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Chapter One

From Academic to Revolutionary: The Young Rozhkov (1868-1905)
The name of Nikolai Aleksandrovich Rozhkov is little known in the West and all but forgotten in Russia too. Yet there was a time when he was considered one of the most important and influential figures in the development of Russian historical thought and a major political activist. As early as 1907, no less an authority than Lenin considered “Rozhkov and Rozhkovians” a significant and potentially dangerous current in the intellectual and political life of Russia.¹ In a series of lectures on Russian historiography, which he delivered in 1923, M.N. Pokrovskii criticised Rozhkov’s historical views and spoke about the need “to fight against Rozhkovism [Rozhkovshchina]”.² A prolific writer who produced in excess of four hundred monographs, articles, published lectures and reviews in a period of approximately thirty-four years, Rozhkov was at his desk to the last.³ As the historian K.V. Sivkov put it in the preface to the posthumous bibliography of Rozhkov’s works, “the scientific and literary [nauchnoe i literaturnoe] legacy of the late N. A. Rozhkov was


extremely significant and extraordinarily rich and diversified in content".4

Rozhkov’s works dealt with a wide range of questions which concerned not only the natural sciences but, more importantly, the social sciences as well. He wrote about world history, sociology, politics, economics, philosophy, psychology, education, contemporary affairs — anything, in fact, which seemed important to him. Consequently, his many articles are found in various journals and collections, ranging from specialised histories to legal works, to general-political discussions, to philosophical studies.5 As Sivkov has pointed out, Rozhkov fully devoted the last thirty-four years of his life to historical scholarship, achieving a vast output in a short time (1893-1927).6 This feat is even more remarkable when we take into consideration the fact that Rozhkov spent over twelve years of his adult life in exile and in prison.

Almost seven decades have passed since Rozkov’s death in 1927, so it comes as no surprise that some of his judgements and statements have been superseded or proved incorrect. Despite the march of time, his works still remain of value today. Rozhkov’s major historical works are worthy of study not only because they are interesting and competent studies in history,

4 Ibid., p.164.
5 For a complete list of Rozhkov’s oeuvre, see the bibliography on pp. 281-312 which supplements Sivkov’s bibliography published in 1928.
6 Sivkov, op.cit., p. 164.
particularly Russian history, but because they reflect an attempt to interpret historical development as a meaningful process in an original manner. Rozhkov's works and ideas are also important because they epitomize the very complex and contradictory set of forces that comprised late nineteenth-century Russian and early twentieth-century Soviet historiography. Rozhkov more than any other historian of the period "represents the essence of the crisis within bourgeois historiography and philosophical thought".7

All of Rozhkov's works have one thing in common: a scientific theory that he believed was capable of explaining all aspects of human development. His early scholarly works reveal a thinker searching for and developing the basis of such a theory. In an article published in 1898, Rozhkov outlined some of the basic elements of his theory.8 Between 1898 and 1905, he published several other papers in which he elaborated and refined his earlier statements.9 By 1905, Rozhkov

---


8 N.A. Rozhkov, "Uspekhi sovremennoi sotsiologii v ikh sootnoshenii s istoriey", Obrazovanie, No. 12, 1898, pp. 17-36. This article was reproduced, with some important additions, under the title "Psikhologicheskaiia shkola v sotsiologii" as the first part of a larger article entitled "Psikhologiia kharaktera i sotsiologiia" which was eventually published in a two-volume collection of articles entitled Istoriicheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki. Sbornik statei, Vols. I and II (Moscow, 1906).

9 See: N.A. Rozhkov, "Natural'noe khoziaistvo i formy zemlevladienia v drevnei rossii", Zhizn", No. 9, 1900, pp. 41-65; "Eticheskie i esteticheskie kharaktery", Obrazovanie, No. 10, 1900, pp. 1-24; Sel'skoe khoziaistvo moskovskoi rusi v XVI yeke i ego vliianie na sotsial'no-politicheskii stroi togo vremen", Mir Bozhii, No. 12, 1900, pp. 1-31; "Eticheskii individualist (Po povodu knigi
had devised a theory of historical development that would become the basis of all his future historical works and that would determine their structure.

While little is known of Rozhkov in the West, the label most frequently attached to him is that of Marxist. Meanwhile, in the Soviet Union, Rozhkov was often charged with the crime of being un-Marxist. Both Western and Soviet accounts have failed to analyse the complex intellectual environment which shaped Rozhkov as a historian, while Western commentators have exaggerated the role Marxism played in this environment. Further, to make sense of Rozhkov’s intellectual development, we need to take into consideration Rozhkov’s political radicalisation between 1898 and 1905. Investigating these issues is the task of this chapter.

The first thirty-seven years of Rozhkov’s life may be seen in terms of his search for a scientific theory of historical development. During this time, he was a professional historian pursuing an academic career. With unyielding ambition and immense energy, Rozhkov

published his research projects and engaged in the prevailing academic debates and issues of the time. Until 1905, Rozhkov was attempting to build an academic career and his early writings reflected this preoccupation. His early works and the theory which governed them seemed to be products of a secure and peaceful academic world, a world removed from the social chaos of the imminent revolutionary era.¹⁰

Of Rozhkov's writings, Mazour wrote:

On the one hand Rozhkov displays the best of the liberal traditions of the earlier decades, while on the other he betrays signs of surrender to the later triumphant spirit of the November Revolution. Because he has no firm grip on either tradition, he pathetically falls between the two.¹¹

This simplistic analysis rests on false assumptions. It is not true that Rozhkov lacked a firm grip of the so-called liberal traditions that preceded the Marxist tradition. Nor is it true that somehow after 1917 a "Marxist doctrine" appeared fully grown and armed like Athene from the head of Zeus. Finally, it is not true that Rozhkov was compelled to superimpose a Marxist doctrine "on a rather mediocre, colourless orthodox narrative".¹²

¹² Ibid.
Contrary to the claims made by Mazour, Rozhkov had a firm grip on the traditions that preceded Marxism. By 1905 his ideas and his works were most influenced by Auguste Comte's writings and the positivist ideas that existed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Russia. As a student at university and as an academic, Rozhkov was also tremendously influenced by Kliuchevskii. Although by 1905 Rozhkov had read and was familiar with Marxist notions, these were a less important influence on him.

By 1905, under the influences just mentioned, Rozhkov had formulated his theory of history. The essential ingredients of this theory remained at the basis of all his major works until his death in 1927. Even after 1905, when his activities as a revolutionary increased and his views on Marxism as a radical ideology changed, his interpretation of history was still governed by his professional and pre-revolutionary training. Rozhkov was first and foremost a professionally trained historian and it was through his academic work that he became involved in revolutionary activity.

As a member of the liberal intelligentsia, Rozhkov fought for "free education in a free society" and for "extensive government reform".13 His political beliefs led him to the Pravda group, the Pedagogical Society of

---

13 N.A. Rozhkov and A. Sokolov, O 1905 g Vospominaniiia (Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1925), p. 7
the University of Moscow and eventually to the Social Democratic movement and the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. But Rozhkov's involvement with the Bolsheviks was to be short-lived. Rozhkov's straightforwardness of mind and his unquestionable belief in the scientific nature of his historical world-view led him to Menshevism after the "years of reaction". With the conviction that Russia had to follow a Western course of economic, social and political development, Rozhkov had much in common with the Menshevik faction of Russian Social Democracy which "was bound by the notion of prescribed stages of development to a far greater extent than were Lenin and his followers".14

The very few references to Rozhkov in non-Russian sources and the discussions of Rozhkov in Russian sources focus on whether or not he was a Marxist. Yaresh made this blatantly clear when he wrote: "As a whole, Rozhkov's conception of Russian history was no doubt based on an orderly and precise scheme. But was it 'Marxist'?".15 On the basis of a very brief examination of the periodization that Rozhkov gave in Russian History in a Comparative Historical Interpretation, Yaresh concluded that "Rozhkov's scheme evolved from the

basic principles of Marxism”.\textsuperscript{16} It comes as no surprise that this is in direct contradiction to the assessment made by the Soviet critic Sidorov who declared that Rozhkov’s periodization was not based on Marxist teachings.\textsuperscript{17}

Rozhkov resembled Marx in that they both viewed history as a progressive process determined, at least in part, by economic development. However, whereas Marx in his preface to \textit{A Contribution To The Critique of Political Economy} emphasised the conflict between “productive forces” and “relations of production” which drives the development of history through stages, comprising Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production, Rozhkov does not use the language of “productive forces” or “relations of production”. For Rozhkov, the most important general feature of historical development was the transition from a natural to a money economy, a process that will be examined in some detail in chapter six.\textsuperscript{18} In Russian history, Rozhkov developed a periodisation that borrowed heavily from his mentor, Kliuchevskii.

Only after 1918 did Rozhkov modify his earlier periodisation to include, at first, nine periods and, subsequently, fifteen periods of Russian and world history. His post-1918 periodisation appears more Marxist in that it described a progression through the

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{18} See figure 6.1 in chapter six.
following stages: 1) Primitive Society; 2) Savage Society; 3) Barbarian Society; 4) Feudal Revolution; 5) Feudalism; 6) Gentry Revolution; 7) Reign of the Gentry; 8) Bourgeois Revolution; and 9) Capitalism. Even here, writing under the constraints of Soviet censorship, Rozhkov continued to infuriate Soviet historians by not imitating Marx’s periodisation outlined in *A Contribution To The Critique of Political Economy* and by further complicating the story of social evolution by adding more and more sub-periods to his scheme.

Using issues like periodization as convenient yardsticks with which to measure Marxism, commentators until recently have presented a ready-made picture of the type of historian that Rozhkov was. Such pictures not only overlook the complex views of Rozhkov the independent thinker but they fail to do justice to late Russian and early Soviet historiographical debates. With the collapse of Soviet Communism, it is no longer necessary or appropriate to cling to antiquated debates forged in the furnace of cold-war ideology and rhetoric. To understand the

---


21 The notable exceptions here are the studies provided by J.D. White, V.O. Volobuev and N.N. Tarasova.

complex and contradictory influences that shaped the views of Rozhkov the historian and the revolutionary is to understand the origins and development of Soviet historiography.

Nikolai Aleksandrovich Rozhkov was born of Russian parentage on 5 November (24 October) 1868 in Verkhotur'e, Perm' guberniia. He recalled that he was born into an "insignificant and impoverished gentry family". Rozhkov's father, Aleksandr Nikolaevich, was a district school teacher and then a supervisor of the district schools in the various towns of the Perm' region and later a school inspector in Ekaterinburg. In this respect, Rozhkov's biography resembled that of Lenin who was only two years younger than Rozhkov and whose father was a school inspector in Simbirsk Province.

Having a father who was a devoted official of the public education system meant that from an early age Rozhkov

---


23 N.A. Rozhkov, Avtobiografiia, in "Pamiati N.A. Rozhkova", Katorga i Ssylka, No. 3, 1927, p. 161. Rozhkov wrote his short autobiography in 1924 for the Granat Entsiklopedicheskii Slovar'. In this chapter, I have drawn heavily on this source. However, to keep footnoting within reasonable limits only direct quotations will be noted henceforth.

A View of Ekaterinburg at the turn of the century
was taught the meliorating value and importance of education.

Rozhkov recalled that the home environment was "typically petty-bourgeois" and while "there were no lack of necessities in the family, at the same time, there were no savings". That is to say, his childhood was comfortable. The family traditions were "conservative, autocratic and orthodox", yet Rozhkov claimed that his younger sister and he were allowed to develop independently. There was no shortage of reading material at home and the gifted Rozhkov read avidly.

Like many of his contemporaries, Rozhkov had from childhood a passion for reading history, and like them it was during his high school days that a sense of protest awoke in him for the first time. The assassination of Alexander II in the spring of 1881 and the trials of the revolutionaries that followed, aroused in him the desire to become more closely acquainted with the social life and literature of the period. This desire convinced the young reader that if any understanding of the past was going to be achieved, then the rules that determined historical development had to be discovered. Such a belief led Rozhkov to the study of positivist thought.

26 *Ibid*.
27 Rozhkov refers to this as the "protsess pervomartovtsev" or "the events relating to the first of March".
Kolia standing next to his mother and younger sister
The young Rozhkov with his parents
Positivism, especially in the latter half of the nineteenth century, had a considerable influence on the natural sciences and on the social sciences in Russia including sociology, law, political economy, historiography and literary theory and criticism. S.F. Platonov, Rozhkov's contemporary and another of Kliuchevskii's students, wrote: "My world-view was formed at the end of the nineteenth century. Christian morality, positivist philosophy and evolutionary theory formed its basis." Platonov declared that he "adopted positivism early" because, as he wrote, "it freed me from the conventions and the metaphysics that possessed the minds of historians such as my teachers Solov'ev, Chicherin, Kavelin and others. It inculcated in me the methods of academic, research work which were removed from a priori speculations."

Like Rozhkov, Platonov regarded positivism as a progressive philosophy.

As Vvedenskii wrote:

Of course, Comte plays an important role in the general course of the intellectual development of the XIX century. It [Positivism] is especially important for us Russians, since it was under its influence that the interest in sociology was consolidated, a field in which Russian scholars quickly came to occupy a

28 Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia (Moscow, third edition, 1975), Vol. 20, p. 156.
30 Ibid., p. 18.
prominent place and even formed a school of their own, distinguished by the use of the so-called subjective method.\textsuperscript{31}

Positivism was arguably the most widespread doctrine among Russian intellectuals at the turn of the century. As Bohachevsky-Chomiak, the author of Sergei Trubetskoï's biography, succinctly put it:

Positivism in Russia was not so much a philosophy as the program of the day, the prevalent worldview of the intelligentsia, the last word in science. The progressive gentry embraced it for fear of being left outside the mainstream of universal progress and of stagnating in provincial Russia. Somehow, reading Buckle, Spencer, J.S. Mill, Darwin, some of Comte and Spencer's comments on Comte, or at least knowing about these men and agreeing with their views, made one progressive, educated and cosmopolitan.\textsuperscript{32}

The widespread influence of positivism in Russia was reflected in the works of many writers including P.L. Lavrov and N.K. Mikhailovskii, both of whom Rozhkov had read.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} A.I. Vvedenskii, “Sud’by filosofii v rossii”, in Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, Book II (42), March-April 1898, p. 349. See also: F.C. Copleston, Philosophy in Russia: From Herzen to Lenin and Berdyaev (Wellwood: Search Press Ltd., 1986), pp. 119-141.


Chapter One: From Academic to Revolutionary

Historians have tended to ignore the influence of positivism upon Russian social thought. The chief reason has been the historian's exaggerated preoccupation with the origins of Russian and Soviet Marxism. This has diminished the importance of other schools of thought to such an extent that it is easy to forgive the reader for believing that only Marxism and those schools of thought that were seen as directly relevant to it ever counted.

While still in fifth form at the gimnaziia 34 in Ekaterinburg, Rozhkov read and came under the influence of the English positivist historian Henry Thomas Buckle, whose main work, the celebrated two-volume History of Civilisation in England, had been published in England between 1857 and 1861 and had appeared in Russian translation, first in the journal Otechestvennye Zapiski in the latter year and subsequently, 1863-1864, in book form. 35

In this work, Buckle concentrated on the study of the influence on English history of the environment, the movement of population, distribution of property and the development of education. Influenced by Montesquieu, Buckle drew a direct connection between "the development of consciousness and the conditions of the geographical environment" and considered the

---

34 The Russian gimnaziia was a type of intermediate or university preparatory school. It corresponds roughly to our senior high school.

“accumulation of knowledge to be the cause of change in economic and political systems”.\(^{36}\) It was not Buckle's belief in the “boundless power of reason” that influenced Rozhkov. It was Buckle’s belief in the “universality”, the “uniformity”, that is, in the determinism of historical events which most impressed him. The events of history were not a product of chance or of supernatural interference.\(^{37}\) They were the product of human actions, collective or individual. Buckle called this the doctrine of Necessary Connexion.\(^{38}\)

Buckle believed that history is a science and developed a Newtonian model of history. He wrote:

> Whoever is at all acquainted with what has been done during the last two centuries must be aware that every generation demonstrates some events to be regular and predictable, which the preceding generation had declared to be irregular and unpredictable; so that the marked tendency of advancing civilization is to strengthen our belief in the universality of order, of method and of law.\(^{39}\)

Not only did Buckle believe that human actions are regular but that these actions are governed by mental and physical laws. He argued that “both sets of laws

\(^{36}\) *Ibid.*


\(^{39}\) Buckle, *op.cit.*, p. 3.
must be studied, and there can be no history without the natural sciences". 40 It will be argued that these ideas held by Buckle were essentially at the basis of Rozhkov's own interpretation of history. Rozhkov's desire to discover "scientific laws of social development" explains not only why he was attracted to positivist thought early in his life but also why he was attracted to the economic determinism of Marxist ideas later in his career. 41

Rozhkov wrote in his autobiography that, as a result of reading Buckle, he began to analyse and study the idea of historical laws in greater detail. He recalled that in his youth he also read and was influenced by such writers as I.S. Turgenev, D.I. Pisarev, N.I. Ziber, H. Spencer and others. 42 Spencer's positivism greatly influenced and interested the young Russian. 43 Spencer held that the ultimate nature of reality is unknowable and that human beings must be content with the knowledge of the physical world around them. 44 He

41 As Bottomore has pointed out, despite Marx's criticisms of Comte and positivism, it is a fact that "Marx's conceptions were capable of giving rise ... to a broadly positivist sociology". Indeed, Marx's later writings were more positivist in nature than his earlier writings which were more influenced by Hegel. See: T. Bottomore, Marxist Sociology (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1975), pp. 9-13.
43 Rubinshtein, op.cit., p. 561. See also: Sidorov, op.cit., p. 186 and Mazour, op.cit., p.185.
maintained that the world began as a great mass of matter in motion whose cause could not be known. Gradually this mass of matter began to divide into separate parts. Living things arose and began evolving and, in adapting to their different surroundings, acquired increasingly dissimilar characteristics. Evolution tends always, Spencer thought, toward greater individuality. As a result of this belief, he explained the evolution of society in terms of the increasing freedom of individuals. Spencer considered that "Living together arose because, on the average, it proved more advantageous to each than living apart". And once a society was created, it was perpetuated because: "maintenance of combination [of individuals] is maintenance of conditions ... more satisfactory [to] living than the combined persons would otherwise have". Spencer believed in the general individualistic principle that "the properties of the units determine the properties of the aggregate".

Spencer believed that evolution, that is, "a change from a state of relatively indefinite, incoherent, homogeneity to a state of relatively definite, coherent, heterogeneity", was a universal process that explained both the "earliest changes which the universe at large is supposed to have undergone" and "those latest changes which we trace in society and the products of

social life".47 Spencer subsequently argued that the "evolution of human societies, far from being different from other evolutionary phenomena, is but a special case of a universally applicable natural law".48 Sociology, he maintained, can become a science only when it is founded on the notion of natural, evolutionary law. Spencer wrote: "There can be no complete acceptance of sociology as a science, so long as the belief in a social order not conforming to natural law, survives".49 As Coser wrote: "It is axiomatic to Spencer that ultimately all aspects of the universe, whether organic or inorganic, social or nonsocial, are subject to the laws of evolution".50 With reference specifically to the operation of social laws, Spencer wrote: "There is no alternative. Either society has laws, or it has not. If it has not, there can be no order, no certainty, no system in its phenomena. If it has, then they are like the other laws of the universe — sure, inflexible, ever active, and having no exception".51

While most Russian thinkers rejected Spencer's belief "in the inevitability of perfection through evolution",52 a few, like Rozhkov, adopted the point of

48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
view more commonly expressed in the West that evolutionary theories were fatalistic. In the West, as Tulloch explained, Social Darwinism "had been quickly adapted to the 'tooth and claw' ethics of a burgeoning capitalism". In Russia, on the other hand, evolutionary theories, including Social Darwinism, "were received not as academic or technical theories, but as total world views — indeed vessels of consolation or instruments of salvation". The Russian interpretation had a radical and visionary character about it. This may have been due to the fact that "Russia had somehow to catch up with the whole history of Western thought in the course of a single century". Whatever the reason, Rozhkov was attracted to the notion of the evolutionary rather than revolutionary development of Russia. He was also attracted to the mechanical quality of the laws enunciated by positivism. Rozhkov’s willingness to accept the notion of determinism was in keeping with the latest developments in natural science which had strict determinism as its theoretical and methodological ideal.

Rozhkov's attraction to Spencer's theory of evolution, as it applied to society, stemmed from his reliable belief that Russia was a European nation that

---

53 Ibid.
54 Ibid., p. 88.
lagged behind Western Europe's general development. Rozhkov belonged to that group of intellectuals that were labelled "Westernisers". In all his major works, Rozhkov argued that Russia was a backward country that lagged centuries behind Western Europe and he advocated a transformation of Russia along what he regarded as Western lines of development.

Rozhkov's belief in the existence of laws of historical development and his desire to discover them was bolstered by his early readings of Buckle and Spencer. While the ideas expressed by these writers may be detected, in one way or another, in most of Rozhkov's major works, the early influence of Buckle and of Spencer had one most important result: they compelled the young thinker to analyse further his interest in positivist ideas. This eventually led Rozhkov to the works of the founder of positivism, Auguste Comte.

In 1886, having completed his secondary schooling, he enrolled in the Faculty of History and Philology at Moscow University and in 1890 he graduated. His association with this distinguished institution, which would last until his death, was to be a dominant influence on his intellectual development. At Moscow University, Rozhkov studied under and was profoundly impressed by V.O. Kliuchevskii, undoubtedly the greatest

Russian historian of the nineteenth century. From Kliuchevskii, "the new phenomenon in Russian historiography", Rozhkov was to learn much about Russian history and the methodology of history. Having attracted a circle of the most brilliant young Russian historians of the time, Kliuchevskii encouraged them to devote their attention to the factual study of what he called "historical sociology", that is, the structure of society, the organisation of human associations and the natural environment. The best of these young students were taught and encouraged to deal with primary sources, a skill which seemed to come naturally to Kliuchevskii.

Before Rozhkov, Kliuchevskii believed that society was as proper a subject for scientific study as nature. Also before Rozhkov, Kliuchevskii believed that the historian could discover the laws of social development through an examination of the three fundamental forces that operate throughout history: man, community and the environment. With such fundamental beliefs in common

58 Mazour, op.cit., p.129.
60 Kliuchevskii, op.cit., p. 34.
before they met, it is no wonder that Kliuchevskii’s “bourgeois economism”, as the Soviet historian of Russian historiography Rubinshtein described it, had such a powerful influence on Rozhkov, his best pupil.62

Under his master’s tutelage, Rozhkov came to believe in the vital importance of economic factors. The economism that Kliuchevskii espoused was not a crude economism, as some of his critics have claimed.63 It was a detailed examination of how economics affects all aspects of society. The economic approach that Kliuchevskii took in his five-volume history of Russia enabled him to examine such factors as the environment, class structure, the legal character of Russian society, the social rivalry and political aspirations of the various social groups within society as well as the cultural development of Russia, including its religion. The historical approach that Kliuchevskii developed placed such an emphasis on economics that Plekhanov went so far as to claim that Kliuchevskii was a Marxist


in spite of himself. Kliuchevskii's economic interpretation of history and his general sociological presentation of historical questions had a tremendous influence not only on Rozhkov but also on Russian historiography in general.

Between 1891 and 1897, to make money while working on his advanced degree, Rozhkov began to teach classical languages at high schools in the Perm' region. Apart from teaching senior students Roman and Greek literature, he advocated and developed a method of teaching history based on the use of original sources. Because of his training in classical languages, Rozhkov was fluent in many Slavic languages and was also widely read in Latin, Greek, French, German, Italian, Spanish and English, with a smattering of numerous other languages including Arabic.

Despite his teaching commitments, Rozhkov demonstrated his remarkable energy and grasp of history by passing his Master's examination in Russian history in 1896. He also managed to write two minor pieces of work that were published in 1893 and 1895. He worked not only diligently but also rapidly, for he completed his

64 G.V. Plekhanov, Istoriia russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli (Moscow, 1918), Vol. 1, pp. 16, 24
65 Rieber, op.cit., p. xxiii. See also: Platonov, "Lektsii po russkoi istorii", op.cit., p. 54.
66 The first of these works was a speech entitled "An Attempt at Explaining the Fundamental Idea of Tragedy in Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound" which he had presented as a supernumerary teacher of classical languages to an audience of young men from the Perm' Men's Gimnazia on their annual speech day on the 4 October, 1892 and the second was a short paper that examined the primary source Russkaia Pravda. See: Sivkov, op.cit., p. 166.
Master's thesis, published in 1899, before both his soon-to-be eminent contemporaries Kizevetter and Bogoslovskii, who had begun their theses before him.67

The thesis, entitled *The Rural Economy of Muscovite Rus in the Sixteenth Century* was, as Tsvibak noted, based on the study of the *pistsovye knigi* that is, books containing detailed descriptions of all taxable objects in early modern Muscovy, from which Rozhkov gathered a mountain of material.68 Kliuchevskii suggested the thesis to Rozhkov, closely supervised the research and imparted to his neophyte his own pioneering knowledge of how to use the *pistsovye knigi* as historical evidence. The thesis was essentially a product of Kliuchevskii's school of history. It was an original study which examined three basic issues: the agricultural technology used; the factors influencing agricultural productivity, including the system of land ownership, peasant labour and the prices of agricultural goods; and the way in which the rural economy of the sixteenth century influenced the state and social structure.69 In other words, the thesis examined not only the economic way of life that existed in the Muscovite

---

68 Ibid., p. 276. See also: M. Tsvibak, "Rozhkov — istorik", *Kommunisticheskaia Mysl'* (Tashkent, 1927), No. 4, pp. 10-11.
Chapter One: From Academic to Revolutionary

Rus period but also how the rural economy influenced the formation of social and political relations.\(^70\)

At the public hearing of the thesis,\(^71\) Kliuchevskii dissected its inadequacies.\(^72\) His major criticism was that Rozhkov had not included a general discussion of the primary sources he had used. This made the thesis methodologically weak. Kliuchevskii believed that since the \textit{pistsovoye knigi} had never before been the subject of a major study, Rozhkov should have stated explicitly why he was going to use them and how they were going to provide him with evidence for his thesis.\(^73\)

Kliuchevskii’s scathing criticism stemmed not only from his immense knowledge of the primary sources but also from his familiarity with Rozhkov’s research. He was further annoyed by the omission, because Rozhkov had already written and published a paper in which the authenticity of the \textit{pistsovoye knigi} had been examined.\(^74\)

\(^70\) It is interesting to compare Rozhkov’s thesis with I.N. Miklashevskii’s economic study of the same period in Russian history and published in 1894 entitled \textit{K istorii khoziaistvennogo byta moskovskogo gosudarstva}. Whereas Miklashevskii was concerned exclusively with economic phenomena, Rozhkov examined all aspects of Russian social development.

\(^71\) At the post-diploma level, the Candidate [\textit{aspirant}] for the award of Candidate of Sciences [\textit{Kandidat nauk}] had not only to conduct a piece of original research for publication in his or her own field but he or she had to defend it at a public hearing before an examining board appointed by the appropriate institution. See: N. Grant, \textit{Soviet Education} (London: Penguin Books Pty Ltd., 1964), p. 126.


Although Kliuchevskii went on to enumerate some of the problems associated with relying on the *pistsovye knigi* as a major source of reference, he recommended that Rozhkov be granted the Master's degree. Rozhkov's second critic at the public hearing was Kizevetter. He agreed with Kliuchevskii's comments, but tried to lessen the severity of the criticisms. Despite the faults with the thesis, it was awarded the Science Academy's prestigious Uvarov Prize. In 1898, assisted by Kliuchevskii, Rozhkov was appointed *privat-dotsent* within the Faculty of History and Philology and there he continued to conduct advanced research.

From 1898 to 1906 Rozhkov lectured at Moscow University as a *privat-dotsent*. He also taught history in the third Military Corps, later in the Practical Academy of Commercial Sciences and, in the latter years of this period, in the Mezhevom Institute, subsequently the Commercial Academy on the Higher Commercial Courses. During those years, Rozhkov had a series of studies...
Rozhkov with a class of cadets
Below, Rozhkov as a teacher
published and these works "immediately established Nikolai Aleksandrovich as a major name in academic circles".80

A major interest of Rozhkov's in the years before 1905, one which never ceased to concern him, was the question of how best to teach history to school children and how best to write history for people educating themselves.81 Between 1900 and 1905, Rozhkov published several articles and reviews concerning these questions in various journals. There appeared in 1901 his attempt at the "creation of a new style of textbook". The publication entitled A Textbook of Russian History for Secondary Schools and Self-Education (Uchebnik russkoi istorii dlia srednikh uchebnykh zavedenii i dlia samoobrazovaniiia) went through seven editions between 1901 and Rozhkov's death in 1927.82

At the turn of the century, Rozhkov gave public lectures organised by the zemstva83 in Moscow and other cities such as Kursk, Voronezh and Tambov. One of them was his celebrated work Town and Village in

---

80 Sivkov, op.cit., p. 164.  
82 Sivkov, op.cit., p.165.  
83 Established in 1864 as part of Alexander's ambitious reforms, the zemstvo was an organ for self-government in rural areas. Zemstva is the Russian plural form of zemstvo. See: S.G. Pushkarev, Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), pp. 190-191.
Chapter One: From Academic to Revolutionary

Russian History 84 which had appeared in four editions before his death. During this period Rozhkov contributed to the journals: Life, Scientific Observation, Education and God's World. 85 It was in God's World that Rozhkov published most of his important work A Survey of Russian History from a Sociological Point of View in 1903-1905. 86 The third part of the second volume and the second edition of the first volume of this work were published separately in 1905. This study, which was never completed because of Rozhkov's political activities during the 1905 revolution and after, formed the basis of his last major work — Russian History in a Comparative Historical Light: the Principles of Social Dynamics.87

By 1903, the young historian was convinced that certain fundamental tenets of positivism were of vital importance to his theory of history. It was at this time that Rozhkov immersed himself in a second wave of positivist thought. Although Rozhkov derived his interpretation of positivism predominantly from its founder Auguste Comte, he was also influenced by the positivism of the English thinker J.S. Mill. As Rozhkov

---

84 See: N.A. Rozhkov, Gorod i derevnia v russkoi istorii (St. Petersburg, 1902).
85 See the journals: Zhizn', Nauchnoe Obozrenie, Obrazovanie and Mir Bozhii.
86 N.A. Rozhkov, Obzor russkoi istorii s sotsiologicheskoi tochki zreniia, Chast' pervaya (second edition) and Chast' Vtoraya, Vyp. I and II (Moscow, 1905).
87 See the bibliography of Rozhkov's works at the end of this thesis, pp. 281-312.
wrote in the preface to the first volume of his twelve-volume *magnum opus*, he had had in mind, for quite some time, "the formulation of the general laws that govern the co-existence and development of social phenomena".88 It was in *A Survey of Russian History from a Sociological Point of View* and in *The Fundamental Laws of the Development of Social Phenomena* that Rozhkov most clearly expounded his positivist approach to history. For this reason, these works will be examined at length and used as the major references in this thesis.

In 1898 Rozhkov wrote an article entitled "The Successes of Contemporary Sociology with Regard to History".89 In it, Rozhkov outlined those principles on which his subsequent historical and sociological constructions were based. These principles included the insignificant role of the individual in history and the evolutionary and causal relationship of historical phenomena. Rozhkov divided social phenomena into five processes: natural, economical, social, political and psychological. Rozhkov stated his belief that "pragmatic facts", that is, facts about the unique deeds of individuals and events, are of little significance unless they can explain the actions and events that take place in history generally.90 In 1899, Rozhkov published an

89 Rozhkov, "Uspekhi sovremennoi sotsiologii v ikh sootnoshenii s istoriei", pp.17-36.
article in which he defended the basic premises he had established.91

Rozhkov acknowledged his debt to Comte and Mill several times in both these very important articles.92 However, Rozhkov best summarised his opinion of Comte and Mill in 1899 when he was defending his basic premises and pointing out how his views differed from those held by N. I. Kareev, a professor of history at St. Petersburg University who had accused Rozhkov of plagiarising his ideas. Rozhkov declared that if his views were similar to those expressed by his colleague it was not because he had borrowed them from him. As Rozhkov declared: “If we have views in common it is because we are indebted to two of the greatest philosophical authorities of the past century — Comte and Mill”.93

Rozhkov most likely discovered Comte while at university as a postgraduate in the mid-1890s because, as R.A. Averbukh has pointed out, Comte’s influence was apparent in Rozhkov’s earliest published works.94 Rozhkov’s attraction to and acceptance of positivist ideas early in his career necessarily led him to the works of Comte. Rozhkov was tremendously impressed

91 See: Rozhkov, “Neskol’ko spornykh sotsiologicheskikh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)”, pp. 82-89.
92 See also Rozhkov’s articles: “Psikhologiia kharaktera i sotsiologiia”, p. 177 and “Znachenie i sud’by noveishago idealizma v’ rossi: po povody knigi Problemy idealizma”, p.36.
93 Rozhkov, “Neskol’ko spornykh sotsiologicheskikh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)”, p. 89.
by Comte’s first magnum opus, the *Cours de philosophie positive* (1830-1842). L.A. Coser distinguished between Comte’s “scientific writings” of the *Cours* on the one hand and the “normative theory” contained in the early essays and everything written after the *Cours* on the other. Coser concluded that Comte’s “sociology as a scientific enterprise” was deserving of far more attention than the normative aspects of his thought.

Similarly, Rozhkov was attracted to the scientific sociology of Comte and concentrated his efforts on an examination of the *Cours*.

Believing psychology to be of the utmost importance, Rozhkov was not satisfied with the fact that Comte completely omitted psychology from his elaborate classification of the sciences. Unhappy with Comte’s lack of understanding of psychology, Rozhkov turned to J.S. Mill’s study of Comte. Mill, according to Rozhkov, corrected Comte’s anomaly with regard to the science of psychology in *A System of Logic* (1843). Mill’s study left its mark on Rozhkov’s theory of history. With Comte’s theory of the hierarchy of the sciences corrected, Rozhkov then set out to investigate and develop a theory of the role of psychology in history.

---

95 See: Rozhkov, “Psikhologiia kharaktera i sotsiologiia”, p. 177 and “Znachenie i sud’by noveishago idealizma v’ rossii: po povody knigi Problemy idealizma ”, p. 34.
98 Rozhkov, “Psikhologiia kharaktera i sotsiologiia”, p. 177.
This aspect of Rozhkov's work became increasingly important to him but he was never able to complete it.99

Rozhkov's first major work, *The Rural Economy of Muscovite Rus in the Sixteenth Century*, cannot be considered just a "typical historico-economical research of the last decade of the nineteenth century".100 Although it was chiefly influenced by Kliuichevskii's understanding of history and economics, it was also inspired by N.I. Ziber's economic materialism and by the Marxist *albeit* legal Marxist ideas that Rozhkov had read during his research. In keeping with his beliefs that Russia had to follow a Western European path of development, Rozhkov embraced the legal Marxist notion that capitalism played a progressive role. Rozhkov belonged to that category of thinkers who, as Harding has put it, saw capitalism as having a "modernizing, Westernizing and civilizing significance for contemporary Russia".101 Such reasoning led Rozhkov to the idea that capitalism could be controlled or made "civilised". Rozhkov's notion of "civilised capitalism", which he developed in detail while in Siberian exile between 1908 and 1917, will be examined more closely in the last chapter of this thesis.

---

99 In his search for a psychological theory of history, Rozhkov consulted the works of such thinkers as Hippolyte Taine, Ludwig Gumplowicz, Lester H. Ward, Franklin H. Giddings, Gabriel Tarde, Karl Lamprecht, Paul Joseph Lacombe, Gustave Le Bon, Benjamin Kidd, René Worms and others. See: Rozhkov, "Uspekhi sovremennoi sotsiologii v ikh sootnoshenii s istoriei", pp.17-36.

100 Tsvibak, *op.cit.*, p. 10.

The Young Rozhkov
Zinaida Petrovna Rozhkova, Rozhkov's first wife (1902)
In his autobiography, Rozhkov declared that he was influenced by Nikolai Ivanovich Ziber, who had been Professor and Head of the Political Economics and Statistics Department at the University of Kiev from 1873-1875. Ziber was one of the first to popularise and defend the teachings of Marx in Russia.\textsuperscript{102} In 1871, a year before the publication of N.F. Danielson's Russian translation of the first volume of Marx's \textit{Capital}, Ziber published a treatise entitled \textit{David Ricardo's Theory of Value and of Capital}. In this work he included "a systematic exposition of Marx's economic doctrines".\textsuperscript{103} This was, as White pointed out, "the first of a whole series of books and articles in which he applied himself to propagating Marxist economics".\textsuperscript{104} Between 1876 and 1877, he published a number of articles in the journals \textit{Znanie} and \textit{Slovo} under the general title of \textit{The Economic Theory of Karl Marx}.\textsuperscript{105} In 1873, Marx noted:

An excellent Russian edition of \textit{Das Kapital} appeared in the spring of 1872. The edition of 3,000 copies is already nearly exhausted. As early as 1871, N. Sieber, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Kiev, in his work, \textit{David Ricardo's Theory of Value and of Capital}, referred to my theory of value, of money

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{104} \textit{Ibid.}
\bibitem{105} \textit{Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia}, Vol. 9, p. 528.
\end{thebibliography}
and of capital, as in its fundamentals a necessary sequel to the teachings of Smith and Ricardo. That which astonishes the Western European in the reading of this excellent work, is the author’s consistent and firm grasp of the purely theoretical position.\textsuperscript{106}

In 1882, Ziber published as a supplement to the works of David Ricardo a chapter from \textit{Zur Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie}.\textsuperscript{107} In 1883 Ziber published his \textit{Essays on Primitive Economic Culture} and in 1885 he re-issued an enlarged version of his dissertation on Ricardo under the new title of \textit{David Ricardo and Karl Marx in their Social and Economic Researches} where, once again, he gave a detailed exposition of the contents of \textit{Capital}.\textsuperscript{108}

As Copleston wrote, Ziber’s books “did a lot to arouse interest in Marx’s economic theories in Russian intellectual circles”.\textsuperscript{109} Rozhkov retrospectively recalled in his essay, “Reminiscences of 1905” published in 1925, how he first became acquainted with the works of Marx while he was only in the last class of the gimnazia. This he did by studying Ziber’s book \textit{David Ricardo and Karl Marx in their Social and Economic Researches}, “which contained, as is well-known, an extremely detailed exposition of the first volume of

\textsuperscript{107} White, \textit{op.cit.}, p.10.
\textsuperscript{109} Copleston, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 246.
Capital with many quotations."¹¹⁰ Later in 1896, when he took his master's examination, one of the questions he chose for the political economy examination concerned capital. For this, Rozhkov read thoroughly the first two volumes of Capital.¹¹¹ Since the Russian translation of the third volume was not published until 1896, Rozhkov could not familiarise himself with it in time for the examination.¹¹²

Rozhkov's attraction to Ziber's brand of legal Marxism stemmed from his early interest in and criticism of the views of the Narodnik (Populist) movement. The young Rozhkov read the major works of P.L. Lavrov and N.K. Mikhailovskii and, like them, accepted the importance of a scientific world view to explain the need for social reform and development. Also like them, Rozhkov agreed that whatever type of social reform was undertaken in Russia it had to take into account the vast peasant population.¹¹³ However, Rozhkov rejected the populist notion that any inspiration for the rehabilitation of Russia would have to come from the peasantry. Whereas the Narodniki advocated a non-capitalist path of development for Russia,¹¹⁴ Rozhkov believed that a Western style of

¹¹⁰ N.A. Rozhkov and A. Sokolov, O 1905 g. Vospominaniia (Moscow: Moskovskii Rabochii, 1925), pp.3-4.
¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 4.
¹¹² Ibid.
¹¹⁴ A. Walicki, A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism, translated from the Polish by H. Andrews-Rusiecka
As early as 1899, Rozhkov acknowledged that Marxism merited attention because it was one of the schools of thought that paid close attention to the study of economics. He wrote:

> It is necessary to admit that of all the historical processes being studied by contemporary historians and sociologists, the economic, social and political processes are the main ones. And, of these three, the greatest significance belongs to that process involving the development of the economy.\(^{118}\)

Rozhkov went on to argue that the study of economics was most important because:

> economic evolution is less subject to causal influence from other factors than is social or political evolution. Economic evolution represents the purest of the three types of evolutionary processes being studied and is also the most powerful \([sil'nee]\) of the three because it causally influences the political and social processes.\(^{119}\)

Rozhkov advocated not only economic materialism but a rigid determinism. He believed that society could be transformed from one type of economic, social and political formation to another through a mechanical chain of causation quite independently of human will or action and he believed that economics was at the basis of this evolution. By the turn of the century, the young historian was already attracted to an evolutionary

---

\(^{118}\) Rozhkov, "Neskol’ko spornykh sotsioligicheskikh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)", p. 87.

\(^{119}\) Ibid.
model of historical development.\textsuperscript{120} When he embraced Menshevism some eight years later in 1907, it was a natural progression given his earlier convictions. Rozhkov's political commitment firstly to positivism, then to legal Marxism and later to Menshevism cannot be seen simply as a product of irrational thought or political opportunism. This political journey reflected the modification of Rozhkov's positivist ideas in the light of his historical research.

Bearing in mind Rozhkov's interest in economics, the attention he paid to Marxism is understandable given that Marxism entered Russia "exclusively as an economic doctrine".\textsuperscript{121} As Nechkina accurately noted, from the time of its appearance in the early 1870s until as late as 1922, the term "economic materialism" could serve as an acceptable synonym.\textsuperscript{122} To Rozhkov, it was one of many economic theories that existed at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{123} At best, it confirmed his belief in the evolutionary and law-governed development of all countries, including Russia. In this belief, he was

\textsuperscript{120} It is worth mentioning that Rozhkov also read, illegally, translations of the works of Ferdinand Lassalle whom Rozhkov later considered "an ardent and steadfast social champion". See: N.A. Rozhkov, \textit{Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki. Sbornik statei}, Vol. 1, p. 258. Lassalle, like Ziber, was opposed to class struggle and wished to see social change through peaceful, political reforms. See: V.V. Vorovskii, \textit{K istorii marksizma v rossii} (Moscow, 1919), p. 16 and Wilczynski, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 303.

\textsuperscript{121} White, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 8.


\textsuperscript{123} Rozhkov, "Neskol'ko spornykh sotsiologicheskikh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)", p. 87.
closely related to Plekhanov.\textsuperscript{124} Before 1905, Rozhkov did not consider Marxism to be a revolutionary theory.

When Rozhkov proudly claimed in 1927 that he was "close to the revolutionary mood" in high school, the truth was that at the time he was "far from any kind of revolutionary practice".\textsuperscript{125} In 1925, recollecting the events of the turn of the century, Rozhkov wrote: "The study of Marx produced in me an intense interest towards his ideas, but it still did not make me a Marxist".\textsuperscript{126} Rozhkov further claimed that he did become a Marxist but that his conversion to Marxism took place only in 1899.

Claiming that his conversion to Marxism came while he was working on his dissertation entitled \textit{The Rural Economy of Muscovite Rus in the Sixteenth Century}, which was published in 1899, Rozhkov declared:

\begin{quote}
Doing the research for this book I became acquainted with a large amount of economic and historico-economic literature that concerned not only Russia but other countries as well. I also had the opportunity to study sources. This specialised study threw new light for me on the origins of the Muscovite autocracy and its class foundation [\textit{kl}a\textsuperscript{s}\textit{so}v\textit{a}i\textit{a podkladka}]. What I had read earlier from Marx acquired a real and actual meaning only when I became convinced that
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{124} A.P. Mendel, \textit{Dilemmas Of Progress In Tsarist Russia: Legal Marxism and Legal Populism} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 104-118.
\item \textsuperscript{125} Rozhkov, \textit{Avtobiografija}, p.161.
\item \textsuperscript{126} \textit{Ibid}.
\end{itemize}
economics provides the key with which to understand politics.\textsuperscript{127}

An examination of Rozhkov's thesis reveals no evidence to support his claim that by 1899 he was "undoubtedly a Marxist".\textsuperscript{128} That is not to suggest that Marxism did not play part in Rozhkov's intellectual development. More importantly, an analysis of his writings between 1898 and 1905 reveals that his views on historical philosophy were more complex than he suggested. In 1925, having just been allowed to return to Moscow and Leningrad after several years of internal exile, Rozhkov deliberately exaggerated the extent of his Marxist commitment at the turn of the century.

By the late 1890s, Marxism had achieved a considerable degree of influence among the intelligentsia in Russia.\textsuperscript{129} In fact, as Plekhanov wrote:

In 1895-1896, Marxism appealed to people who, in their social standing, mentality or moral qualities, had nothing in common either with the proletariat or with its liberation struggle. There was a time when Marxism was the vogue at every St. Petersburg chancery.\textsuperscript{130}

This growth in the influence of Marxism was one factor that resulted in the founding of the Russian Social

\textsuperscript{127} Rozhkov and Sokolov, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid.
Democratic Labour Party in 1898.\textsuperscript{131} Increasing too was the radicalism of the population.\textsuperscript{132} As Rozhkov was to recall in a lecture he wrote in 1919: "In the 1890s, we experienced a development which was completely unexpected some years earlier. We lived through the huge, mass workers' movement which was, to a significant degree, successful".\textsuperscript{133}

This change in the social climate demanded a re-evaluation of theories concerning the development of society. Consequently, there was a tremendous development in sociological theory. As Göran Therborn argued in his study entitled Science, Class and Society: On the Formation of Sociology and Historical Materialism, this was the so-called "classical age" of sociology. The period from the 1880's to about 1920 was the epoch in which sociology "first achieved intellectual maturity".\textsuperscript{134} Rozhkov's ideas were formulated during this classical age of sociology. Rozhkov was developing and explaining his theory of history at a time when social theories generally were flourishing and when the political situation within Russia particularly was changing dramatically. Not only was Rozhkov drawn into the political turmoil that occurred at the turn of the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[132] N.A. Rozhkov, Lektsii po istorii sotsializma: chitany na sentiabr'skikh pedagogicheskikh kursakh v Petrograde 1918g (Petrograd, 1919), pp. 75-76.
\item[133] Ibid., p. 76.
\end{footnotes}
century but he was compelled to examine the ideas entailed in Marxism and other radical social theories that came into fashion.

Thus, in the years between 1898 and 1905, Rozhkov appeared both as a professional historian with liberal views and as a revolutionary. On the one hand, he was a professional historian pursuing an academic career, predominantly interested in establishing his theory of history, in publishing his research projects and in commenting on the latest academic debates and issues. On the other hand, Rozhkov was also actively involved in politics and was deeply convinced of the need for political reform.

At the turn of the century, Rozhkov believed that Marxism was another theory which examined the important role that economics plays in sociological and historical explanations. He believed that Marxists were “completely correct” when they “defended the economic-monist point of view [ekonomicheski-monisticheskoe vozrzenie]” in sociology. Rozhkov's belief in the primary importance of economics in explaining social development. In his opinion, Marxism was another name for economic determinism. For the young freethinker, Marxism's greatest significance was the emphasis it placed on the role of economic factors in history.

In his historical writings before 1905, there are several instances where Rozhkov rejected Marxism. He preferred to be associated with positivism. In 1898 Rozhkov declared that “economic materialism or dialectical materialism, in other words, Marxism” was the most popular monist view of history.\(^\text{136}\) He believed that the economic materialism founded by Marx was “in a period of development and was not a complete and integrated system”.\(^\text{137}\) That is why he not only preferred the positivist theory expounded by Comte and improved by Mill but why he dismissed the future development of Marxism. He asserted that the future of economic materialism was not as brilliant as the future of the application of psychology to history and sociology.\(^\text{138}\) He suggested that the future of Marxism relied on whether or not it examined the “psychological process” in history.\(^\text{139}\)

In 1899 Rozhkov once again dissociated himself from Marxism by declaring that: “The ... misunderstanding might be that the writer of these lines will be taken for an economic materialist”.\(^\text{140}\) Elsewhere in 1899 Rozhkov distanced his point of view from Marxism by declaring that any conclusions drawn from it had to be examined carefully and that “the


\(^{137}\) Ibid.

\(^{138}\) Ibid., p. 35.

\(^{139}\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^{140}\) N.A. Rozhkov, “Proiskhozhdenie soslovii v Rossii”, Obrazovanie, Nos. 7-8, 1899, p. 30.
excessive dogmatism of Marxists was completely irrelevant”. Such dogmatism, he added, “had to be mitigated with an element of criticism and even scepticism”.\textsuperscript{141} In 1901 Rozhkov wrote: “I consider it necessary to declare that I do not belong at all to those extreme followers of so-called economic materialism, who are inclined to explain everything without exception directly from economic, to be exact, productive relations”.\textsuperscript{142}

As late as 1923, Rozhkov admitted in a footnote that while he accepted some of the notions entailed in historical or economic materialism, he rejected the idea held by Marx, Engels, Plekhanov and Kautsky that “a direct class interest” can be seen in everything, even in spiritual culture (协同发展文化), that is, in a society’s psychology, religion, morality, literature, art, knowledge and philosophy.\textsuperscript{143} According to Rozhkov, this was “an extreme point of view”.\textsuperscript{144} Before 1905, the year that he joined the Bolshevik faction of the R.S.D.L.P., Rozhkov described himself as a “critical positivist”.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{141} Rozhkov, “Neskol’ko spornykh sotsiologicheskikh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)”, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{142} N.A. Rozhkov, "Otvet g. Vatinu", Mir Bozhii, No. 8, 1901, p. 25. See also: Rozhkov, "Uspekhi sovremennoi sotsiologii v ikh sootnoshenii s istoriei", p. 26.
\textsuperscript{143} N.A. Rozhkov, Russkaia istoriia v sravnitel’no-istoricheskom osveshchenii (osnovy sotsial’noi dinamiki) (Moscow-Petrograd: Kniga, second revised and enlarged edition, 1923), p. 10.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{145} See: N.A. Rozhkov, "Nauchnoe mirosozertsanie i istorii", Nauchnoe Slovo, No. 1, 1903, pp. 105-112 and N. A. Rozhkov, “Znachenie i sud’by noveishago idealizma v rossii: po povody knigi Problemy idealizma”, Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, Moscow, March-April,
Marxist thought had very little influence on Rozhkov's historical works before 1905. Although he believed that Marxism or economic materialism was a popular theory, he maintained that it "did not as yet represent a complete and integrated system". Unless it developed its potential in the area of psychology, it did not have a future. It was Rozhkov's contention that Marxism offered a valuable but limited solution to the understanding of the psychological process because Marxists did not recognise the importance of the psychology of the individual. They only recognised the psychology of the social group as all individual members were united by identical economic interests.

According to Rozhkov, Marxism teaches that the psychology of a particular social group is determined by that group's class position. This was not enough to explain the psychological differences within the class group and therefore, he argued, it was necessary to examine the methods used in psychology. In his last major study, he elaborated his views on the role of psychology in history and showed once again how strongly he was influenced by the psychological school in sociology.

---

1903, Book LXVII, pp. 314-333. Both these articles were included in Rozhkov, Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki. Sbornik statei, Vol. 1, pp. 20-46.
147 Ibid., p. 27.
148 Ibid.
Rozhkov not only believed that it would be possible in the near future to construct the evolutionary process of the development of psychic types, but that it would become necessary to reconsider which of the evolutionary processes in the social life of human beings is least subject to causal influence from the other evolutionary processes. In other words, it will become necessary to re-examine the primary role attributed to the economic explanation of social phenomena. In 1899, he had no doubts as to what he believed would replace the primary role of the economic explanation of social phenomena. Rozhkov wrote: "According to certain signs, I am personally convinced that the psychological evolutionary process finds itself in such a position". Rozhkov had in mind the development of a monist view of history based on psychology and, in his twelve-volume Russian History published between 1918 and 1926, he tried to develop such a theory.

Rozhkov believed that psychological evolution had not been adequately studied because psychology and, in particular, ethology, the study of character formation, had largely been neglected. That is why in 1899 Rozhkov asserted: "we have the right to limit to a short period of time the significance that Marxism will have

150 Rozhkov, "Neskol'ko spornykh sotsiologicheskikh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)", p. 86.

in history and philosophy and we are obliged to handle with great care the scientific and practical conclusions that may be made from this theory". In Rozhkov's opinion, history and sociology should not study the individual. Rather, their attention should be focused on the psychic type and the classification and description of psychological types. Rozhkov maintained that the study of psychological types was hardly conceived in his time and yet would become of vital importance in future explanations of social development.

The intellectual milieu out of which Rozhkov emerged as an academic was the most important factor in the development of his theory of history. At the same time, we cannot fully comprehend Rozhkov as a historian without examining briefly his political radicalisation. Between 1898 and 1905, Rozhkov formed his political point of view while retaining his theory of history, which he not only confirmed during this period but which he developed further taking into consideration his newly formed political ideology. As N. Stepanov aptly put it: "Rozhkov entered his mature years not as a professional revolutionary ... but as a representative of the Russian Academy of Science". Rozhkov recalled that his first association with the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (R.S.D.L.P.) took the form of a public lecture in the auditorium of the Museum of History in Moscow. He had

---

152 Rozhkov, "Neskol'ko spornykh sotsioligcheskichh voprosov. (Otvet Prof. Kareevu)", p. 88.
been invited to speak by a woman called Serebriakova, who had led him to believe that the funds raised by the lecture would go to the party. However, the truth was that Serebriakova was working for the Okhrana and Rozhkov could never be certain that the funds raised reached the coffers of the party.

Between 1898 and 1903, Rozhkov gave many public lectures and seminars. These lectures and seminars were organised by the zemstva and aimed at the professional development of individuals, especially teachers.\textsuperscript{154} His appearances took him to many towns including Kursk, Voronezh, Tambov, Ufa and Rzhev and they were always well attended. N. Chekhov, in his recollections of Rozhkov, gave the following description:

An exhibition on popular education and courses on general education for state teachers had been organised by the zemstvo. At the exhibition, along with several hundred teachers from the Kursk gubernia, over a thousand teachers from other gubernii assembled. All of them received free accommodation and free access to the courses ... N.A. arrived at the auditorium where the courses were being given. He then began to read a course of Russian history but these were more than lectures, they were seminars — astonishing seminars with thousands in the audience. The hall as well as the adjoining corridors were crowded.\textsuperscript{155}


\textsuperscript{155} N. Chekhov, "Pamiati N.A. Rozhkova: (Iz lichnykh vospomianii)"; \textit{Vestnik Prosveshcheniia}, No. 3, 1927, p. 120.
Rozhkov continued to give these lectures until 1903. In that year, the zemstvo decided to prohibit Rozhkov from teaching in the courses it organised because of the “harmful” influence he was having on teachers.\textsuperscript{156}

Rozhkov was becoming involved in political activity which in turn was influencing every facet of his life to an ever greater degree. This process was intensified when, at the end of 1904, an internal dispute erupted in the History Section of the Moscow Pedagogical Society over the ideological affiliations of some of its members. Rozhkov recalled that the authorities attempted to suppress the activities of the “historical materialists” who had “built a nest” within the society.\textsuperscript{157} When the chairman of the history section failed to give a sufficiently “resolute rebuff” to the college administration, he was replaced. The outcome of the dispute was that Rozhkov became the chairman first of the department and, at its next elections, of the society as a whole.\textsuperscript{158} Rozhkov recalled that his lectures after 1904 “developed openly in a political direction”. The History Section of the Moscow Pedagogical Society also began to “work out a constitutional project” and organised meetings at which problems of contemporary society were discussed, often with Social Democrats speaking.\textsuperscript{159}

\textsuperscript{156} E.A. Morokhovets, “Kratkie biograficheskie svedeniia o N.A. Rozhkove”, \textit{Uchenye zapiski instituta istorii RANIONa}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{157} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{158} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 162-163.
\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 163.
Also in 1904, Rozhkov and Bogdanov, together with Smidovich, M.G. Lunts and writers I. Bunin and V.V. Veresaev, cooperated to produce the monthly journal *Pravda*,\(^{160}\) which was published by V.A. Kozhevnikov, the wealthy and respected railway engineer.\(^{161}\) The journal ran from January 1904 until it was closed in February of 1906.\(^{162}\) When I.I. Skvortsov-Stepanov returned from exile, he also joined the editorial board that consisted of Rozhkov, Bogdanov, Pokrovskii, Lunts and P.P. Rumiantsev.\(^{163}\) Politically active in the 1905 Revolution, Rozhkov formally joined the R.S.D.L.P. affiliating himself to the Bolshevik faction. White has already noted that "the journal *Pravda* and the group of intellectuals associated with it occupy an important place in the history of Bolshevism".\(^{164}\)

Rozhkov published several articles in *Pravda*, the most significant of which was the article entitled "History, Morals and Politics" which was published in January 1904.\(^{165}\) In it Rozhkov does not mention Marx but he does refer to Hume and Kant whose work he considered made it necessary to examine critically questions concerning the theory of knowledge. The
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160 *Pravda* — ezhemesiachnyi zhurnal iskusstva, literatury, obshchestvennoi zhizni.


162 White, *M.N. Pokrovsky*, p. 73.


164 White, "The First *Pravda*", p. 181.

165 N.A. Rozhkov, "Istorlia, moral' i politika", *Pravda*, No. 1, 1904, pp. 170-185. This article was later republished as part of *Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-19.
article is not only important because Rozhkov has pinpointed, as White wrote, "the Achilles heel of Russian Marxism, namely, its failure to discover its own theory of epistemology",\textsuperscript{166} but also because Rozhkov used critical positivist philosophy rather than Marxist theory to combat idealism. Many of the articles published in \textit{Pravda} were criticisms of a collection of articles that had been published in 1902 under the title \textit{Problems with Idealism} and edited by the idealist P.I. Novogorodtsev.\textsuperscript{167}

Rozhkov must have felt at home writing for a journal that gained a reputation for airing positivist ideas.\textsuperscript{168} This was not only the logical direction for Rozhkov but also for Pokrovskii who was busy at the time borrowing ideas from Mach. It is interesting to note that the Moscow censor believed that the journal had "nothing in common with historical materialism and Marxism" and that the "direction of the journal was 'realistic' and 'positivist' and that it was intended to struggle against incipient 'idealism' on a purely philosophical and theoretical plane".\textsuperscript{169}

The first thirty years of Rozhkov's life demonstrate his passion for history in the Greek sense of learning or knowing by inquiry. By the time he began

\textsuperscript{166} White, \textit{M.N. Pokrovsky}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{167} See: P.I. Novogrodsev (ed.), \textit{Problemy Idealizma} (Moscow, 1902).
\textsuperscript{168} White, "The First \textit{Pravda}", p. 184.
to teach at Moscow University in 1898, Rozhkov had come into contact with the plethora of theories and ideas that existed in Russia at the time. Like many thinkers of his period, he had arrived at the important conclusion that any interpretation of society had to be scientific. One of the major implications of such a view was that it had to take into consideration the latest developments not only in the social sciences but in the natural sciences as well. This meant that Rozhkov believed in the totality or universality of history. In other words, history should include everything that can be known about humanity and is thus eclectic by nature. Nevertheless, there were limits to Rozhkov's eclecticism.

By 1905, the two major influences that shaped Rozhkov's world view and his writing of history were nineteenth-century positivist ideas, especially those espoused by Auguste Comte, and Kliuchevskii's economic materialism. Contrary to commonly held beliefs, Marxism was a significant but not a fundamental influence on the young Rozhkov.