

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

Vol. XXXIX, No. 2

OCTOBER 1969

Whole No. 87

CONTENTS

- The Narodniki and Marx on Russian
Capitalism in the 1870's-1880's** *Masaharu TANAKA* 1
- An Interindustrial Analysis of the
Transportation Sector** *Hiroyuki YAMADA*
Takeo IHARA 26
- Shadow Prices for Public Investment
Criteria** *Banri ASANUMA* 62
-

PUBLISHED BY

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY

SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN
THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XXXIX NUMBER 2 (OCTOBER 1969) WHOLE NUMBER 87

THE NARODNIKI AND MARX ON RUSSIAN CAPITALISM IN THE 1870's-1880's

By Masaharu TANAKA*

I Two Possible Ways at a Forked-Road during the Period 1870-1880

It was prior to the period of the emancipation of the serfs that the capitalist production system began to be brought up in Russian society. And, when A. I. Herzen (1812-70) and N. Chernyshevsky (1828-87) endeavoured to advocate a unique course of Russian development of her own on the basis of her village community, though they were obliged to acknowledge the necessity of introducing certain achievements of western civilization, their minds could not be entirely free from a criticism of capitalism and further criticism of bourgeois economics. However, their criticism, being criticism directed not against Russian capitalism but against western capitalism, had more of the meaning of an exemplary warning lest the future course of Russian development should follow the course taken by many western countries. Then, when was it that any movement to capitalize Russia came to be noticed as being a problem belonging to an actual process in reality?¹⁾ It is not possible now

* Professor of Economics, Kyoto University

1) In view of the fact the machines had already been introduced to a considerable extent in the cotton industry prior to the days when the serfs were emancipated, it is quite natural that confirmation of the partial existence of capitalism in Russia should go back to the period prior to the emancipation of the serfs. What is meant here in this paper is not to recognize the merely partial existence but to present the problem of how the movement to capitalize the whole social structure of Russia was making headway.

to answer such a question, but it may be assumed that a crisis of the total capitalizing trend of the whole country came to be felt with more and more pressing seriousness as the process went on. Just in the midst of those days the so-called Narodism came to be formed²⁾, and in the early 1870's when an idea called Narodism came to be firmly established, the consciousness of this crisis must have been felt with considerable tension, and in this way the Narodniki came to make his first appearance as a prosecutor of Russian capitalization.

Clear expressions of such crisis-consciousness are seen in the so-called liberal Narodniki³⁾, many of whom were contributors of the journal "Records of the Fatherland", particularly in N. K. Mikhailovsky (1842-1904) and H. Z. Eliseev (1821-1891). The early 1870's in Russia are known in economic history as the first heightened period of Russian capitalism. Not only a series of events such as the remarkable progress

2) The concept of Narodism (Populism) varies greatly depending upon each disputant's interpretation. In the Soviet learned world Chernyshevsky and his contemporaries are, according to Lenin, distinguished as revolutionary democrats from the Narodniki. F. Venturi, an Italian scholar of the Narodniki laid stress on the decisive influence given to the original train of thought of Narodism (Herzen, Chernyshevsky, Bakunin, etc.) by the 1848 revolution and its resultant counter-revolution and maintained that the Narodism had its origin in 1848. But at that time he added that the word "Narodism" began to be used for the first time about the year 1870, and so prior to that period the word "pre-Populism" should be used in the strict sense of the word. F. Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, 1960, pp. xxxii-xxxiii. According to Pipes, the word "narodnistic" came to be used among radicals roughly denoting the meaning "standing on the side of people" in those days during the 1860's, but those who took part in "into the people" (1873-74) called themselves not Narodniki but social revolutionary. The word "Narodism" began to be used frequently in 1878 as an expression of the thought of the emancipation of the people by the people in confrontation against the thought of a revolution for the people by the elite. It was the original meaning, but as time passed it came to be used more extensively and the original meaning was lost. R. Pipes, "Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry", *Slavic Review*, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, pp. 441-58. But if the word "Narodism" is to be used in the limited sense of its original meaning, it would rather cause confusion at the present moment, and so I would, generally speaking, adopt Venturi's view.

3) It has been general in the Soviet Russia to make a distinction between the revolutionary Narodniki and the liberal Narodniki, as Lenin did. By revolutionary Narodniki was meant (1) those who conceived that the emancipation of the people (revival of Russia on the basis of village community) is to be realized only by overthrowing czarism on the assumption that the 1861-Reform was of anti-people nature and (2) those who participated in actual movements such as "Into the People". By the liberal Narodniki was meant (1) those who liked to plan for the improvements (protection of village community) within the system of czarism by accepting the 1861-Reform and (2) those who engaged themselves only in criticizing the realities in lawful publications and never engaged in any underground activities. (См. Н. К. Караев, *Народническая экономическая литература (Н. Э. Л.)*, стр. 14-20.) These two criteria may seem to be almost alike, but strictly speaking they should not be identical. Moreover, in the 1890's the liberal Narodniki and revolutionary Narodniki were found to be so closely related to each other that it was hard to distinguish one from the other. For example, Mikhailovsky who was a central figure of the editorial board of the "Records of Fatherland"—this journal was in fact frequently officially suppressed—had contact with underground movements and gave them its assistance. It was some time after those days in the 1880's that the liberal Narodniki (legal Narodniki) became to really assume the character of anti-revolutionalist.

of railway construction at a quick tempo, the development of various credit organizations with national banks as their apex, a boom in the creation of joint-stock companies but also the appointment of M. Kh. Reiter to the post of Finance Minister by czarism (being in the post 1862-78) who was an adherent of economic liberalism and who was an enthusiastic promoter of private enterprises, all of these activities, indeed, attracted public attention⁴⁾. The comments of Mikhailovsky on the stenographic records of the First All Russian Factory Owners' Congress (May 1870) are particularly of such a characteristic nature that I must give some quotations from them here.

"The problem of workers in Europe is a problem of revolution. The reason is because the problem of workers in Europe demands that the working conditions should be turned over into the hands of workers and that the bourgeoisie in the present situation should be taken over. On the other hand the problem of workers in Russia is a conservative problem. The reason is because the only thing required in Russia is nothing but to maintain the means of production in the hands of working people and to guarantee the right of such ownership for the present owners. Even in the vicinity of Petersburg, which happens to be one of the areas which have been affected by the British things and spoilt by factories, parks and villa residences, there exist villages. Dwellers in those places are living on their own land, eating their own cereals and wearing overcoats which have been made by their own labour out of the wool of sheep brought up by themselves. Only see that those things belonging to them are reliably guaranteed, and the problem of workers in Russia will disappear. If the meaning of a reliable guarantee is to be understood in the proper way, everything else should be given up to accomplish that purpose. It is said that people should no longer be content with sticking to the wooden ploughs and three-fold system of cultivation and should no longer be content with the old way of making their own overcoats in the manner as it was done in ancient days. Indeed, things should not be in such a state. Nevertheless there are *two gateways* to get away from this difficulty. One of them is an extremely simple and convenient way, which has been approved of as a matter of fact from a practical viewpoint. In other words, see that the rate of tax

4) Prior to the emancipation of the serfs there had been as many as 78 joint-stock companies. But 357 more companies came to be established by the year 1873 and the total sum of their capitals increased more than 100 times. The railway construction project was started in 1857, but during the period covering 1865-1875 new railways were constructed on a very extensive scale and one of the most powerful sources of the funds for the purchase of shares by railway companies and other related ones was the paid redemption to landowners (capitalized feudal rental) as "a compensation for releasing the land". См. П. И. Лященко, *История народного хозяйства СССР*, т. II, 1952, стр. 174-89.

be raised and that the village community be disorganized, and perhaps nothing else will be required — if carried out so, manufacturing industry will keep growing like mushrooms after rainfall as if it were a British industry. However, this manufacturing industry will no doubt exploit the working people. Well, there is another way, which is of course much harder. To settle any problem in an easier way does not necessarily mean an adequate way of its solution. This different gateway lies in developing the combinations between labour and possession which do exist in reality, but only in an extremely crude and primitive forms. Needless to say, this purpose is of such a nature that it can not be accomplished without extensive intervention by the state, and the legal security of village community must in itself be the very first step to be taken.”⁵⁾

“Needless to say, the security of village community is no more than the first and unavoidable step of government intervention, but it also constitutes the first step of prime importance which determines the future fate of people. It is impossible for the land ownership of the village community to co-exist with large-scale British manufacturing industries for a long period of time.”⁶⁾

Mikhailovsky, placing emphasis on the difference between Western Europe and Russia in this manner, found the foundation of the brilliant future of Russia lying in village community. Because he was prejudiced against capitalism, when Jukovsky (1822–1907) opened an attack against “Capital”, he stood on the side supporting Marx, saying that “Capital” is a brilliant book in which criticisms of capitalism are given consistently with a thoroughgoing ethical spirit, but he made the following review of the Russian version of “Capital” (Vol. I) jointly translated by G. A. Lopatin (1845–1918), N. F. Danielson (Nicolai-on, 1844–1918): “Your (Marx’s) place is not Russia but Europe. In Russia you are only fighting against a windmill.”⁷⁾ There is no doubt that Mikhailovsky was asserting with emphasis that Russia had not been capitalized yet, but it should not be interpreted in any sense of the word that he was asserting that it would be impossible for capitalism to take root in Russia, or that Russian capitalism would be destined to give rise to a still birth. Even if Russian capitalism were “something transplanted from Western Europe”, he seemed to be convinced that, once it was transplanted, taking root in Russia, there would be sufficient probability that it might spread through-

5) Н. К. Михайловский, Русский рабочий вопрос на съезде промышленников, 1872, *Н. Э. Л.*, стр. 174–75.

6) *Там же*, стр. 176.

7) J. H. Billington, *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism*, 1958, p. 66.

out Russia, and that the Russian government was now taking step to choose "an easy way of capitalization", wherein the present crisis lay. But it was not too late yet at this stage. Russia was now standing at a forked-road, one way leading to capitalization and the other founded on village community—the position of Russia at that moment in history was viewed by him in this way. Therefore I would like to call such a typical way of thinking as conceived of Mikhailovsky the *idea of two possible ways at a forked-road*.

The idea of two possible ways at a forked-road was not exclusively conceived only of Mikhailovsky and Eliseev. Similarly the revolutionary Narodniki in the 1870's were found to have had a concept of the two possible ways at a forked-road just mentioned. In contrast to Mikhailovsky and others who expected much from the government policy of protecting the village community as seen in the aforementioned quotation, (although Mikhailovsky did not wholeheartedly expect so much from czarism. He did severely criticise czarism from time to time), the revolutionary Narodniki attempted to establish socialism founded on the village community by overthrowing czarism and emancipating the power arising from the lower class people without expecting anything from czarism. We can see that this is why they are called revolutionary Narodniki. G. V. Plekhanov (1856-1918), a theorist for a society organized by the revolutionary Narodniki named "Land and Liberty" in the closing period of the 1870's, made the following statement at that time: "As far as the greater part of the peasants in our country maintain their village community in their possession, it can not be assumed that our country has started to make headway toward a road of that law in which capitalist production forms an inevitable step for further advancement". In the event that a certain society is once launched onto the track of capitalist reproduction, that society will not be able to reach socialism unless such a society should go through a series of stages of capitalistic development. "When was it that various societies in Western Europe, which played the role of providing objects of observation for Marx, fell into this fatal track? It seems to us that it happened when the village community in Western Europe came to break down."⁸⁾ Contrary to this, the country of Russia, in which the village community still remain as the foundation for her social economy, has not yet fallen onto such a "fatal track": this was the Plekhanov's view. It is clear enough that his view of the realities of Russian society was in essence that of the two possible ways at a forked-road.

8) Г. В. Плеханов, Закон экономического развития общества и задачи социализма в России, 1879, Соч., т. I, стр. 59.

The conception of the then existing state of reality by a group of people standing for the "People's Will" which was a strong organization finally formed by the revolutionary Narodniki, was also formed according to the same train of thought. The following statement was given in an article presumably written by L. A. Tikhomirov (1853-1921): "..... The bourgeoisie who came to appear on the stage under government protection, providing that no change is made in the general living conditions in Russia, would undoubtedly proceed to form a dreadful social force, subordinating not only the people at large but the state herself under their control. But this is a future problem still to be met. At present our bourgeoisie have not produced anything beyond a group of plunderers who are not united. In the course of several generations to come we will be seeing the bourgeoisie in the true sense of the word in our country and we will be seeing exploitation which is raised to a principle, theoretically well grounded and ethically justified. All of these events can certainly occur. However, it is only applicable to certain circumstances under which a fundamental change in the various relationships of our state and society fails to clear away the roots of the bourgeoisie."⁹⁾

In the writings on Russian society by the Narodniki in the 1870's there is something, for which our eyes should be opened in the way of grasping the structure of the state and village community and of grasping the relationships between the state and capitalism, and there is something for which we should not merely form the hasty conclusion that they had false idea of underestimating the development of capitalism. It is beyond this article to discuss further the Narodniki's 'theory of Russian society' in detail here, but I must pick up the following two points.

One of them is the position of the problem of capitalism in the theory of Russian society. Since the Narodniki did not maintain one and the same idea throughout the 1870's and moreover because there must have been not a little difference of stages of capitalization of Russia between the early and closing days of the 1870's, it is inevitable that such changing realities must have had an immediate bearing upon aggravating the crisis-consciousness of people against total capitalization. This can easily be understood if the writings of Mikhailovsky in 1872 are compared with those of Tikhomirov in 1879. However, this movement of capitalization was not the only problem and was not necessarily one of the most important problems of the time. According to their basic formula, the most fundamental class-opposition of the social classes in Russia was grasped as an opposition of "two irreconcilable or hostile camps" consisting of

9) N. Toriyama, "Theory of Revolution by 'People's Will Party' — Materials and Commentary", *Slav Kenkyu*, No. 1, 1957, p. 32.

“one group belonging to the avaricious state, and another group of people who were made a prey of them”: on the side of the state-group were included the czar, court aristocrats, landlords, factory owners, merchants and ‘kulaks’ and on the side of people were included peasants and workers¹⁰⁾. What they were primarily and always concerned with were such problems as the exploitation of people by the state through taxes and other means as well as sweating of peasants by a landlord making use of the residues of serfdom. The Narodniki were holding to anti-czarism, anti-serfdom and anti-capitalism, and they expressed their opinions to the effect that capitalism was growing and being brought up by czarism and that the bourgeoisie was coming to be new master of Russian society. This view does involve on the one hand a shortcoming, making it rather impossible to have a clear sight of the problems of capitalism because they were merged into the controversies on czarism, but on the other hand such a view makes it possible for us to comprehend capitalism in an image of Russian society as a whole.

Secondly, it must be pointed out that the Narodniki in the 1870's by no means disregarded the interests of the proletariat. For instance, Plekhanov in his Narodnik days made the following statement: “..... The town workers are of the type of people who are the most active, most inflammable and most likely to be revolutionalized” and “the expected role to be played by these people at the time of the forthcoming social revolution must be highly appreciated.”¹¹⁾ Nevertheless, it was generally considered that these town workers (or factory workers) were in their essence merely “peasants temporarily working in the town” and most of them had their allotments of land in their native village community, therefore they were just a branch of the peasants, and not an distinguished class of workers¹²⁾.

II Marx and Engels on Russia

It may be remembered that K. H. Marx (1818-83) and F. Engels:

10) *История русской экономической мысли*, под ред. А. И. Пашкова и Н. А. Цаголова, т. II, ч. 1, 1959, стр. 422.

11) Г. В. Плеханов, *указ. соч.*, стр. 69-70.

12) It appears that this way of thinking is very suggestive for presenting new problems to us pertaining to the relationships between the factory workers and peasants in Russia, such as “when and to what extent was it that the proletariat in its exact sense of the word came into existence in Russia?” and “to what extent was the argument about the ‘alliance of workers with peasants’ based on reality that factory workers was keeping close connections with their native villages?” Indeed, these questions are also concerned with the basic production relationships of Russian capitalism.

(1820-95) made reference to Russia during the 1840's, but it was not until much later that they came to be highly interested in Russian affairs. It was Engels who started to learn the Russian language before Marx did so. A keen interest in comparative linguistics made Engels start learning Russian from the year 1851, and in the meantime he was led to think that "there is a necessity for one of us two to have a complete knowledge of the history, literature and social system of all the countries of Slavic speaking people."¹³⁾ On the other hand Marx began to study Russian from November 1869, after passing 51 years of age¹⁴⁾.

Both Marx and Engels continued to bear a bitter hatred towards czarism as "the reactionary stronghold of the whole Europe" and furthermore they hated any Russian refugees. Their cold-hearted criticism towards Herzen is one of the good examples of this. One autumn day in 1868 when Marx was informed that "Capital" (Vol. I) was being translated into Russian, he wrote in his letter to Kugelmann, exclaiming "what an irony of history it is to see "Capital" translated into Russian by the very hand of the Russian, against whom I have kept fighting for the last 25 years," and further added, "I can find no good reason why I should highly appreciate such translation work," because the only reason why such translation work is now in the making must have been merely due to "the tastes of Russian aristocrats who were looking for some extremities" provided by Western Europe¹⁵⁾. The view of regarding czarism as a provost guard never underwent any change as long as he lived, but the way of thinking about the Russian revolutionary movement began to be modified gradually in a more careful manner as time passed on.

Correspondence and contacts between Marx and Russian people began to be made in a rapidly increasing frequency from about the year 1870. The extensive field of study conducted by Marx from that time onward was chiefly directed to the literary works of Russian scholars as well as

13) Engels' Letter to Marx, 18th March 1852, *Marx-Engels Werke*, Bd. 28, 1963, S. 40.

14) Vgl. *Karl Marx Chronik seines Lebens in Einzeldaten*, 1934, S. 285.

15) Marx's Letter to Kugelmann, 12th October 1868, K. Marx, *Briefe an Kugelmann*, 1953, S. 55. The translation of Vol. I of "Capital" into Russian was first attempted by Bakunin, but his work was suspended after a short while, and then the rest of the work was done by Lopatin. But just when the considerable job of painstaking translation was being carried on by him, he had to entrust the job to Danielson because of his urgent plan to relieve Chernyshevsky from prison in Siberia. The translation work was completed by Danielson, being published in March 1872 in Petersburg, which was the first and complete Russian version of Vol. I of "Capital". Subsequent Russian versions of Vol. II and Vol. III by Danielson were published in 1885 and in 1897 respectively. As to the whole story of the Russian version of "Capital", see A. Л. Реуэль, *Русская экономическая мысль 60-70-х годов XIX века и Марксизм*, 1956, стр. 224-36, 382-405.

thinkers like N. I. Ziber (1844-88), M. M. Kovalevsky (1851-1916), N. A. Dobrolyubov (1836-61), with primary emphasis on Chernyshevsky on the one hand¹⁶⁾, and to the particular problems of Russian economic trends after the emancipation of the serfs and to the survey of Russian village community on the other. It is known that Marx began to have an intense interest in problems in Asia in those days in the 1850's and he wrote several comments on current events that had taken place in India and China such as the Taipei Revolt and the Sepoy Mutiny. At the same time he proceeded to further contemplate the basic structure of societies in the Orient, which culminated in formulating a category in world history such as the "Asiatic community" described in "Pre-capitalist economic formations" (manuscripts, 1857) and "Asiatic mode of production" given in the Preface to his "Critique of Political Economy" (1859), and we can now say that the study on Russia conducted by Marx after having published "Capital", Vol. I. came to widen his sight over the world history still more in his advanced age. However, its fruitful results could not after all be put to any practical use in a definite shape. That part of his study on the forms of land ownership and exploitation of serfs in Russia was to be utilized in the part on rent in "Capital", and "as far as the volume relating to ground rent was concerned, Russia was supposed to play a similar role to that played by England at the stage where the industrial wage-earners were taken up in Part I"¹⁷⁾, but this expectation was not realized. Again, it can be regarded that the study relating to community which belonged

16) According to *Переписка К. Маркса и Ф. Энгельса с русскими политическими деятелями*, 1951, the list of important people of Russian nationality who corresponded with Marx starting from about 1870 would include such names as Danielson, ranking first in the list, and then by Lopatin, Lavrov, Kovalevsky, Vela Zasulic, etc. After the death of Marx correspondence with Engels was carried on by Danielson, Lavrov, Zasulic, and after 1893 Plekhanov. Judging from „*Karl Marx Chronik*“, it is known that Marx made his studies of Russia by making use of the following materials: Flerovsky's "Conditions of the Labourer Class in Russia" in 1870; about Shchedrin and Ziber in 1873-74; about landownership in Russia through Skaldin and others in about 1873; about Chernyshevsky in 1873-74; about social economy in Russia after the Reform based on government published materials and money markets in Russia in 1875; about the Russian system of agriculture and forms of rent, etc. in 1876; continued study on the system of agriculture, banks in Russia, Kovalevsky and Russian finance in 1877-78; about loan relationships in Russia and arguments on village community in 1879; and again about agriculture in Russia and arguments about capitalism in 1882. Vgl. *Karl Marx Chronik*, passim. Upon being requested for support from the "People's Will Party", he had shown his favourable intention since November 1880. *Ibid.*, SS. 379, 381, 383-84.

17) Engels' "Preface" to Vol. III of "Capital", Adratsky ed., S. 8. In addition, see Marx's Letter to Danielson, 12th December 1872, *Karl Marx Chronik*, S. 339. Pages referring to Russian tariffs in "Capital" can be found without difficulty in the general index, but no more than a few references are made with respect to village community, servitude, the cotton industry in Moscow, emancipation of the serfs, factories based on serfs, transportation revolution, etc. The references to Russia are rather poor with the exception of the "Postscript to the 2nd Edition".

to the field of "Pre-capitalist economic formations" should enrich the theory of economic forms of various pre-capitalist community (political economy in the broad sense of the word) and should prepare a road to the theory of historical forms of so-called primitive accumulation. The train of thought relating to village community held by Marx in his advanced age was handed down in a suggestive manner written in four unfinished manuscripts of letters addressed to Vera Zasulic¹⁸⁾. Many passages and pieces from books and statistics in Russian extracted by Marx from the year 1870 afterwards occupy almost three books, Vol. 11, 12 & 13 of "Archives of Marx and Engels", a series of Russian non-periodical publications (passages from Engels' notes are seen in some parts of Vol. 11 and 12)¹⁹⁾. Indeed, we have to confess that, by such a scholarly and painstaking study which has never been published before, no one can help being inspired with a feeling of reverence. But these works were left behind in the form of no more than notes.

We shall neither attempt here to present the argument or view relating to Russia held by Marx as a whole, nor try to clarify the widened viewpoint of Marx in his later years from his notes of manuscripts. Our discussions here must necessarily be limited only to all that is necessitated from the point of view of the history of Russian capitalism. It was in 1875 for Engels, "Social Relationships in Russia" and in 1877 for Marx (his letter addressed to the editorial board of the "Records of Fatherland") that either Marx or Engels came to formulate an established view respectively relating to Russia for the first time, and since that time afterwards each of them expressed his own opinion from time to time with respect to the existing situation and the future of Russia and the nature of a Russian revolution as the occasion called for²⁰⁾. It was true that the Narodniki were influenced by these views of Marx and Engels and that the Narodniki made full use of them in the controversies,

18) *Marx-Engels Archiv*, Bd. 1, SS. 309-42.

19) *Архив Маркса и Энгельса*, т. XI, 1948, XII, 1952, XIII, 1955. Roughly speaking, in Vol. XI are compiled "Letters without Address" by Chernyshevsky, "Various Problems of the Russian Agricultural Economy" by Engelgart and other writings, and in Vol. XII books as well as a great number of statistics in those days of 1861-Reform and thereafter, among which are the "Railway Economy" by Chuprov and the "Outline of Social Economy of Our Country after the Reform" by Danielson, which is taken up in our next chapter. Besides, it can be seen, judging from „*Karl Marx Chronik*," that Marx read the "Fate of Capitalism in Russia" by Vorontsov (see the next Chapter) in the later days of November 1882 when his intellectual activities were about to cease. Vgl. *Karl Marx Chronik*, S. 392; *Архив Маркса и Энгельса*, Vol. XIII composed of extracts from "Reports of Taxation Committees" (1873-75).

20) As to collected writings relating to Russia by Marx and Engels, see K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Russian Menace to Europe*, co-ed. by P. W. Blackstock & B. F. Hoselitz, 1953. Especially useful are the editor's bibliographical notes giving explanations of the complete stories about how each manuscript came to be written.

against their bourgeois opponents, but it was also evident enough that the views of Marx and Engels in themselves had something to support the Narodnic view of Russian capitalism in the 1870's. Now, we shall proceed to outline the important points of Marx's idea.

(1) Marx made strictly denied any possible interpretation which might carry any implication that "Capital" could provide any authentic grounds for proving the inevitability of Russian capitalization. "In the chapter on primitive accumulation it is merely attempted to show how capitalism came into existence in Western Europe, developing from the old feudalistic economic system. Can it be possible for any one of those who criticizes me to find something in my historical sketch which could be applied to Russia? It can not be nothing else except the following point, if any. That is, even if Russia attempts to make herself one of the capitalistic people by following the pattern of many people of different countries in Western Europe, and though Russia has been taking huge steps toward this direction, it would be impossible for Russia to accomplish her purpose without previously converting the greater part of her farmers into proletariat. And once capitalized as desired, the Russian people would be forced to conform with this heartless law in the same manner as all other ordinary nations were obliged to. That is all that will happen."²¹⁾ At another opportunity he confirmed that "the analysis shown in "Capital" would by no means provide any theoretical grounds for the pros and con relating to arguments about the vitality of Russian village community" and it was further asserted by him that, in striking contrast to the explanations of the origin of capitalism described in "Capital", Vol. I as a movement of "the transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labour into capitalist private property", "the ancient form" of the ownership of agricultural land by the village community was still maintained in Russia, and as a result the foundation for "any private property arising from individual labour" was in Russia not yet in existence²²⁾.

(2) Marx did not deny the process of the capitalization of Russia, but he grasped the capitalistic development of Russia as a pattern quite different from that of countries in Western Europe. "A certain sort of capitalism being brought up at the cost of the peasantry through the intervention of the state has arisen and is standing against the village community,"²³⁾ "the state saw that various departments of the Western

21) Letter to the Editorial Board of 'Records of Fatherland', Marx and Engels, *The Russian Menace to Europe*, p. 217.

22) A Letter from Marx to Vera Zasulich, 8th March 1881, *Marx-Engels Archiv*, Bd. 1, SS. 341-42.

23) A Letter from Marx to Vera Zasulich: Manuscripts, *ibid.*, S. 334.

capitalist system were kept growing in a greenhouse at the cost and sacrifice of the peasantry,"²⁴⁾ the development of railway net works of the leading capitalist countries made it possible to create a capitalist upper structure in a short time, even in those countries in which capitalism was in operation only on the surface of society."²⁵⁾ Needless to say, Marx did notice the critical phase of the Russian village community. According to the viewpoint held by Marx, the prevailing crisis in the Russian village community appeared just when "various pressures from outside" (from capitalism with the aid of the state after the emancipation of the serfs) caused a sudden development of internal contradictions in the community system to appear. Putting it in other words, the dualistic features of the community system, such as "the common ownership of land and individual management" and its internal contradictions "tended to induce the further division of the property of component members of such a community with increasing frequency" as the movable property was required to play a more and more important role in agriculture....."resulting in a clash of interests within the community". In this connection it was "the severe exaction owing to financial necessity of the state" that was aggravating such a process, and it was further asserted that the village community had fallen into such serious circumstances that "no one can any longer conceal the critical fatality of the village community", and also that the Russian bourgeoisie were not only exploiting the village community by the instrumentality of the state, but were also intending after all "to dissolve common ownership only in the hope of making the minority who are leading a more or less well-to-do life among the peasants the middle class of the land, and the majority to convert the majority of them into the proletariat."²⁶⁾

(3) Besides Marx did positively recognize that even at present "the village community constitutes a spontaneous base for a social resurrection of Russia" and did accept the possibility of a direct transition from a community system to socialism. However, this possibility does not simply lie in the very uniqueness of Russia; it can only be given in the realities of world history, which demonstrates that the Russian communes co-exist simultaneously together with western capitalism, and in order to materialize such a possibility into reality it becomes necessary that "a Russian revolution should become the signal for a proletarian revolution in Western Europe, so that two revolutions can mutually support each

24) *Ibid.*, S. 327.

25) A Letter from Marx to Danielson, 10th April 1879, *Die Briefe von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels an Danielson*, 1929, S. 21 f.

26) A Letter from Marx to Vera Zasulich : Manuscripts, *Marx-Engels Archiv*, Bd. 1, SS. 327-28.

other."²⁷⁾ We must remember that in this connection the view relating to Russia held by Marx was based on such an international and world-historical field of vision, and that the view held by Marx was free from those narrow-minded assertions of the uniqueness of Russia which prevailed among the Narodniki and we can not say, of course, that Marx's view on Russia is found to be identical with that held by the Narodniki during the 1870's. Nevertheless, there is no longer any need to reassert that the view relating to Russia held by Marx did have something to inspire the Narodniki in the days of 1870's. In fact Marx's view of Russia did influence the Narodniki and it was in truth quoted by them as one authoritative opinion. The opinion of Plekhanov referred to previously was conceived by learning it from Marx without being contradicted by a creed cherished in the way of Narodnic reasoning.

Marx kept holding such view to the end of his life and Engels was also of the same opinion. But when it comes to be determined whether such a view held by Marx and that by Engels were strictly identical or whether there was a delicate difference between the two, this problem is not so simple as appeared at first. That their views were fundamentally identical with each other can easily be affirmed by the facts that the "Social Relationships in Russia" (1875) written by Engels prior to Marx does not contradict Marx's opinions after 1877, and also that what was referred to in the foregoing subparagraph (3) was written under the joint signatures of Marx and Engels in the "Preface to the Russian Version of the 'Manifest of the Communist Party'" (January 1882). However, if we contemplate the matter further in detail, the following points come to our notice: that Engels was found to be obviously less sympathetic to Narodniki revolutionary movements in Russia than Marx was, not to mention his ironical criticism against P. N. Tkatchov (1844-86) and Engels seemed to have a tendency to place emphasis not on a revolution from inside Russia but on "an impact from outside"²⁸⁾, and that although it is true that Marx started to study Russia later than Engels did, Marx investigated Russia deeper. Engels seemed to had a strong tendency to evaluate the Russian revolutionary movements exclusively from

27) "Preface to the Russian Version of the 'Manifest of the Communist Party'" (January 1882). *Manifest der kommunistischen Partei*, Dietz Verlag, 1953, S.xvi.

28) It is commonly held that arguments relating to Russia given by Marx and Engels are of the same nature, but as far as my knowledge is concerned, it was only Schwarz who pointed out that there was a difference between Marx and Engels. He contends that the "Preface to the Russian Version of the 'Manifest of the Communist Party'" was originated from Marx, to whom Engels aligned himself to a certain extent by toning down his own opinion. Cf. S. M. Schwarz, "Populism and Early Russian Marxism on Ways of Economic Development", in *Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought*, 1955, pp. 48-53.

the aspect of the immediate interests of the Western European proletariat²⁹⁾.

Now, Engels, who lived longer than Marx, making observations on the development of state of things in Russia after the year 1883, came to form a new and quite different view from the one he used to share with Marx during his lifetime. It is the view which maintains that "all the foundations of the capitalist mode of production were laid in Russia. However the axe had also been taken to the roots of the Russian village community"³⁰⁾. In other words, Engels, thinking that the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road had lost its actuality, began to form his opinion along the line of the capitalization of Russia. Then, when was it that Engels' view changed? It is rather hard to give a precise answer to this question, but as far as my knowledge is concerned, we can find his new view in a letter written around 1891 for the first time, and in his manuscript of "A Postscript to the 'Social Relationships in Russia'" (1894) in which a quotation of the above-mentioned new view of his was involved. If so, in this connection we can now point out one thing beforehand. It was by no means a mere amplification of the views concerning Russia held by Marx and Engels that Plekhanov formed his judgement on it in "Our Differences" (1885), to the effect that Russia had plunged onto on the track of capitalism and he prepared his program upon this recognition. It must be said that Plekhanov's task was not only a transition from the way of thinking about Russian capitalism as the Narodniki viewed it to the way of thinking as Marxism viewed it, but it constituted in its essence a turning point in the history of Marxian views on Russia. Indeed, it was only considerably later on, after Plekhanov had brought forward his argument for Russian capitalization, that Engels came to side with Plekhanov's idea³¹⁾.

In addition we also have another problem to settle. Could it so happen that the view held by Marx relating to Russia during the period 1877-82 came to be in accord with subsequent economic development in Russia? It would be too hasty a conclusion only to say that the realities in Russia during the period 1877 (or 1875)-1882 were exactly as Marx

29) See especially Engels, *Foreign Policies of Russian Czarism*, 1890; *Socialism in Germany*, 1881.

30) F. Engels, *Internationales aus dem Volksstaat*. (1871-75), 1894, S. 70.

31) According to „*Die Briefe von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels an Danielson*“, 1929 (ed. by Mandelbaum), Engels judged the then existing state of things in Russia as "a process of creating domestic markets for a big industry", comparing it to "Central or Western Europe in the period 1820-40" for the first time in his letter dated 29th October 1891. *Ibid.*, S. 35. In his letters written after March 1892 he pointed out that it would be a dreaming of a castle in the air to expect much from the village community and further made a statement in his letter dated 17th September of the same year that eyes should be opened to the fact that capitalism is developing a new prospect and a new hope.

and Engels stated in those days, but since that time the state of things which underwent changes developed exactly as Plekhanov and Engels viewed afresh. Did it not so happen that Marx and Engels underestimated the development of Russian capitalism in comparison with objective reality in those days, partly because their basic data were limited and partly because they were obtaining their information from the Narodniki? Indeed, is it not a point worthy of our due consideration? But it is not all I want to say. It must be said that the view Marx maintained with respect to Russia is extremely suggestive for us in the respect in which Russia was grasped by him in the field of world history, and the characteristics of Russian capitalism (contrasting with the western type of capitalism) were taken into account with stress. Generally it is true that any controversy will result in shedding a strong light on the point at issue and will leave everything else in a dark background, and all the arguments about Russian capitalism during the 1880's-1890's are no exception in this point. As in all arguments about Russian capitalism during the 1880's-1890's the participants of the controversies concentrated their assertions on one point to determine whether Russia was being capitalized or not, problems such as the characteristic structure of traditional Russian society seen from the aspect of world history and the type of Russian capitalism were likely to be lost sight of, even by Plekhanov and Lenin, at least being put outside the focus of their disputes and being left in the background without being taken into consideration. In this sense the significance of the views held by Marx with respect to Russia, I think, should be reconsidered, not merely as views prior to Plekhanov or Lenin but as what they meant in themselves originally.

III Arguments on the Failure of Russian Capitalism in the 1880's

Although the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road conceived by the Narodniki in the 1870's was cherished in the arguments about Russian capitalism by the Narodniki in the 1880's and still further in the 1890's, another type of argument about Russian capitalism, which might be suitably called 'the failure-theory of Russian capitalism', being partially overlapped with the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road, though substantially different from it, came to be brought forth in the early 1880's. The "Fate of Capitalism in Russia" (1882), by V. P. Vorontsov (under his pen name V. V., 1847-1918) was the forerunning and at the same time the classical work of such kinds of arguments. We can add to it another article entitled "Outline of the Social Economy of Our Country after the Reform" written by Danielson (pen name Nico-

lai-on, 1844–1918, in the periodical “Slovo”, 1880) as another example of such ‘failure-theory’, though not so typical as the work of Vorontsov.

Both Vorontsov and Danielson were classified by Lenin as Narodniki economists and they were known to us as such, and as a matter of fact it was in a sense a well-grounded saying, but neither of them ever thought that they were mutual comrades and most people in those days in 1880–90 never thought that these two authors were of the same kind. This was particularly so in the early days of the 1880’s.

Vorontsov was born in a nobleman’s family, though his exact social standing was unknown. He grew up wanting to make himself surgeon, working at the ‘zemstvos’ of the various prefectures, and at the same time he took a very deep interest in economic studies in making a survey of the actual status of the peasants’ lives. He had no special education in economics and it seems that there is no indication that he studied economics by himself any time before 1880. We find that only a few passages from “Capital” were quoted as a book of economics in his “Fate of Capitalism in Russia”. Also he never attempted to take part in the Narodnic revolutionary movements. The romanticism and pathos of the Narodnikian revolutionaries such as ‘revolution by the people’ or ‘an overthrow of czarism by the people’ were not his. He was a certain kind of realist. He attempted to design such measures from one kind to another in succession that appeared to be practicable so that the peasants’ lives might be improved. But, because all his propositions like the peasants’ banks, kustari banks, alteri, zemstvo warehouses, etc. could in fact only be of use to those few who were better off among the peasantry, although Vorontsov himself was thinking of nothing but the general interests of the peasantry, it is not without reason to say that he was rather characterised as a spokesman for the petty bourgeoisie in the land³²). Be the matter as it may, his uniqueness can be found lying in his adherence to the peasants’ daily economic interest. He dared to call himself a Narodnik (Populist) and it was, indeed, a manifestation of his self-confidence to act for the people’s daily interests. In this sense he had something quite different not only from the revolutionary Narodniki but also from an intellectual critic of civilization like Mikhailovsky. Tugan-Baranovsky once made a statement that Vorontsov’s tragedy lay in the fact that what had to be said to the peasants was obliged to be said to intellectual people because the peasants were too illiterate to read, and this comment of Tugan-Baranovsky’s seems to be the right guess in

32) It is known that Lenin described ‘the old Narodism during the period 1870–1880’ as the ‘ideology of peasants’ and the new Narodism during the period 1880–1890’ as the ‘ideology of the petty bourgeoisie’. См. В. И. Ленин, *Соч.*, 1, 4-ое. изд., стр. 376.

all likelihood³³). The opposition between idealists (political principles) and realists (economic principles) in any labourers' movement is a phenomenon of usual occurrence, and Vorontsov was a man of economic principle among the Narodniki in a broad sense of the word. That is why he was naturally disliked in some respects by those who maintained the standpoint of the great cause of Narodnic principles³⁴.

The "Fate of Capitalism in Russia" is book in which seven essays published in a publication called "Records of the Fatherland" during the period 1880-1882 by Vorontsov were collected together. Here we shall only give a brief outline of it³⁵.

Vorontsov brought forward the question, "can capitalism conquer all the fields of production in Russia?" and gave his answer, "No" throughout his entire book. To begin with, the relative position of Russia in the international environment and world-wide capitalism were called to attention and his assertions went on as follows: the availability of high level techniques created by capitalism in Western Europe offered convenience to Russia for the rapid development of her big-scale industry, but at the same time it provided no chance for Russian capitalism which had a late start to operate to force its way in this field of development, because all the foreign markets had already been monopolized by Western European capitalism with its overwhelming productive powers. The Russian industry of factory system which started to operate by adopting advanced techniques borrowed from Western Europe began to produce products in great quantity by using a comparative small number of workers from its initial stage³⁶. A great quantity of such products were forced to be left in stock without being disposed of through domestic markets. This industry of factory system outrivaled all other small-scale manufactures and peasants' jobs (kustari) in the domestic markets. But it was very rare that those producers who were economically ruined could

33) М. Туган-Барановский, *Русская фабрика в прошлом и настоящем*, т. 1, 7-е изд., 1938, стр. 454. Both Lenin and Struve stressed the similarities of opinions held by Vorontsov and Danielson. But on the contrary Tugan-Baranovsky saw a difference between the two. Because Tugan-Baranovsky's description of the Narodniki during the period 1880-90 happened to be that part which was written as a supplementary writing to the 3rd edition of the said book printed in 1907, it is written in a calm and historical attitude.

34) For example, Mikhailovsky always distinguished himself from Vorontsov and other pacifistic Narodniki. Cf. J. H. Billington, *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism*, 1958, p. 165 n. His criticism has it that Vorontsov's "Fate" does nothing but blame Russian capitalism and he is too generous towards capitalism in general.

35) T. Matsuoka, Arguments by the Narodniki about the Failure of Russian Capitalism—Development of the Failure-Theory by Vorontsov, in *Comparative Study of Bourgeois Revolution*, ed. by T. Kuwabara), Chikuma Shobo, 1964. Matsuoka's essay is chiefly used in referring to Vorontsov hereafter.

36) It can be said, if expressed by the words of Marx's, that industry with machines in Russia had been characterised by the relatively highness of the organic composition of capital from the beginning.

become wage-earners, because of the very much smaller need of employment in such industry, and furthermore such industry in itself came to a deadlock because the domestic markets became narrower and narrower owing to over-production in such fields. Such industry was limited only to one section of the national economy and could not expand itself from such a limitation. Such industry brought forth the confusion and ruin of the national economy, but it was impossible for such industry to capitalize the entire country of Russia. The Russian authorities had to take a new policy along the line of alteri (a traditional form of co-operation) and community which would be more suitable to Russia by doing away with her useless capitalization policy.

The "Fate" is an epoch-making work in the history of arguments about Russian capitalism in the sense that it initiated arguments on the subject of Russian capitalism and that it also established a framework for such arguments, but we are only concerned here with the peculiar points by which this book is characterised in comparison with the thought of the two possible ways at a forked-road in those days in the 1870's³⁷⁾.

Firstly, according to the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road a judgement was determined, as seen previously, that Russia had not been capitalized yet, but she was on the point of stepping on to the road of capitalization, having a great possibility of being capitalized in the future. In opposition to such an opinion Vorontsov asserted that although Russia had experienced a certain amount of capitalization, there would be no future prospect for its further development. He further went in asserting that capitalism in Russia had undergone a transition into the stage of increased production without increasing the numbers of labourers (transition from 'development in extension' into 'development in intension' as expressed in his words) since 1842, when England removed the embargo on her export of machinery or at least since 1861 and the capitalism of Russia had further plunged into another stage of "absolute decrease" in output since 1870. Thus he maintained that in was both in theory and in fact that Russian capitalism had been destined to collapse.

Secondly, it must be pointed out that the Narodniki in those days in the 1870's not only took up the problem of capitalism itself, but also took it up as something combined or concerned with czarism and the residue of serfdom. Making a contrast with this opinion, Vorontsov had no consciousness of the problem of serfdom or the residue of serfdom and

37) What "Fate" attracts our attention to today are two points; firstly, the procedure of analysis—the world markets (foreign trade)→large industries→small industries→agriculture, secondly, the unique concept of capitalism, by which the distinction of "capitalism as a form of production" and "capitalism as a form of exploitation" is made.

only took up the subject of capitalism for discussion. Even when he engaged in arguments on management by landowners, he engaged himself intently only to demonstrate the failure of capitalism in agriculture and paid no attention to the aspect of the residue of serfdom. In the way that Vorontsov viewed the Russian economy only through the two categories of capitalism and non-capitalism lies one of his characteristics.

Next we shall turn to Danielson. As may be assumed from the fact that Lopatin entrusted his translating work of Vol. I of "Capital" into Russian on which he had already put his hand with Danielson when Lopatin had to go to Siberia to help Chernyshevsky. Danielson had been on intimate terms with the Narodnic revolutionaries, having a few experiences of taking part in such movements, but he himself was not a revolutionist. He made his living by finding a job at a certain credit bank in Petersburg and completed the whole translation of three volumes of "Capital". His idea did not originate from a view developed in close contact with the peasants' daily economic interests, as in the case of Vorontsov, since he was the type of man of thought who contemplated the future of Russian society, rather resembling Mikhailovsky. He distinguished himself from Vorontsov and declared that he was not a Narodnik himself³⁸). When 24 years old in 1868, he began to exchange correspondence with Marx, and in those days he was translating "Capital" on the one hand and kept himself being instructed in a modest attitude by Marx on the other, and at the same time he played the role of the main supplier of Russian literature required by Marx. In this way, Danielson happened to become one of Marx's disciples unexpectedly in his later years, and perhaps Marx must have had an ease of mind, as there was no fractional relationship of revolutionary movements between him and Danielson, so, his letters written to Danielson were filled with kindly intended words to encourage a young lover of learning³⁹). There is nothing strange at all in Danielson professing himself to be a "disciple of Marx". He sought and received instruction from Engels after the death of Marx, and he became one of the Russians who received the greatest number of letters from Marx and Engels. As pointed out in the foregoing chapter, it was true that Marx had a deep interest in Narodnic revolutionary movements as well as frequent associations with such revolutionaries, but after all it was Danielson, who was not a Na-

38) Nicolas-on, *Histoire du développement économique de la Russie depuis l'affranchissement des serfs*, trad. du russe par Gg., 1902, p. 497; Туган-Барановский, *указ. соч.*, стр. 451-54. Conversely, again, Vorontsov criticised Danielson, saying that his practical conclusion was "fantastic". В. Воронцов, *Очерки теоретической экономики*, 1895, стр. 219.

39) Letters from Marx to Danielson are collected in *Die Briefe von Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels an Danielson (Nikolai-on)*, 1929, SS. 3-30; and *Переписка К. Маркса и Ф. Энгельса с русскими политическими деятелями*, 1951, стр. 67-113.

rodnic revolutionist, that Marx was on the closest terms with, and after all it was Ziber, who was not a revolutionist but an economist, who was the first man to have mastered Marxian economics⁴⁰.

Now; Danielson published his "Outline of Our Social Economy after the Reform" two years prior to Vorontsov's "Fate", i. e., in 1880, just when Vorontsov began to publish those essays to be printed in "Fate". The "Outline" is the first attempt to illustrate the structure of the Russian economy after the Emancipation of the serfs with the extensive use of statistical data. It won a high appreciation in those days as being scientific and positive. Plekhanov made a quotation to criticize Vorontsov in his "Our Differences", 1885, stating "that Nicolai-on (Danielson) has a far better economic knowledge of our country after the reform than all the knowledge of our revolutionists and reactionists put together", and Marx gave his appraising compliments to Danielson in writing "I have read your article with the greatest interest. It is original in the best sense of the word", which might appear to be a slight over-appreciation, to give encouragement to his beloved disciple. It can never have even been dreamt by Marx or Danielson himself that it would turn out some ten years afterwards that Danielson would come to be criticized as an enemy of Russian Marxism.

Danielson wrote a second part of his "Outline" a couple of years later, which was much wider than the first part written in 1880, and he put them together in a book under the same title of "Outline of Our Social Economy after the Reform" (1893). The present author will here take up only those essays written in 1880 as 'esoteric' examples of the the failure-theory of Russian capitalism⁴³.

Danielson's comprehension of the economy of Russia after the Emancipation of the serfs was the *co-existence* of and the *struggle* between the mode of production in which the means of production was possessed by producers themselves and the capitalist mode of production, which was characterised by the separation of the producers from the means of

40) H. Wada made it clear why Marxism could not have been introduced into Russia during the period 1870-1880 as an ideology of revolution. Cf. H. Wada, "Revolution Theory of 'Land and Liberty'", *Rekishigaku Kenkyu*, May 1960, pp. 9-10.

41) Г. В. Плеханов, Наши разногласия, 1885, *Изб. фил. произ.*, т. I, 1956, стр. 254.

42) *Die Briefe von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels an Danielson*, 1929, S. 26. (Letter dated 19th February 1881).

43) Some contended that it was after the year 1890 that Danielson made a turn to the failure-theory. See the assertion made by Karataev in *Народническая экономическая литература*, 1958, стр. 54-58. However, as far as the Part I of the French version of *Histoire du développement économique de la Russie depuis l'affranchissement des serfs*, 1902 which the author made use of, was not a drastic revision of the Russian original published in 1880, it must be said that the essence of the essay in 1880 was none other than the failure-theory. The further discussion hereafter is based on the French translation.

production. According to him, the "Imperial Ordinance" to emancipate the serfs in 1861 "gave the means of labour (land) to the producers to make an objection against applying capital to the land", but since that time on "the whole economic policy of the state only contributed to capitalism". Describing the scene with precise figures in detail relating to such subjects as the development of railway construction in Russia, the impact of railway finance on the state budget, the development of public bonds, the increased circulation of commodities, etc. etc., he observes that "the capitalistic stream has been positively winning" in "the struggle between the two economic systems. All available data make us believe that an increasingly greater number of producers are being exploited"⁴⁴⁾. At this point Danielson's essay even seems to be more of a corroborated description of Russian capitalistic development than an argument about the failure of Russian capitalism. But at the same time this essay contains a contention in its background that Russian capitalism was approaching a deadlock. The point is, according to the author, as follows. Contrasting with the fact that the annual quantity of yield of grains in Russia was found to be nearly constant throughout the period 1870-1880, when due allowance was made for every rich or poor harvest, the quantity of grains to be dispossessed from the hands of producers (peasants) through being transformed into commercial goods increased in the course of the same period. As a result the living standard of the people (peasants) was made worse both quantitatively and qualitatively; the peasants' management was entering a critical phase and the productive power of agriculture was rather in a decreasing tendency⁴⁵⁾. Capitalism in the U.S.A. made the productive power of American agriculture increased with rapid progress, but on the contrary Russian capitalism made her agriculture impoverished⁴⁶⁾. On the other hand, the levels of all economic

44) Nicolas-on, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

45) According to Danielson, the yield of grains for every year covering the period 1871-88, though there was a great difference between rich and poor harvests in each year, was found to be almost the same if based on the average yield for the first four years and the latter four years of this period. If it is supposed that there was no change in the number of people engaged in farming, because the total quantity of seeding increased, it follows that the productivity of agricultural labour was rather decreased during the said period (*ibid.*, pp. 36-37). On the other hand, owing to the development of railways and the increase in the export of grains, the rate of grains to be turned into commercial goods became greater, and the quantity of grains to be left in the hands of farming people came to decrease by 14% during the period (*ibid.*, p. 45). This meant "the decline of people's consumption". What was meant by "the lowering of the quality of people's consumption" was that things like meat, fruit, wheat, etc. were taken away from the peasants' own consumption, and the peasants were obliged to live mainly on potatoes. It is seen that this last point corresponded to what Max Weber pointed out with respect to the agricultural workers in the East-Elbe district in Germany.

46) Danielson came to believe in the failure of Russian capitalism, seeing the stagnation of Russian agriculture which marked a sharp contrast to the remarkable increase of productivity

activities in Russia were ultimately to be regulated by the level of production of grains and any stagnation or decreasing tendency in the quantity of grain production in turn placed a limitation on the quantity of grains to be turned into commercial goods and all of these tendencies led inevitably to the checking of capitalistic activities.

“The economic trend over the last few years, when viewed with all available data, shows slackness in the circulation-mechanism—for example the decrease in the quantity of merchandises transported by rail”. Moreover, “although it is impossible now to predict exactly what kind of crisis is going to break out, it is possible to enumerate a great number of phenomena suggesting that a crisis is just ahead”. Danielson proceeded in this way to foresee the dark future of Russian capitalism.

The view held by Danielson has some points of difference from that held by Vorontsov. While on the one hand Vorontsov placed emphasis on Russia in its position in world capitalism, particularly on the problem of foreign markets, Danielson completely left these points out of his contemplation in this essay on the other. Contrary to Vorontsov, who dealt at any rate with the Russian economy as a whole, Danielson omitted the analysis of manufacturing industry. Problems relating to the market were never brought forward by Danielson as done by Vorontsov. Vorontsov emphasised the economic resisting power of the peasants against capitalist aggression, while Danielson emphasised the destructive effect of capitalism upon the peasants' economy. Vorontsov made a judgement saying that Russian capitalism was entering a falling state, having passed its golden age, while Danielson held a view maintaining that “the current of capitalism is now overwhelming”. The above-mentioned differences observable between “Fate” and “Outline” are very suggestive of the typicalness of “Fate” in the form of arguments about the failure of Russian capitalism and the non-typicalness of “Outline”, and in addition the character of easily excitable inducement to controversy of the former and the monographic character of the latter. Because Vorontsov had an opinion that Russian capitalism was destined to collapse, it was possible to keep himself optimistic as an anti-capitalist and engage him-

achieved side by side both in industry and agriculture in the U.S.A. (See the figures for 1871-91, *op. cit.*, p. 86.) Danielson observed its cause not in the remainders of serfdom but in the contradiction of capitalism against 'production by the people'.

47) Danielson prepared a variety of statistics for every year with respect to the yield of grains, volume of freight transported by railways, railway accounts, amount of credit, etc. and reached the conclusion that after all in Russia the level of the yield of grains (its total sale in the strict sense is income of peasants) prescribes the economic activities for the following year to come with only the exception of railway construction which has no direct influence from it. See *ibid.*, pp. 52-61 and the tables at the end of this book.

48) *Ibid.*, p. 85.

self in "minor works"⁴⁹⁾ which might bring forth a certain improvement in the peasants' daily economic interests. Because Danielson made clear the development of Russian capitalism and its resulting destructive effect on her national economy and made a full appreciation of the force of capitalism, he could not but call for a drastic change in economic policy instead of "minor works", but his contention was lacking in the concrete content of such policy and the method of carrying them out. There was no other way for Vorontsov, who was more fantastic in grasping reality, than to be more realistic about policy-making, and for Danielson, who was more realistic in grasping reality, than to be more fantastic about policy-making. In spite of all that is pointed out, the two particular characteristics discerned previously with respect to "Fate", can be observed in "Outline" too.

The first point at issue :

In "Fate" it was attempted to bring forward a 'failure-theory' by definitely denying the concept of the two possible ways at a forked-road. On the contrary in the "Outline" it was attempted to raise a failure-theory without denying the concept of the two possible ways at a forked-road, but the thought in the "Outline" no longer remained to be of the same opinion based on the two possible ways at a forked-road conceived in those days in the 1870's. "Outline" has it that Russia has been and will be tracing along the road of capitalization, but this road seems to come to a deadlock, instead of assuming two different roads to trace in the future and determining that Russia is now standing at a point on a forked-road. The Narodniki in the 1870's did raise objections against capitalization, but they never thought that Russian capitalism would collapse or fail. Contrariwisely, the thought of "Outline" contained a far more advanced recognition of reality with respect to the progress of Russian capitalism and at the same time the presupposition of its dark future.

The second point at issue :

Danielson, too, exclusively took up only the problem of capitalism just like Vorontsov did. Though the Narodniki did accept that it was by the shortage of land (the problem of cut-off land at the emancipation), payment for redemption, heavy taxes, etc.—all these points were taken up most seriously by the Narodniki in the 1870's—that the peasants' management was so hard pressed, it was further contended that the crisis in the peasants' management was principally caused not by these factors but by such circumstances as that money is becoming to

49) About the way the thought of "minor works" came to attract so many people's attention in the days of 1880's, see J. H. Billington, *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism*, 1958, pp. 146-52.

have command of the whole of economic life in an increasing tendency⁵⁰⁾ and that the peasants' management was forced to be dragged into the process of capitalization, of which the prime move was railway construction. In this connection I should think that it was indeed progress that Danielson, putting aside the tax system and other problems, took up so to speak the pure economic process. And furthermore, even if his confrontation of one sector of production by the people against another sector of production by the capitalists were, as Lenin criticized it, too abstract a schema, I should think that he was right in perceiving the presumption and foundation of capitalization in the very transformation of the natural economy into a commodity and money economy. But on the other hand, such an attempt to analyse the Russian economy only through the schema 'natural economy→money economy→capitalism' resulted in putting the residiums of serfdom out of the field of vision, thus leading man to lose sight of the transition of society of a semi-serf-nature into bourgeoisie-type society as a whole.

I should think that the foregoing explanation has made it clearly understandable that the particular argument about the failure of Russian capitalism raised in the early part of the 1880's was different in nature from the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road brought out in the 1870's. As a matter of fact, it must be admitted that the failure theory did not have exclusive sway over public opinion during the first half of the 1880's and the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road was kept subsisting then, and moreover, another argument recognizing the development of Russian capitalism was being prepared,—for example such as the general theory on the collapse of village community developed by Kovalevsky during the closing part of the 1870's and the reports prepared by Olrov on the internal dissolution of the village community based on the area survey about Moscow prefecture⁵²⁾. However, it was

50) Nicolas-on, *op. cit.*, p. 44. "There is no doubt about heavy tax. ... Those taxes which are levied on the net income of land even amount to two times as much as the net income." (p. 43.) "But no reform of the taxation system can ever be a universal remedy for all economic evils". (p. 88.)

51) But, because Danielson has no sufficient insight into the social division of labour, he is inclined to distort the course of evolution of natural economy→merchandise economy→capitalism into the confrontation of natural economy versus merchandise economy=capitalism. And "even in village communes some noticeable phenomena are beginning to appear; the community make allotments of inferior land to those members of the commune who do not practically engage themselves in agricultural labour; the terms of exchanging the allotted land with one another become longer and longer; we are obliged to witness the proceeding of the transformation from collective land ownership to individual land ownership" (p. 81). These facts were, in truth, perceived but no effort was ever made beyond pointing them out. Danielson could not recognize that these phenomena were none other than the positive proof of the act that capitalism was taking firm root in Russia.

52) М. Ковалевский, *Общинное землевладение, причины, ход и последствия его разложения*, ч. 1, 1879; В. И. Орлов, *Сборник статистических сведений по Московской губ., Отдел хозяйственной статистики*, т. IV, вып. I, 1879.

the failure-theory that was brought forth during the 1880's and won overwhelming approval. The "People's Will Party", which was the main group of the revolutionary Narodniki, had fallen into a state of confusion under severe oppression after giving a terrifying shock to czarism by the successful assassination of Alexander II on March 1st, 1881. From that time onward the failure-theory based along the line of Vorontsov's thinking, which was different in nature from that of the Narodniki who were originally of revolutionary character, began to have a commanding influence among some of them. It was against such a failure-theory that Plekhanov had to direct his criticism above all other things when he, having started to act as a revolutionary Narodniki, made a turn towards Marxism and attempted to reconstruct a new revolutionary movement based on a new recognition of the prevailing state of things. The period covering 1870-1880 may be called the first stage of the history of arguments about Russian capitalism during later period of the 19th century. In those days the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road was advocated by the Narodniki who happened to be the only single revolutionary group in Russia in those days, and it was also supported by Marx and Engels under the above reservations. The period covering 1880-1890 may be called the second stage of the history of arguments about Russian capitalism during the later period of the 19th century. Although the thought of two possible ways at a forked-road did not disappear altogether in those days, another kind of argument on the failure of Russian capitalism which was different in nature came to be raised during this period and Plekhanov then developed his own argument on the development of Russian capitalism in objection to the aforementioned argument, and under such circumstances varied arguments or controversies about Russian capitalism came to be raised in the form of the confrontation of the failure versus the success-theory of Russian capitalism. The period covering 1890-1900 may be called the third stage of the history of argument about Russian capitalism during the later period or the 19th century. In those days controversies about Russian capitalism came to constantly rage on a larger scale. In this period Lenin and 'legal Marxists' came to make their appearance, and varied streams or schools of Russian economic thought came to be materialized respectively regarding the varied arguments about Russian capitalism⁵³).

P.S.: The contents of this paper were originally printed in Chapter I of my "*Study of the History of Economic Thought in Russia : Plekhanov and Controversies about Russian Capitalism*" (in Japanese), Kyoto, Minerva Shobo, 1967.

53) See my previous paper "The Controversies concerning Russian Capitalism", *The Kyoto University Economic Review*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 81, Oct. 1966, pp. 21-55.