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Chapter Six
Rozhkov’s Laws of Social Dynamics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
<th>Phases of History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the natural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death of the natural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the money economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death of the money economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appearance of the industrial economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of the industrial economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appearance of the pre-agricultural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of the pre-agricultural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Reform Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appearance of the pre-agricultural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of the pre-agricultural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 1861 to early twentieth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of the pre-agricultural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Twentieth Century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth of the pre-agricultural economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All societies progress from a natural economy to a money economy.

Kochko, V. Periods of History

Figure 6.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods of History</th>
<th>First Period (Kiev Rus) VI-XII centuries</th>
<th>Second Period (Apparage Rus) XIII-XVI centuries</th>
<th>Third Period (Muscovite Rus) XVI-XIX centuries</th>
<th>Fourth Period (Post-reform to 1907)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Extractive Industries</td>
<td>Manufacturing Industries</td>
<td>Money Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor Rich</strong></td>
<td>Relative Equality</td>
<td>Extensive and Primitive and Family</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Predominant Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>Extensive and Primitive and Family</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Predominant Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of Enterprise</strong></td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Predominant Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of the Goods</strong></td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Predominant Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Production of</strong></td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Land over enterprises of Predatory</td>
<td>Predominant Branch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Phenomena:**

Figure 6.2 Rozhkov's Scheme of Russia's Historical Development.
Whereas social statics examined the structure of a particular society at a given moment in time, social dynamics looked at the "development [razvitiia] of the social system or, what is the same thing, the development of the structure of society". Rozhkov believed that social dynamics would retrace the successive and necessary stages of the development of human societies. He believed this was possible because the laws of social statics governed the essential order of every human society and because the whole of the past formed a unity. He also believed that once the law-governed regularity [zakonomernost'] of social phenomena had been discovered, it would become possible to predict and control the future development of society.

Like Comte, Rozhkov believed that the study of social statics was inevitably linked to the study of social dynamics. Comte wrote that:

The static study of sociology consists in the investigation of the laws of action and reaction of the different parts of the social system — apart, for the occasion, from the fundamental movement that is always gradually modifying them.

---

1 N.A. Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony razvitiia obshchestvennykh iavlenii (Kratkii ocherk sotsiologii) (Moscow, 1907), p. 64.
2 N.A. Rozhkov, Obzor' russkoii istorii s sotsiologicheskoi tochki zreniia, Chast' vtoraa, Vypusk vtoroi (Moscow, 1905), p. 160.
3 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, pp. 44, 87.
For Comte and Rozhkov, the “fundamental movement” that modifies society can be explained by the laws of social dynamics. At the same time, the laws of social dynamics could only be formulated after the laws of social statics had been determined.\(^5\) In 1905, Rozhkov wrote:

> The laws of social statics just expounded are applicable to every society in any period of its historical existence. This entire study repeatedly confirms the validity of these laws. The laws of social statics are of vital importance for the establishment of the law-governed regularity [zakonomernost’] of society from a dynamic point of view.\(^6\)

Rozhkov maintained that, once the static and dynamic forms of society had been studied, the evolution or progress of human societies in general could be understood, explained and predicted.

At the end of the nineteenth century in Russia, new concepts developed in the philosophy of the social sciences and Rozhkov noted that one of the most important new concepts was the notion of evolution.\(^7\) He rightly claimed that the notion of evolution was of fundamental importance to various thinkers including

\(^5\) In his last major study, Rozhkov wrote that “strictly speaking, it would be more correct to derive social statics from social dynamics” but he did not change the fundamental order of his earlier research. See: N.A. Rozhkov, *Russkaia istoriia v sravnitel’no-istoricheskom osveshchenii (osnovy sotsial’noi dinamiki)*, Vol. 1, (Petrograd-Moscow, second edition, 1923), p. 14.


Hegel, Darwin, Comte and Spencer. He observed correctly that the notion of evolution had become very influential and had even gained universal recognition in sociology.

The term “evolution” requires some qualification. Even when the idea of evolution “dominated European thought”, it was interpreted in many different ways. However, the starting point of all theories of social evolution was an attempt to discover the general trends in the development of all human societies. This attempt usually led to the formulation of a series of stages of development. The notion of a series of stages has been an attractive one for many theorists and continues to exercise appeal today.

Although Rozhkov acknowledged various thinkers that developed theories of evolution, he was most impressed by those writers who developed positivist

---

8 Ibid., pp. 167-176.
9 Ibid., p. 172.
11 Nowadays, the attempt to explain the behaviour of phenomena has led to the notion of chaos. See: J. Gleick, Chaos: Making a New Science (London: Cardinal, 1988) and I. Stewart, Does God Play Dice? (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989). In its own way, the new notion of chaos attempts to discover the general trends, or the lack thereof, in the development of phenomena. As Kamminga, for instance, has pointed out, chaos can occur within the context of "deterministic disorder". Alternative futures are not ruled out in the chaos theory. See also: Harmke Kamminga, "What is This Thing Called Chaos?", New Left Review, No. 181, May-June 1990, pp. 49-59.
views which examined society as an organism. Rozhkov considered that "the best example of a purely evolutionary, sociological theory is the so-called organic school in sociology" and "its founder and most talented representative is Spencer". Rozhkov mentioned other writers that shared the organismic framework of Comte and Spencer, including René Worms and Aleksandr Ivanovich Stronin.

Rozhkov was particularly influenced by Herbert Spencer’s theory of social evolution. Spencer defined evolution as the movement or "change from a state of relatively indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a state of relatively definite, coherent heterogeneity". He conceived evolution as the general movement from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the indefinite to the definite and from incoherence to coherence. Rozhkov conceived evolution in a way that was more mechanistic than Spencer had envisaged. Whereas Spencer’s theory of evolution does not maintain that all societies must pass through the same stages, Rozhkov’s

---

13 René Worms (1869-1926) was the French sociologist who founded the journal *Revue internationale de sociologie* (1892). His work entitled *Organisme et Société* established him as one of the best exponents of the organismic school of sociology. Aleksandr Ivanovich Stronin (1826-1889) was a Russian positivist who was also greatly influenced by Auguste Comte. Applying a mathematical approach to his study of society, Stronin analysed it from the point of view of statics and dynamics.
theory of evolution was clearly unilinear. Rozhkov believed that all societies had to pass through the same stages of development. His theory of evolution was also unidirectional rather than diversified. He argued that societies that were more differentiated and integrated displaced those societies that were more primitive and simpler.16

Yet, for Rozhkov, evolution in itself was not sufficient to explain the movement of human society.17 A second motive force was needed; and this was causality or, as Rozhkov put it, 'causal dependency [zavisimosti prichinnoi]'. According to Rozhkov, it is causality that explains how all societies pass through the same sequence of stages. He argued that "historians have completely and correctly rejected the exclusive predominance of the evolutionary connection in social phenomena by acknowledging also the existence of causal dependency".18 This distinction requires further clarification.

For Rozhkov, causality made accurate prediction about human society possible. As far as Rozhkov was concerned, every particular event had a particular cause and all that was apparently required in order to forecast the event in detail was the necessary and invariable conditions under which the cause acts. He believed that

16 Ibid., p. 74.
17 Rozhkov, Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki, p. 173.
all phenomena are locked in a matrix of cause and effect. Borrowing the distinction made by William James in his essay “The Dilemma of Determinism”, Rozhkov was a “hard” determinist.¹⁹

Given that the notions of causality and evolution were the subjects of major debates at the turn of the century in Russia, it was not surprising that Rozhkov should include both of them in his sociological theory. After all, in his opinion, he was taking the “best” elements of different theories to form a new, more complete and plausible doctrine.²⁰ He claimed that historians had already reached the stage when they were busy trying to discover the link between causality and evolution.²¹ He was so impressed by the “constant attempt of historians to unite causality with evolution” that he accepted and developed both these notions in his own works. He argued that society developed in an evolutionary manner, but was also subject to laws of causality.²² In 1898 he wrote:

The modern researcher, having taken up the challenge of studying a historical question, first of all assiduously selects certain historical antecedents [istoricheskie antetsedenty] of the phenomenon being examined, that is, those facts in the past

²¹ Rozhkov, Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki, p. 173.
²² Ibid., pp. 167-173.
which contain the phenomenon in an embryonic state and which represent the beginnings of a process that is more clearly expressed later in time. Thus, there is an unbroken thread linking a series of epochs which establishes a process of development, an evolutionary connection [evoliutsionnaia sviaz'].

Rozhkov concluded that "having surveyed and examined a variety as well as a large number of historical facts, it is possible to classify them into several large groups". As was shown in the previous chapter, Rozhkov believed that there were five categories of historical phenomena, that is, natural, economic, social, political and psychological phenomena that developed simultaneously and influenced each other. This influence, he claimed, amounted to a causal dependency between the various processes. He wrote:

Attention should also be paid to the neighbouring processes [sosednie protsessy] which develop simultaneously with the process being studied. Under their influence, the process being examined may be diverted in one direction or another. This then would be a causal dependency [prichinnaia zavisimost'].

Furthermore, Rozhkov believed in historical regularity. Inherent in this belief was the notion that societies move towards the same goal and follow the same necessary course of evolution. Knowledge of the laws of social progress can merely explain a

---

23 Ibid., p. 24.
24 Ibid., p. 173.
25 Ibid.
development which is inevitable. As Rozhkov wrote in
his study entitled *The Evolution of Economic Forms*, a
social system can only disappear in so far as "from the
wombs of one period of economic evolution there is born
the new economic forms".26

Because of the law-governed regularity
[zakonomernost'] of social development, Rozhkov
believed that history must repeat itself. Not only did he
claim that history repeats itself but he maintained that
it did so "in no less degree than phenomena do in the life
of nature".27 Rozhkov expressed this view even in his
last major work. He wrote: "There is no dictum more
incorrect than the one which claims that 'history does
not repeat itself".28 The idea that history repeats itself
was a precondition of Rozhkov's theory of historical
development as it was for many other thinkers of his
time. The applicability and the validity of his grand
sociological scheme rested on the claim that the history
of every society evolved the same way. Without this
belief, Rozhkov could not have conceived his
comparative historical method, which claimed that his
laws of social statics and social dynamics were
universal. For Rozhkov, different geographical areas
experience the same processes of development but at

26 N.A. Rozhkov, *Evoliutsiia khoziaistvennykh form* (St. Petersburg:
Molot, 1905), pp. 31-32.
27 N.A. Rozhkov, "Istoriia, moral' i politika", *Pravda*, No. 1, 1904
cited in Rozhkov, *Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki*, pp. 11-
12 and pp. 15-16.
different times and this was proof of the inevitable regularity that governs history.

In all his major works, Rozhkov expressed the idea that society developed gradually and without sharp transitions. Such a view of history was another sign of how far Rozhkov was from Marxism of the Leninist variety. In 1918, in the first volume of his last major work, Rozhkov added that “in the development of society, as in nature, leaps (‘mutations’) inevitably and frequently occur”. Rozhkov introduced the notion of leaps for two major reasons. Firstly, he could not deny that change often occurred very quickly in the development of society and nature. In other words, like Plekhanov, Rozhkov did not wish to deny the role of revolutions and social upheavals in history. Nevertheless, even after the events of 1905 and 1917, Rozhkov maintained the belief that revolution was evolution speeded up and was therefore “unnatural”. In fact, Rozhkov believed that even revolutions were the results of a much longer period and took hundreds of years to develop.

Society experienced several stages of development and it is on these stages of development that the
divisions of a nation's history are based. According to Rozhkov, these historical divisions are only of "relative significance" since:

in reality there are no sharp breaks and unexpected leaps. Each new period appears as the direct continuation of a previous one. Looking at it from a different angle, at any given period of time, not a single social phenomenon can be found at rest, that is, in a motionless state. Every social phenomenon is always in a process of change or in constant movement.  

Because society was constantly developing Rozhkov believed it was impossible to study society as a whole. Consequently, any historical study of society entails the use of a scheme which divides the development of that society into clearly marked periods. Rozhkov wrote:

The division of history into periods is the only means of conceiving the process of the development of social phenomena clearly and distinctly. This is so because the human mind needs this sort of schematisation [skhematizatsiia] when it attempts to distinguish those particular moments or stages of social development that set the tone for the rest of the period.  

He maintained this argument in his later works. In Russian History in a Comparative Historical Interpretation, for example, Rozhkov once again claimed that without the division of history into periods "a study loses much of its clarity and definiteness".  

---

33 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, Vypusk I, p. 6.  
34 Ibid.  
argued that while such periods were artificial and schematic, they could not be rejected. Without them any historical study would be vague and confused. In itself, this is a view that many historians would share. What made Rozhkov's division of history into periods original was the basis on which these periods were formulated, as well as, the universality he claimed for his periodisation. For Rozhkov, every society followed the same pattern of evolution.

According to Rozhkov, every society had to pass through two major stages of development. The first stage was dominated by a natural economy \([\text{natural'noe khoziaistvo}]\) and the second by a money economy \([\text{denezhnoe khoziaistvo}]\). He defined a natural economy to be one in which there is no need for money or trade. Goods are produced and distributed to satisfy directly the needs and wants of the producers themselves. In other words, a natural economy is a subsistence type of economy. On the other hand, Rozhkov defined a money economy to be one which involved exchanges between producers and consumers through the use of money. This form of economy entailed a division of labour and system of exploitation that created strict class

36 Ibid.
37 Rozhkov, \textit{Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki}, pp. 11-12.
39 Russell, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 76.
structures in society. Rozhkov correctly argued that societies were most homogeneous when they were dominated by a natural economy because money economies tended to diversify and change societies radically.

Since Rozhkov believed that society is like an organism, he maintained that the birth of a new type of economy, like the birth of a living organism, is not an easy process. Consequently, he wrote: "The transition from a natural economy to a money economy was extremely difficult. All life had to be reconstructed anew and all that had taken centuries to establish had to be broken". In *Town and Village in Russian History* he wrote:

> The transition from a natural economy to a money economy is always accompanied by a strong shock to the social organism and is distinguished by extreme pain. During this time, the weakest parts of the economy die off and the need for a money economy becomes especially acute.

Rozhkov described the birth of a money economy in very general terms. At first, the economy was still...
predominantly a natural one but a rapidly expanding money economy was forming in its interstices as it were. The money economy was in its "embryonic" stage.\(^{45}\) Next, the money economy became more powerful than the natural economy. However, the natural economy was not completely annihilated.\(^{46}\) Finally, there occurred the disappearance of the natural economy and the complete domination of a money economy. In Russia, the transition from a natural to a money economy began in the sixteenth century and continued until about the middle of the nineteenth century. Rozhkov considered 1861, the year the serfs were emancipated, a convenient year to mark the beginning of the development of the money economy which continued into the twentieth century.\(^{47}\)

As well as being able to comprehend the development of human societies as a whole, Rozhkov believed that it was possible to divide history into periods and to explain the basis on which this is done. He wrote: "we are not only able to conceive each moment of the development of society as an organically connected unity but we are also able to understand the basis for dividing this whole into periods".\(^{48}\) By 1905, it was clear that Rozhkov had four main historical periods in mind which he believed were universal. These were: (1)

\(^{45}\) Rozhkov, *Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki*, p. 135.
\(^{46}\) Ibid.
\(^{47}\) Ibid.
\(^{48}\) Ibid.
the birth of the natural economy; (2) the development of the natural economy; (3) the death of the natural economy and the birth of a money economy, and (4) the development of the money economy.

On the basis of his historical research, Rozhkov formulated his periods of Russian history. Accordingly, he divided Russian history into four periods (see Figure 6.1). The first was the Kiev Rus' period which lasted from the sixth to the twelfth century. The second was the Appanage Rus' period which lasted from the thirteenth to the mid-sixteenth century. The third period lasted from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century. It included the Muscovite and the modern pre-reform periods. The post-reform period was the last period in Rozhkov's scheme. It began with the Great Emancipation Act of 1861 and continued into the early twentieth century. In each period, a particular branch of the economy predominated. Generally speaking, these periods corresponded to the birth, growth and death of a natural economy and the birth and growth of a money economy. This might appear to represent five

---

49 Rozhkov, Osnovne zakony, pp. 44-48.
50 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' 1, Vypusk 1, pp. 6-7. See also: Rozhkov, Gorod i derevnia, p. 7 and Rozhkov, Osnovne zakony, pp. 44-48.

Although in Russian History from a Sociological Point of View Rozhkov was able to analyse and apply all five of his categories of historical phenomena, he was unable to complete his study. By 1905 he had examined the first two of his major periods of Russian history. His examination of the last two periods was interrupted by the political events of the time and his involvement in them. It is not just coincidence that the two periods of Russian history that Rozhkov did not have time to analyse were directly related to these events. The last two periods that covered the years from Peter the Great to Rozhkov's time were concerned with the development of a money economy or capitalism.
periods but for Rozhkov it was four because the period of the birth of the money economy overlapped the period of the death of the natural economy (see Figure 6.1).

Rozhkov established four laws of social dynamics for each major period of Russia's historical development. He had a law for each of the economic, social, political and psychological phenomena that he believed governed society in each of these periods.51 Believing that natural phenomena were not active causes of historical development, Rozhkov declared that they did not require further elaboration.52 He began his study of social dynamics with an analysis of those laws "that directly concern economic phenomena".53 His fondness for neat schemes forced him to arrive at sixteen laws of social dynamics which he believed explained the internal evolution of each period as well as the mechanism which shifted Russian society from one evolutionary stage to another (See Figure 6.3).

Rozhkov saw as his greatest achievement the formulation of his sixteen laws of social dynamics. He dedicated much space to these laws in his writing and their importance to his research cannot be

51 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, pp. 83-86.
52 Ibid., p. 44. See my discussion of this in chapter 5.
53 Ibid. Unfortunately, as the worldwide ecological crisis has shown, we cannot accept the idea that nature will be less important as societies develop. See, for example, such works as: R. Bahro, Socialism and Survival (London: Heretic Books, 1982), pp. 24-43; W. Leiss, The Domination of Nature (New York: George Braziller, 1972), passim; W. Ophuls, Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity (San Francisco, 1977), pp. 184-91 and R. Carson, Silent Spring (London: Penguin Books, reprinted 1982), pp. 240-257.
Rozhkov's first law of social dynamics related to any society's initial period of development and it was formulated as follows:

The first period of the development of every society is distinguished in economic terms by the predominance of extractive industry and primitive cattle-breeding under the preservation of a natural economy; by the predominance of a free or predatory [zakhvatnago] landownership; by a family form of enterprise; by an extremely extensive technology [tekhniki]; by cheap land rent, low wages [zarabotnoi platy] and government taxes [gosudarstvennykh nalogov] at a time when there was an extremely high interest on capital; and by the comparatively even distribution of real economic goods [real'nykh khoziaistvennykh blag] between the various groups within the population.54

Rozhkov's first law of social dynamics was an economic law and was consistent with his theory of social statics which, as was shown in the previous chapter of this thesis, claimed that all other aspects of society were determined once the predominating branch of the economy had been determined (see Figure 6.2). Although, it may seem contradictory that Rozhkov used such factors as the growth of land rent and the rate of

---

54 Ibid., pp. 83-84. See also: Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' II, Vypusk II, pp. 160-161.
increase of capital, wages and government taxes to determine the distribution of wealth in an economy that was essentially subsistent in nature, it must not be forgotten that these factors originated and developed precisely during the first stage of human history. As such, Rozhkov uses these factors as criteria with which to assess every society's level of economic progress.

According to Rozhkov, once the predominant branch of the economy had been determined, the forms of landownership, labour and technology and the distribution of wealth were determined (see Figure 6.2). The predominant branch of the economy also determined the social, political and psychological relations that prevailed within society during that particular period (see Figure 6.3).

Rozhkov's second law of social dynamics was that "in terms of social relations, the first period is characterised by the lack of social organisation [neorganizovannost'iu obshchestvo], that is, by the absence of social classes [klassov] and estates [soslovi]".\textsuperscript{55} As was shown in chapters three and four, Rozhkov believed that society during the Kiev Rus' period was harmonious. Rozhkov made the claim that society was not divided into different classes on the basis of economic distinctions or estates determined predominantly by law or custom. In his efforts to show that social divisions are mainly created by money

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p. 172.
Chapter Six: Social Dynamics

economies, Rozhkov deliberately oversimplified the social picture of Russia's first historical period. There was no doubt in Rozhkov's mind that Kiev Rus', as the first period of Russia's historical development, was a primitive and backward society in comparison with those societies of western Europe. As was pointed out earlier in the thesis, the view put forward by Rozhkov concerning the lack of class differentiation in Kiev Rus' has in recent times enjoyed a revival of interest in the works of I.Ia. Froianov.

Rozhkov's third law of social dynamics stated that:

the government is characterised by a lack of organisation in administrative terms [neorganizovannost'iu sredstv upravleniiia] and has as its objective the crudely understood personal profit of rulers [gruboponiatuiu lichnuiu vygodu pravitelei]. Power [vlast'], during this period, belongs to each individual as a representative of the family [sem'i].

The most powerful social unit was the family and the greatest power rested with the individual who headed the family. Rozhkov believed that although a system of government did not exist, there were individuals who sought power. He also claimed that the concept of government as an administrative body with power to rule over people had not as yet evolved.

Rozhkov's fourth law of social dynamics dealt with the psychological phenomena of society in the first

---

56 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' II, Vypusk II, pp. 172-173.
period of its development. Rozhkov believed that because society was so poorly developed and primitive in nature, the psychology of that society and the psychology of the individuals within that society were also poorly developed. There were no complicated characters or characters with a complete psychological type as outlined in his laws of social statics.\textsuperscript{57} The spiritual culture of society reflected the primitive economic, social and political conditions that prevailed during this period. Consequently, the spiritual culture of society was primitive and underdeveloped. Rozhkov believed that this was the case because:

In the first period of the development of society, there are no complicated, fully formed characters [\textit{net slozhivshikhsia, tsel'nykh kharakterov}] and, corresponding to this, all forms of spiritual culture bear the mark of having been mechanically borrowed from more culturally advanced peoples. These borrowed works were not even modified in any systematic way.\textsuperscript{58}

Whereas the first period in the development of society was characterised by the birth of a natural economy, in the second period the natural economy reaches its highest level of development. Rozhkov argued that the world came to be divided into two economic groups. In some areas economic diversity occurred. According to Rozhkov's fifth law, the upper classes in those societies were preoccupied with foreign trade while the mass of the population was evenly divided and

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p. 173.  
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
concerned with either the activities of extractive industry or agriculture. In other areas all layers of society were occupied in agriculture. In his opinion, the towns of Novgorod and Pskov, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, belonged to the first group while western and eastern Russia, during that time, belonged to the second group.

In both areas a natural economy still prevailed. According to his fifth law, those people in the higher layers of society that possessed capital began to acquire land. The acquisition of land meant that peasants were dispossessed of it and, "as well as permanent landownership, there developed conditional and temporary forms of landownership [formy uslovnago i vremennago zemlevladeniia]."\(^59\) In Rozhkov's opinion, this meant that peasants were forced to rent land which they paid in kind [obrok natural'nyi] by handing over a share of the harvest or a certain amount of grain.\(^60\)

In his fifth law of social dynamics, Rozhkov claimed that during the second period, "handicrafts or petty domestic craft [remesla ili melkago kustarnichestva] and merchant companies [kupecheskoi kompanii] developed".\(^61\) Furthermore, he claimed that technology improved slightly and that rent, wages and state taxes [renta, zarabotnaia plata, gosudarstvennye nalogi] all increased despite the fact that capital

\(^{59}\) Ibid. See also: Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, pp. 53-54.
\(^{60}\) Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, pp. 53-54.
\(^{61}\) Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' II, Vypusk II, p. 173.
became cheaper. Rozhkov concluded his fifth law by claiming that all of these economic changes caused the "first inequalities in the distribution of real economic goods" and this accentuated the divisions within the society.  

According to Rozhkov's sixth law of social dynamics, the formation of classes and estates began to occur during the second period (see Figure 6.3). During this period, social divisions were not completely formed but they did become more noticeable. In his seventh law of social dynamics, Rozhkov claimed that "governments [sredstva upravleniiia] began to develop administrative departments but there was little change observed in the concepts concerning the aim of government and the wielder of power [sub"ekte vlasti]".  

According to his seventh law, Rozhkov argued that two types of government were formed during the second period of a society's historical development (see Figure 6.3). Two types of government arose because of the different types of economies that had developed. Those economies that had the upper layers of society involved in foreign trade and the mass of the population evenly involved in the extractive industry or in agriculture developed the type of government that Rozhkov characterised as a municipal-aristocratic republic.
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[munitsip'al'no-aristokraticheskaia respublika]. On the other hand, he believed that those economies that had a predominantly agricultural base developed a feudal-votchina style of government [votchino-feodal'noe gosudarstvo].

Rozhkov believed that the ancient Russian city of Novgorod, Athens and Sparta in the seventh and sixth centuries BC, Italian medieval cities and the cities of the Hanseatic League were examples of municipal-aristocratic republics. These are "states, cities or municipal states [gosudarstva, goroda ili munitsipal'nye gosudarstva] in which supreme power belongs only to the citizens of the reigning cities". Rozhkov added that these cities were aristocratic republics "because although individual power [edinolichnye vlasti] belonged only to those who performed executive functions, they received their authority from popular assemblies and these assemblies in reality obeyed the will of the rich aristocracy". The western European countries of the early Middle Ages or Russia from the XIII to XV centuries were examples of feudal-votchina styles of government. In these countries, power belonged to the King or Prince
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65 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 71.
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as if it were a “votchina right”, that is, it was regarded as private property. Power, as such, was in the hands of individuals.\textsuperscript{70}

Rozhkov’s eighth law of social dynamics stated that society, in its second period of development, continued to be a “spiritually amorphous mass”.\textsuperscript{71} However, various psychological types were beginning to evolve. He claimed that egoists [egoisty] already existed and that they had gained supremacy.\textsuperscript{72} He also claimed that “ethical natures” [eticheskie natury] developed especially among the lower classes of society and that individualists [individualisty] began to develop in the upper strata of society.\textsuperscript{73} Rozhkov concluded his eighth law by claiming that an “original reworking of religious, artistic, literary and, to a lesser extent, scientific traditions” began as a result of the emerging social diversification.\textsuperscript{74} In his opinion, societies began to develop their own cultures out of the cultures that they had originally acquired (see Figure 6.3).\textsuperscript{75}

According to Rozhkov’s ninth law of social dynamics, the third period of social development is especially interesting and significant because at the beginning of this period the natural economy begins to die and a money economy begins to develop (see Figure

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{71} Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{72} Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast’ II, Vypusk II, p. 173.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid. See also: Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{74} Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast’ II, Vypusk II, p. 173.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
6.1). Agriculture still predominated in this period and it experienced tremendous changes with the introduction of the three-field system and machinery. Along with these technological changes a sharp increase occurred in government taxes, land rents and wages, while interest on capital dropped. Rozhkov believed that as a result of these economic changes, the distribution of economic goods became much more uneven and that this in turn caused the development of pauperism. In Rozhkov's opinion, all of these changes occurred as a result of the development of a money economy and comprised his ninth law of social dynamics.

According to Rozhkov's tenth law of social dynamics, "classes and estates during this time became more sharply isolated". He argued that the growth of a money economy was accompanied by the growth of manufacturing industries. In their third period of history, Rozhkov maintained that countries developed in two basic ways and could thus be divided into two major categories. In one category belonged those countries that produced goods for "a small, local market" and in the other category belonged those countries, such as
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76 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, pp. 66-67 and p. 85. See also: N.A. Rozhkov, "Natural'noe khoziaistvo i formy zemlevladieniia v drevnej rossi" and "Denezhnoe khoziaistvo i formy zemlevladieniia v novoi rossi" in Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki, pp. 102-164; Rozhkov, Gorod i derevnya, pp. 52-53 and Rozhkov, O formakh narodnago predstavitel'stvo, p. 18.
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Russia, that immediately began to produce for "a very wide market" (see Figure 6.2).\textsuperscript{80}

Rozhkov wrote that "free estates predominated in those countries that initially experienced an epoch dominated by a money economy operating on a small, local market but which later changed to operate on a wide market. On the other hand, those countries that were forced immediately to adapt to a money economy based on a wide market developed serf estates".\textsuperscript{81} He believed that pomest'ia and peasant barshchina labour developed in Russia because the predominant noble class was tied to the land and was not free to alienate its property.\textsuperscript{82} In order to meet service obligations to the prince, nobles had to ensure that peasants worked on their estates. The nature of this relationship necessarily led to an increase in pomest'ia and barshchina labour.

Rozhkov maintained that in the third period of a country's social development, political relations changed significantly. He argued that government administrations were strengthened and that the concept

\textsuperscript{80} Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, pp. 48 and 66.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., p. 85.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., p. 54. A pomest'e was a fief, "inhabited land granted on the condition of military service" in Pushkarev, op.cit., p. 93. However, in "the latter part of the 15th century land held on condition of service began to be called a pomest'e, and its holder a pomeshchik", cited in J. Blum, Lord and Peasant in Russia from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 85. Barshchina (or Boiarshchina) was a Russian form of corvée, or "obligatory work performed by the peasants, especially by the serfs, for the landowner (barin=Boiarin)", cited in Pushkarev, op.cit., pp. 2-3.
of the general good was advanced in government work. As Rozhkov wrote in his eleventh law of social dynamics, "a weakening of the votchina principle in the understanding of the notion of power began" and gradually the "idea of the state as the representative of society as a whole" began to grow.83 Consequently, Rozhkov argued, two types of political formations developed: an autocratic monarchy and a parliamentary government (see Figure 6.3).84

As a result of such economic, social and political developments, Rozhkov wrote his twelfth law which claimed that the spiritual culture of the third period was characterised "by the formation of extremely diversified types or characters that penetrate not only the mass of the population but also the various forms of religion, art, literature, science and philosophy".85 Rozhkov concluded his twelfth law by declaring that although the predominating psychological type was still "egoistic" in nature, its significance had diminished (see Figure 6.3).86

In his thirteenth law of social dynamics, Rozhkov claimed that countries in their fourth period of development could be divided into two major groups according to their economic structures. He wrote: "Countries that were characterised by the complete

83 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 54.
84 Ibid.
85 Ibid., pp. 82 and 85.
86 Ibid., pp. 80-82.
flourishing of a money economy with the absolute predominance of a manufacturing industry”\(^87\) belonged to one group, while “countries that had an equilibrium between the manufacturing industry and agriculture” belonged to another group.\(^88\) Rozhkov’s thirteenth law also claimed that this period was characterised by the “triumph of free forms of landownership, hired labour, an intensive technology of the economy, a quick growth in land rent, wages and taxes, the sharp decline of interest on capital and by the continuation of pauperism”.\(^89\) Along with these changes, Rozhkov argued that “governments benefitted from the tendency to have a higher taxation on large incomes”.\(^90\) Rozhkov enshrined this observation in his thirteenth law of social dynamics (see Figure 6.2).

The economic changes that occurred in the fourth period of historical development significantly influenced the social structure of society. As Rozhkov wrote in his fourteenth law of social dynamics: “In the social structure, estate divisions vanish and very sharp class distinctions appear”.\(^91\) Rozhkov also maintained that political changes followed. As he wrote in his fifteenth law:

> In political relations, the fourth period is characterised by the organisation of

\(^{87}\) Ibid., pp. 85-86.  
\(^{88}\) Ibid., p. 86.  
\(^{89}\) Ibid.  
\(^{90}\) Ibid.  
\(^{91}\) Ibid.
regular, well-established institutions [*pravil'nykh i stroinykh uchrezhdenii*]; by the adoption of the idea of the general good as the aim of society and by the understanding that the wielder of supreme power is the representative of society as a whole.\(^92\)

It was during this period that capital became a real political force.\(^93\) That is why representation in parliament on the basis of wealth [*tsenzovoe predstavitel'stvo*] became a dominant form of government (see Figure 6.3).\(^94\)

Finally, Rozhkov believed that in the fourth period, the psychological nature of society was characterised by a "diversity of types and characters, by an originality and variety of all phenomena of spiritual culture and by the predominance of individuals and ethical individualists" [*individualistov i eticheskikh individualistov*].\(^95\) This was Rozhkov's sixteenth law of social dynamics. In terms of the psychology of society, Rozhkov believed that those features that existed in the third period were more refined and developed in the fourth period of a society's development (see Figure 6.3).

Given Rozhkov’s penchant for strict hierarchy and order, he was acutely aware of the importance of the moving force in history. Although he was convinced of
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\(^95\) Rozhkov, *Osnovnye zakony*, p. 86.
the significant role that economic phenomena play, he struggled to explain why the predominant branch of the economy changed, forcing society to move from one stage of development to another. His laws of social dynamics do not clearly explain the mechanism which shifted Russian society from one evolutionary stage to another, that is, from a natural economy to a money economy. His historical works reveal that Rozhkov considered population growth to be the "motor of history", yet sadly he did not fully integrate it into his sociological scheme.

Rozhkov believed population growth determined economic phenomena and, as such, was responsible for the development of history in general. In The Evolution of Economic Forms (1905), Rozhkov clearly expressed the determining role of population growth when he wrote:

Everywhere, population growth continued to occur to a greater or lesser extent. At the same time, the economic needs of society also increased. In order to satisfy these needs completely, an increase in the productivity of labour was required and this increase was only possible with a separation of occupations, that is, with specialisation. Specialisation in turn assumes that the products of labour are exchanged. So, under the influence of population growth the transfer from a natural, exchange-free economy to an exchange or money economy [от natural'nago, bezobmennago khoziaistva k khoziaistvu menovomu ili denezhnomu]
occurred and continues to occur all over the world.96

The growth of population was the principal explanation of why phenomena developed not only within periods of history but also between the major periods of history. As Rozhkov put it:

the fundamental element in all economic development of modern (as well as ancient) Russia was the growth of the population. This increase in population immediately caused agriculture to spread throughout the entire land. It also caused the beginning and slow development of the money economy, of what may be considered a more or less extensive market.97

In his Survey of Russian History, Rozhkov once again stressed the importance of population growth which was placed before economic changes, technological breakthroughs and social progress in general. He wrote:

Population growth, a decline in the amount of available land space and the development of foreign trade coupled with the growth of agriculture also turned out to be an extremely real influence on the system [sistemу] or technology [tekniku] of the economy. Generally speaking, it is possible to notice sufficiently clearly the tracks [sledy] of progress, that is, the gradual replacement of some primitive, economic systems by slightly more advanced ones.98
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96 Rozhkov, Evoliutsiia khoziaistvennykh form, p. 17. This paragraph is quoted verbatim in Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 47.
97 Rozhkov, Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki, p. 163.
Rozhkov argued that population growth had a direct and immediate influence on the technology of the economy. By destroying the free usage of land that predominated in earlier times, population growth caused the "transfer to a less extensive system of economy and elevated the technological level of production and exchange". In the final analysis, Rozhkov explained all historical development through population growth.

The dynamics of population growth were and remain one of the most disputed points of social science. As Bottomore has pointed out: "It has always been recognised that there is a reciprocal relation between population and social structure; i.e. that the social structure influences population changes as well as being affected by them". Since Malthus' Essay on Population, there have been many discussions of the relations between demographic change and economic activity. At the turn of the century in Russia, as in Europe generally, such discussions were popular and
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especially of interest were the ideas expressed by Malthus. This is not surprising given that the Malthusian explanation of historical development does contain “a certain compelling logic”. As Brenner put it in a recent essay:

If one takes as assumption first an economy’s inability to make improvements in agricultural productivity, and second a natural tendency for population to increase on a limited supply of land, a theory of income distribution seems naturally to follow. With diminishing returns in agriculture due to declining fertility of the soil and the occupation of increasing marginal land, we can logically expect demand to outrun supply: thus terms of trade running against industry in favour of agriculture, falling wages, rising food prices and, perhaps most crucially in a society composed largely of landlords and peasants, rising rents.

Rozhkov came to appreciate the significance of population growth and movement on historical development not only through his readings of Comte and Kliuchevskii but also from his examination of the views of M.M. Kovalevskii. Through Kovalevskii, Rozhkov
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came to consider Malthusian-like arguments that explained historical development. As Rozhkov wrote in 1900, Kovalevskii was not the first to put forward the theory "that the development of a country's national economy is determined in the final analysis by the degree of the density of the population". However, in Rozhkov's opinion, it was Kovalevskii who best elaborated this idea in a study entitled *Europe's Economic Growth to the Emergence of Capitalist Economy*. Consequently, as Rozhkov clearly declared, his intention was "not to refute this theory but rather to develop, elaborate and partly to improve it".

From Kliuchevskii, Rozhkov borrowed the idea that between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries a large-scale migration of people took place. Kliuchevskii argued that Muscovite Russia arose as a result of the almost wholesale migration of the population of the middle Dnepr region to the upper Volga. Although Kliuchevskii's hypothesis is no longer accepted, Rozhkov most strongly supported it. Rozhkov's contention that Kiev Rus' was predominantly a society based on

---
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extractive industry rather than on agriculture was evidence of Kliuchevskii's well-known "historical contradiction" that "in the eleventh century the mass of the Russian population centered around the black soil middle Dnepr region, while toward the middle of the fifteenth century it moved to the Upper Volga region."\textsuperscript{111} As Kliuchevskii pointed out, "it would seem that in the former region agriculture should have become the foundation of the national economy, and in the latter, foreign trade as well as the forest and other industries. However, the concurrence of external events resulted in the fact that so long as the Russians sat on the Dnepr region black soil, they traded in the products of the forest and other industries, and started ploughing only when they moved to the upper Volga region argillaceous soil".\textsuperscript{112}

The influence that both Kliuchevskii and Kovalevskii had on Rozhkov's examination of population growth and movement was greater than the influence that Comte had in this regard. Nevertheless, given Comte's profound influence on Rozhkov on other matters, it would be foolish to ignore his views. Although Comte insisted repeatedly that "intellectual evolution" was "the preponderant principle" or the motor of change that explained human progress, he did admit that increases in population were viewed as a major determinant of the
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role of social progress.\textsuperscript{113} He believed that “the progressive condensation of our species, especially in its early stages” brings about:

such a division of employment ... as could not take place among smaller numbers: and ... the faculties of individuals are stimulated to find subsistence by more refined methods ... By creating new wants and new difficulties, this gradual concentration develops new means, not only of progress but of order, by neutralizing physical inequalities, and affording a growing ascendancy to those intellectual and moral forces which are suppressed among a scanty population.\textsuperscript{114}

Despite Comte’s emphasis on intellectual evolution, his argument that population growth caused a division of labour and technological changes had much in common with Rozhkov's argument.\textsuperscript{115}

Another thinker who was influenced by Comte on the relationship between the division of labour and population growth was Rozhkov’s contemporary, the eminent French sociologist Emile Durkheim. Durkheim made population size one of the principal factors in that branch of sociology which he called social morphology. In *The Division of Labour in Society* (1893), Durkheim


\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.

attempted to show that an increase in population produces, through the division of labour, a change in society. Society changed from being a "mechanical solidarity" to one based upon "organic solidarity".\textsuperscript{116} In a review of Durkheim's study, Rozhkov pin-pointed a major disagreement he had with Durkheim's theory.\textsuperscript{117} In Rozhkov's opinion, Durkheim ignores the importance of economic factors in his theory. Rozhkov was of the opinion that:

in Durkheim's work [\textit{The Division of Labour in Society}] the reader is strangely struck by the fact that it does not express the phenomena being studied in terms more suitable to the present moment, namely, in economic terms. Indeed, what is Durkheim's segmental society if not society living on the basis of a natural economy? And what is organic cooperation if not the predominance of a system of money economy?\textsuperscript{118}

Rozhkov claimed that his economic materialist scheme of social development was based on historical reality.\textsuperscript{119} At the same time, he claimed that his scheme revealed much about a society's future. In fact, he believed that his laws of social dynamics allowed him to furnish predictions about a society's development. Consequently he wrote that his sociological scheme
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\item \textsuperscript{117} N.A. Rozhkov, Review of E. Durkheim's \textit{O razdelennii obshchestvennago truda. Etiud ob organizatsii vysshikh obshchestv}, translated by P. Iushkevich, Odessa, 1900, in \textit{Zhizn'}, No. 11, 1900, pp. 341-343. This is incorrectly cited in Vucinich, \textit{op.cit.}, p.280.
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\item \textsuperscript{119} Rozhkov, \textit{Osnovnye zakony}, p. 87.
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undoubtedly had “a relevance to the future”. He wrote that:

Firstly, [it] gives the possibility for some sort of prognosis or prediction about the future and, secondly, it provides the means for determining healthy guidelines for practical social activity. Or, in other words, it allows the possibility to construct a system of scientific politics.

The idea that the study of the laws of social dynamics and social statics made the prediction of a future society possible was borrowed from Comte.

Comte believed that science was a powerful instrument that enabled the scientist to predict and hence to act on the basis of that prediction. The relationship between knowledge, prevision and action was emphasised by Comte when he wrote:

All sciences aim at prevision. For the laws established by the observation of phenomena are generally employed to foretell their succession. In truth all men, however little advanced, make predictions, based on the same principle, the forecast of the future from the past.

He added:

For it is only by knowing the laws of phenomena, and thus being able to foresee them, that we can ... set them to modify one another for our advantage ... Whenever we affect anything great it is through a
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knowledge of natural laws ... From Science comes Prevision; from Prevision comes Action. Savoir pour prévoir et prévoir pour pouvoir.\textsuperscript{123}

Rozhkov, in a similar fashion, believed that people could act and change their environment once they had discovered the laws governing social evolution.\textsuperscript{124} He admitted that the task of predicting the future of society was "extraordinarily complicated" and therefore required a "special study".\textsuperscript{125} However, he clearly claimed that before any prediction could be made, a study of the laws of social dynamics was necessary:

In order to understand the immediate tasks of politics, it is necessary to determine in detail that period which a given country will experience on the basis of the laws of social dynamics; to explain on this basis what sort of social forms it will have in the future; and to find concrete ways and means to facilitate the realisation of these forms.\textsuperscript{126}

Rozhkov admitted that the prediction of the future evolution of societies was very difficult, especially "the prediction of the future of more cultured countries".\textsuperscript{127} Such a study would be a pioneering work and consequently have before it "a huge space" that could not be filled completely. Nonetheless, Rozhkov reiterated the fact that his laws of society, especially

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., p. 88. See also: Coser, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{124} Rozhkov, \textit{Osnovnye zakony}, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
his laws of social dynamics, allowed a general picture to be developed of the not too distant future.\footnote{Ibid.} For Rozhkov, the "future of cultured countries undoubtedly entailed the destruction of the defects of the economic structure of the fourth period, in particular, the unsuitability of the production of economic goods to their exchange and distribution".\footnote{Ibid.}

By about 1905 Rozhkov was convinced that societies would continue to evolve for the better. He began to think and write about the nature of post-capitalist societies. While he intimated that a post-capitalist society would signify the beginning of a new fifth period in history, he did not provide any details of such a period. Instead, he confined himself to a study of society as it was developing during his lifetime. Rozhkov believed that his theory of history was inextricably tied with reality and therefore with the political issues and events of his time. As early as 1898 Rozhkov wrote:

\textit{The theoretical importance of the sociological foundations of history is increased even more by the fact that these sociological principles inevitably influence life and everyday activities. An understanding of the fact that human existence \textit{[zhizn' chelovechestva]} is formed under such basic influences inevitably affects the way social ideals are worked out and the means by which we}
choose to achieve these ideals in reality.\textsuperscript{130}

Rozhkov began his \textit{Survey of Russian History} by assuming that historical development could be explained by general laws. He considered his laws of social statics and social dynamics a great achievement precisely because he believed they explained historical development. Rozhkov was not alone in believing that general laws aid the study of history.\textsuperscript{131} As Mandelbaum has pointed out: “It might be the case that in order to describe, to understand, or to explain particular events of the past, historians must utilize general laws”.\textsuperscript{132} Certainly, Rozhkov could not be accused of neglecting “the task of generalization in the belief that the facts will eventually speak for themselves when enough of them have been accumulated”.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{130} N. A. Rozhkov, “Uspekhi sovremennoi sotsiologii v ikh sootnoshenii s istoriei”, \textit{Obrazovanie}, No. 12, 1898, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{131} It is not my aim here to discuss the notion of the existence of laws in history or the social sciences. That notion has had its share of critics and in recent years it has been subjected to critical analysis by numerous historians and philosophers. See, among others: Gardiner, \textit{op.cit.}, \textit{passim}; K. Popper, \textit{The Poverty Of Historicism} (London: ARK, 1986), \textit{passim}; E.P. Thompson, \textit{The Poverty Of Theory and Other Essays} (London: Merlin Press, second impression, 1979), pp. 193-384; D. Bebbington, \textit{Patterns of History} (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979), pp. 145-150 and Collingwood, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 126-133.
\textsuperscript{132} Mandelbaum, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 55.