling yourself than it is for you? To what end is all your bother?'

Perhaps the single most important restatement of the major themes of \textit{pochvennichesto} came in the \textit{Vekhi} collection of 1909. The \textit{Vekhi} contributors, who were steeped in the same idealism as the \textit{pochvenniki}, reiterated the critique of the radical intelligentsia. They particularly insisted, as had their predecessors, on the dangers of abstraction as the foundation of social thought and action and of the weakness of revolution as a panacea. Like the \textit{pochvenniki}, Struve and the other contributors pointed to the proclivity of the radicals to treat the \textit{narod} only as a tool for fomenting social upheaval and stressed the need for the moral education of the masses as the prerequisite to the growth of national self-consciousness and political responsibility. In \textit{August} 1914 Solzhenitsyn turned to similar themes in his search for the roots of the Russian Revolution and the Soviet system.

Few conservative nationalists in Russia after the \textit{pochvenniki} any longer accepted the backward-looking orientation of Slavophile nationalism. Orest Miller was, perhaps, overly optimistic when he declared as early as 1864 that no one in Russia doubted the necessity and utility of Peter's reforms, but most conservative nationalists had by that time turned their thoughts to Russia's future. \textit{Pochvennichesto} played a decisive role in the transformation.

At the core of the theory of nationality of the \textit{pochvenniki}, it will be recalled, was the concept of the reconciliation of the achievements of civilization with the national principle, through the agency, at least initially, of a group of 'best men.' After the \textit{pochvenniki} the idea of reconciliation enjoyed a long history. Not only did it reappear in Ivan Aksakov's theory of \textit{obshchestvo}, which he defined as 'educated people regardless of their social status,' but it also became a commonplace in nationalist thought for the rest of the century and beyond. And the idea of reconciliation did not stand still. It was originally propagated by Grigor'ev as a process internal to Russia, the reconciliation of the Western principles contained in Russia's educated classes with the national principle that was possessed by all Russians but preserved in purer form among the masses. In his middle and later years, however, as is well known, Dostoevsky came to believe in a universal mission for Russia. Through Orthodox Christianity, he believed, all the conflicts of civilization would be reconciled. Hence in Dostoevsky reconciliation carne to mean the reconciliation of East and West in universal Christian harmony. Solov'ev took the same idea in a different direction. Through its humility and demonstrated powers of self-renunciation, Russia would initiate the reconciliation of the churches under papal auspices.

An unlikely place to find the notion of reconciliation was in the work of Danilevsky. His theory of exclusive cultural-historical types seemed to preclude all significant borrowings of one type from another. But the idea of reconciliation was too deeply entrenched in nationalist thought for Danilevsky to resist. 'Where,' he asked, 'are we to seek the reconciliation between Russian national feeling and the demands acknowledged by reason for human prosperity and progress?' And he went on to argue that although the idea of pan-human unity was nonsense, the Slav type was nevertheless unique in that it was capable of absorbing and reconciling all the positive achievements of other cultural-historical types. In the twentieth century reconciliation lived on in Berdiaev's religious philosophy and in Eurasianism and has recently reappeared in Solzhenitsyn's \textit{August} 1914.

Influences are difficult to trace. To demonstrate that Grigor'ev influenced Dostoevsky whose ideas left their mark on Solov'ev whom the \textit{Vekhi} contributors admired and who, it transpires, were important in Solzhenitsyn's intellectual evolution is possible and even interesting but not in the end very illuminating. It is more important for the historian of ideas to discover the conditions under which a body of ideas can arise and persist over decades or longer. In Russia, where disjunction characterizes so much of life, where the fashionable and dominant ideologies have rested on materialism and class struggle, where the cultural, economic, and social differences between Russia and the West are perennially of paramount concern to Russian intellectuals, and where the creative intelligentsia is condemned to a life of alienation from the regime and mass public opinion, hopes for social and cultural harmony founded on theories of the reconciliation of the contending forces will remain a vital feature of the nation's ideological repertoire. The \textit{pochvenniki} stood near the beginning of an intellectual tradition the force of which is far from spent.