

Historical Letters

Petr Lavrov

1868-1869

Cleaned English machine-translation edition

Source: user-provided Firefox-translated PDF of the Russian Wikisource page. The text has been reflowed, browser headers/footers removed, and major section headings normalized. The translation remains a machine translation, not a scholarly edition.

Contents

Preface to the Second Edition

Preface to the First Edition

Letter One - Natural Science and History

Letter Two - The Process of History

Letter Three - The Magnitude of Progress in Humanity

Letter Four - The Price of Progress

Letter Five - The Action of Personalities

Letter Six - Culture and Thought

Letter Seven - Personalities and Social Forms

Letter Eight - The Growing Social Force

Letter Nine - Banners of Social Parties

Letter Ten - Idealization

Letter Eleven - Nationalities in History

Letter Twelve - Contract and Law

Letter Thirteen - "The State"

Letter Fourteen - Natural Boundaries of the State

Letter Fifteen - Criticism and Faith

Letter Sixteen - Theory and Practice of Progress

Letter Seventeen - The Author's Aim

Notes

Preface to the Second Edition

More than 20 years have passed since the appearance of the first edition of this book, and besides 20 years very significant for our fatherland.

Then the sermon of Chernyshevsky and Herzen was still fresh. Increasingly and wider satire Shchedrin seized the area of "unforgettable more words". There were disputes between the supporters of the brilliant articles of Pisarev, with their exaltation of natural science in theory, individualism in life, and the nascent populists, for whom everything was obscured by the demand of a social struggle due to the introduction into the historical life of the newly liberated Russian peasant. Then it was only vaguely to feel - but not even foreseen - that among the scattered, mainly engaged in self-education of circles of Russian youth, a blanched call "to the people" will be heard in three years later! under the banner at which the motto will shine, the theoretical teachings of Marx and Lassalle 11, with the practical requirement to "size."

Russian society has since survived this era of the selfless crusaders of socialism. It experienced the liberal intoxication with which the justification of Vera Zasulić was met throughout Russia. It survived another short, short but formidable story: a small group of young people in the early 80-ies managed to merge the old revolutionary tradition of the Decembrists of the 20-ies with the ideological tradition of the Russian intelligentsia, which preached in the continuation of the long and soulful reign of Nicholas the beginning of humanism and human dignity, and these began to hatch now from their state of the liberal guise. In the name of the economic and political emancipation of the Russian people, the "People's Will" entered into an inexorable struggle against Russian absolutism, not counting the sacrifices that its supporters had to bring. But the Russian liberals, the natural enemies of absolutism, having developed in the past the tradition of the struggle of ideological, were still ungrown to the political determination of their grandfathers of the 20-ies to defend their ideas in practice.

The Russian society paid at a heavy price for its mistakes. The Russian social-revolutionary movement has fixed an indelible line for the present and for the future in the history of our homeland, but its temporal suppression was called by an excruciating social disease. The era of demoralization has arrived. From the ranks of selfless fighters for the future of Russia began to lag behind the tired and disappointed. To the names of other of these yesterday's fighters had to add the words: "apostate", "traitor", "traitor". Together with the remains of Saltykov and Chernyshevsky, Eliseev and Shelgunov, Russian literature buried the "forgotten words" of these almost the last representatives of the ideological struggle. The lonely are the ones who remained on the literary stage. Literary "youth" of the 80's began to clearly renounce the traditions of

Belinsky and Dobrolyubov. "Advanced" writers began to recognize as their comrades in the case of supporters of vague idealistic metaphysics and defenders of more or less heretical Christian theology. The sermon of "non-resistance to evil" received a significant number of supporters. Among the Russian students, careerists and indifferentists began to speak loudly and boldly. None of the "adapted" is no longer ashamed of their concessions, going further and beyond. All life in Russia, all imbued with the determination to fight against mental corruption, against social indifference, against the archaic forms of Russian absolutism, and against capitalist exploitation throughout the civilized world - all preserved the great ideological tradition of the Russian intelligentsia and all the learned understanding of the even more

powerful practical problems of scientific socialism is forced to return to the cautious underground work of the conspiratorial work.

And after these 20 years of our life, there were publishers for a book that appeared in 1870 and the material for which were published by the journal published in the late 1960s.

Was the author should agree to an offer to make a new edition of this book, and if it could have presented any interest, in what form could this publication appear? The tasks that stood before the Russian writer and the reader in the field of thought to which this book belongs, or have changed since then in their production, were replaced by others. The reader of the early 70's himself changed, and the new generation, in various forms experienced during this time, represents a considerable difference from his predecessors. Both are desirable, in all likelihood, something else. The new reader has a full reason to ask himself: was it necessary to relearn the work that tried to reflect the tasks of Russian life and thoughts in the form of how they were presented in the late 60-ies? If there was a need to return to this subject, should not this work be completely reworked and the reader had something more appropriate and the present of Russian thought and life, and the attitude in which the author now became to this thought and life, and the fact, and that fact, finally, that the second edition appears abroad, and not under the conditions of the press that lay and lie on every writer and publisher within the Russian Empire? If in the world of Russian readers there was a need for a new edition of this book, and it, reflecting the long-established epoch of Russian development, would it now be necessary to publish it completely without any changes, in the form as it appeared in 1870, when the only two of its copies, who reached the author, were received by him in Paris just the day before the German army, which imposed Paris?

Since the author agreed to the proposal to make the second edition of his labor and at the same time did not stop either on the idea of reworking it, nor on the intention to reproduce completely without any changes the publication of 1870, he considers himself obliged to explain himself about this with his new readers.

Books have their own destiny, as the Latin proverb says, and this fate in many cases is very vaguely foreseen - if it is foreseen - by the authors at a time when they begin to work. "Historical Letters" appeared for the first time in the "Week", which was in the late 60s under the guidance of a good personal friend of their author, who contributed to their premises in this publication, and, as far as the author knows, this room then met the censure of many prominent representatives of our advanced literature. At the same time, it was not a whole book, but a number of separate articles on issues that presented a certain common analogy to them. The author wrote his letters in the remote city of the Vologda province and had a full reason to fear that this series could break through every minute and the editorial office can offer him "for reasons beyond its control" to go to objects of a different kind. The questions that contained the contents of individual letters were not always, according to the author, the most important in essence; but sometimes they most occupied the press at the moment. The author would give them a completely different place and other dimensions, if he had assumed from the very beginning that a more or less complete and complete book would come out of it; if he had foretold that Russian youth would pay attention to it, which this book had been given. This was the more unexpected for the author that he knew very well himself and too often heard from his more outspoken friends that his manner of writing for some distraction and heaviness is not particularly attractive to most readers at all. As a number of letters lengthened, he, regardless of the conscious intention, the author

received greater integrity, concentrating about two or three main questions, and the author's thoughts were deliberately developed into a work capable of putting a good name for the reader, or badly, but certain questions and offering a certain solution for them. When a series of letters were completed, the author in his Vologda exile learned that this series met in some places attentive and sympathetic readers; that his appearance by the book may have some success; that many find this appearance of the readers of this era. The author engaged in the processing of individual letters of the series into a more consistent whole, as he explained this in the preface to the first edition, and thus from the individual articles of the "Week" of the late 60s there was a book that appeared in September 1870.

Not being in Russia and having very little intercourse with his homeland, the author could not at all follow the success of the book, its dissemination, for the impression, it was made. Only a few critics came to him. He placed objections and explanations caused by these critics 4 in Knán't they knew the same in the "Domestic Notes" in the article on the formula of the progress of the g. Mikhailovsky 55. In March 1872, he was asked to make the second edition of this book in Russia. He gladly took up this case, and took advantage of the instructions of critical articles that had survived to him, and made amendments and additions to more or less extensive inserts from his just mentioned articles in "Knowledge" and "Domestical Notes". The original of the second edition, significantly supplemented and corrected, but still aimed only at clarifying the tasks of progress for Russian readers in the form, as the author considered it possible to do this in the late 60's and in the early 70's, was quite ready for publication; he was sent to Russia; even almost began to print a new edition. However, it turned out that it could not appear. It was forbidden. At the same time or shortly after that, the first edition was extracted from the appeal by order of the administration.

It's been 10 years. The author learned that the book became rare; that it managed, quite unexpectedly for the author, to gain some importance among the circle of Russian youth; that the questions raised by her are of lively interest in this circle; that it had many readers of sympathizers in its distant homeland, "Future- friends". But that is why the author did not think about a new edition at that time. It seemed to him that his work of the late 60-ies can no longer be satisfactory; that Russian thought has moved forward in its ripening; that the wider and clearer horizons have unfolded for Russian life; that the Russian living reader needs something not only preparing him for the era of the social struggle, but something more definitely characterizing the tasks of this struggle; that the rise of spirit and the energetic social movement that took place in our country. He was given the opportunity to put articles in a new magazine. He decided to replace the "Historical Letters" of 1870 in 1881 with a new labor, where the same tasks would be developed from the point of view on which he considered it possible to put the Russian reader in this era. The first article of this genus was to be "Theory and Practice of Progress", which was now included as the sixteenth letter. But she was also the only one. The word was banned].[1]

It's been another ten years. Last year, the author was asked to publish "Historical Letters" again. An attempt was made to characterize in several lines the sad state of Russian thought and life at present compared to what was happening in the 60's and especially in the early 80's. The author of "Historical Letters" is not at all sure whether there are now few or many such readers in his homeland, which he could call "diet-friends". He does not know whether there is a sufficient number of readers interested in the questions that he continues to consider one of the most important for a developed person in general and, perhaps, for the Russian developed person in particular. Therefore, he did not consider it necessary to offer new publishers to

replace the "Historical Letters", which almost disappeared from circulation in printed copies and circulating in Russia only in lithes, new labor on the same issues, as he thought to do so in 1881. He did not fail to refuse publishers either. But he considered it permissible to accept for the basis of the new edition not a copy of 1870, but the corrected and supplemented original, which was completely ready for printing and, it seems, was even partly printed in 1872. This assumption to be printed in Russia, but not appeared on sale, the publication includes all the large additions and changes that the reader will find here. But, sending to the set

his work outside the territory where the Russian press office operates, the author did not consider it necessary to keep in the form of speech those reservations and obscurities that were inevitable in any labor published within this territory were inevitable in the original "Historical Letters" of 1870 and 1872. In all such cases, the publication of 1891 uses a more definite, accurate and frank expression. The author took the opportunity to understand what the work he had supposed to be on the same questions, adding a new letter to the previous letters of 1870, which concludes, in the same way, a revised article from the Word. Almost all the other small changes and additions that the author found it necessary to make in this new edition are marked by the year when they were made.

Thus, the reader of this new edition of Historical Letters has, in fact, the proposed edition of 1872 in the form in which it would have been able to appear then only abroad, with an addition of one article of 1881 and with minor changes and notes of 1890-91, almost everywhere indicated.

In 1870, giving his work in print in the form of a book, the author did not know how the Russian public would meet him. She met him with more sympathy than he expected, with more, maybe than the work that made many shortcomings. The author then met "readers-twomen". He is deeply grateful to these "readers- friends" for the good moments he had experienced after learning about their sympathy. The author again and now does not know how many of these "readers-friends" of the 70's now retained sympathy for this work. He even less knows how to meet readers of the new generation this new edition in general, and in the form as it now appears. From Paris, it is difficult for the author to follow the real mood of the Russian public.

In any case, he sends greetings to the readers sympathetic to him for a distant homeland, no matter how few or many of these sympathetic readers. Those who do not sympathize with him, let this book remind us what questions, as life issues, have been aroused the interest of readers 20 years old. The same ones that in scattered groups have devoted themselves to the same tireless struggle for the future of Russia, which their predecessors were waied by their predecessors with weapons to ideological and vital, those that continue this struggle with weapons, which are convenient for them at the present moment, it is necessary not to remind them of the irrevocable past, but the ability to unite into one historical force, a clear understanding of the new tasks facing the developed Russian people, and a selfless determination to fulfill these tasks.

Paris, 29/17 October 1891

Preface to the First Edition

By offering readers, together and in an updated form, the letters placed before in the Week, I consider it useful to provide this publication with a small explanation.

When I started sending these letters, I was not at all sure whether the editorial board of the magazine would find convenient to put a systematic series of studies on the issues discussed here. The distance from the capital did not allow me to monitor the progress of the case and see how much I managed to interest readers. The time frame should keep in mind the purpose of being readable. Several times in the continuation of these letters, I could think that I would have to stop them, and only with the end of the printing I was sure that they would make a somewhat connected whole for the readers of the magazine. In addition, I am well aware that magazine readers rarely have the patience to monitor the development of thought somewhat distracted, if the beginning of this development is placed in one issue, the continuation takes place in several numbers, and the end is separated from the beginning year. All this prompted me to give each letter a more complete form than it should be for a coherent series of sketches, and therefore the whole row could suffer in both connection and integrity. And his own thought, breaking away from work to return to it after a while, told her too fragmentary character. Therefore, when revising these letters, it was necessary to indicate their relationship in some cases, to understand the relationship between individual sketches, to develop some points, to rearrange something so that it is more convenient for the reader to embrace the whole. This purely formal alteration consists of the main difference between this publication and the original type of "Historical

Letters". I hope that the new form, with greater connection of parts and in clearing basic thoughts, will make my work at least a little more worthy of the reader's attention.

I would very much like to make more substantial corrections in this work, but in this respect our criticism did not help me in any way. Neither in thick magazines, nor in daily newspapers, nor in journals of serious historical, nor in the tendentious journals of different directions - how much at least I have managed to see these publications - I have not seen a review, refutation, correction, instructions that would make me to the idea of where more accuracy is required, where more development; whether I have looked at the important side of the subject in one place; whether I have taken the important side of the subject in one place; whether I have taken the appearance in another. Maybe I did not know enough to interest readers and critics with these letters; perhaps critics considered the thoughts expressed here too bored to pay attention to them; perhaps, and finally, that exactly the publications that I would not have reached. Anyway, I was left in this respect to myself and some of the fragmentary, personal reviews that came to me. The latter were especially concentrated about one drawback: distracted, dry, difficult to read ... Unfortunately, this disadvantage lies in the object itself. Nevertheless, I confess that it belongs to my way of presentation. In a separate edition, I tried to correct this in some places, giving examples, but I did not mean to write a new work, but I only wanted to present to readers the previous work in a slightly better way. Excessive diversity of examples could, it seems to me, somewhat harm the coherences of the development of thought. The latter remained completely unchanged, and only in some places the more accurate expression replaced the previous one.

Not wanting to change the general title of my work, I considered, however, it is unnecessary to keep in it some forms of epistolary syllable used by me before.

I do not know exactly how much my letters were or ignored by readers of the Week. Maybe now criticism will find them unworthy of their attention. I spoke in the last letter that I myself am aware of many shortcomings of this work, especially in comparison with the importance of the subject. I give readers what I have, how I can.

Kadnikov, 1869

Letter One

Natural Science and History

If the reader is interested in the movement of modern thought, then immediately they will immediately claim his attention to his two areas: natural science and history. Which one is closer to modern life?

This question is not as easy to answer as it might seem at first sight. I know that natural scientists and most thinking readers will not think to decide it in favor of natural science. Indeed, how easy it is to prove that the questions of natural science themselves are in the life of a person every minute that he can not turn, look, die, think so that a number of laws of mechanics, physics, chemistry, physiology, psychology do not come into action! What is history about this? Fun of idle curiosity. The most useful figures in the sphere of private or public life can live and die, without even having to remember that once Hellenism penetrated into the environment of the Asian tribes with the troops of Alexander the Great; that in the era of the most despotic rulers of the world, those codes, pandaelects, novels, etc., which formed the basis of modern legal relations of Europe were compiled; that were the era of feudalism. Turning to national history, we ask ourselves, is there a lot of useful applications for the life of modern man in the knowledge of the heroic epics, the "Russian Truth", in the wild reason of Ivan the Terrible or even in the Peter's struggle of European forms with the ancient Moscow? All this has gone irrevocably, and the new next questions, requiring all the concerns and all the reflections of modern man, leave only interest to the past more or less dramatic pictures, a more or less clear incarnation of universal ideas ... So, apparently, there can be not even a comparison between the knowledge that determines every element of our life, and other knowledge, which explains only interesting

objectse, between the daily bread.

Natural science is the foundation of intelligent life, this is indisputable. Without a clear understanding of his requirements and basic laws, man is blind and deaf to the most ordinary needs and to his highest goals. Strictly speaking, a person who is completely alien to natural science does not have the slightest right to the title of a modern educated person. But when he once became on this point of view, it is asked that the closest to his life interests? Is it about the reproduction of cells, about the rebirth of species, about spectral analysis, about binary stars? Or the laws of development of human knowledge, the clash of the beginning of public benefit with the beginning of justice, the struggle between national unification and universal unity, the attitude of the economic interests of the starving mass to the mental interests of a more secure minority, the connection between social development and the form of the state system? If you put the question in this way, then hardly anyone, except the philistines of knowledge (and there are many of them), does not recognize that the last questions are closer to man, more closely related to his everyday life than the first.

Even, strictly speaking, they are close to him alone, they are important to him. The former are only so important and close to him as they serve for a better understanding, to the most convenient solution of the second. No one argues about the benefits of literacy, about its unconditional necessity for human development, but it hardly has such dull defenders to

assume in it some independent, magical power. Hardly anyone will say that the very process of reading and writing is important for a person. This process is only important to a person as a guide to assimilating those ideas that a person can acquire by reading and transmitting by writing. A person who does not extract anything from reading is not higher than the illiterate. The name of the illiterate is the denial of the basic condition of education, but literacy in itself is not at all an end, it is only a means. Almost the same role is played by natural science in the general system of human education. It is only the literacy of thought; but the developed thought uses this literacy to solve purely human questions, and these questions constitute the essence of human development. It's not enough to read the book, you have to understand it. Similarly, it is not enough for a developed person to understand the basic laws of physics and physiology, to be interested in experiments on protein or Kepler's laws. For a developed person, protein is not only a chemical compound, but also an integral part of the food of millions of people. Kepler's laws are not only the formula of the abstract motion of the planets, but also one of the acquisitions of the human spirit on the path to the assimilation of a general philosophical understanding of the immutability of the laws of nature and their independence from any divine arbitrariness.

We note here even the exact opposite of what was discussed above about the comparative importance of the foundations of natural science and history for practical life. The chemical experience over protein and the mathematical expression of Kepler's laws are only curious. The economic significance of protein and the philosophical significance of the immutability of astronomical laws are very significant. Knowledge of the external world delivers absolutely necessary material, which has to be addressed in solving all issues that occupy a person. But the questions for which we turn to this material are not issues of the external, but of the inner world, the questions of human consciousness. Food is important not as an object of the food process, but as a product that eliminates the conscious suffering of hunger. Philosophical ideas are important not as a manifestation of the process of development of the spirit in its logical distraction, but as logical forms of consciousness by a person of his higher or lower dignity, more extensive or closer goals of their existence; they are important as a form of protest against the present in the name of the desire of the best and fairest social system, or as forms of satisfaction with the present. Many thinkers noticed the progress in the thought of mankind, which was that a person who represented himself primarily as the center of all existing, later realized himself only one of the countless products of the unchanged annexation of the laws of the external world; that from the subjective view of himself and to nature, man turned to the objective. True, this was the progress of the extremely important, without which science was impossible, the development of mankind is unthinkable. But this progress was only the first step, which was inevitably followed by the second: the

study of the immutable laws of the external world in its objectivity to achieve a state of humanity that would be subjectively conscious as the best and fair. And here the great law, guessed by Hegel, and justified, apparently, in many spheres of human consciousness was confirmed; the third stage was a visible rapprochement with the first but real resolution of the contradiction between the first and second stage. Man has once again become the center of the whole world, not for the world, as he exists on its own, but for a world understood by man, conquered by his thought and directed towards his goals.

But that's the point of view of history. Natural science sets out to man the laws of the world in which man himself is only a barely noticeable share; it recalculates the products of mechanical, physical, chemical, physiological, mental processes; finds between the products of

the last processes in the entire animal kingdom the consciousness of suffering and pleasure; in part of this kingdom, which is closest to humanity, the consciousness of the ability to set goals and strive for their achievement. This fact of natural science forms the only basis of the biographies of individual beings of the animal world and the stories of individual groups of this world. History as a science takes this fact for this and develops before the reader, which way of history as the process of human life originated from the aspirations to get rid of what a person was aware of as suffering, and from the aspirations to acquire what man was aware of as pleasure; what modifications occurred in this concept, associated with words, pleasure and suffering, in the classification and hierarchy of pleasure and suffering;

Therefore, the works of the historian are not the negation of the works of the naturalist, but the inevitable addition of them. Historian, who is neglected to the naturalist, does not understand history; he wants to build a house without a foundation, to talk about the benefits of education, denying the need for literacy. The naturalist, who is with disregard for the historian, proves only the narrowness and underdevelopment of his thought; he does not want or does not know how to see that the setting of goals and the desire for them is as inevitable, as natural a fact in human nature as breathing, blood circulation or metabolism; that the ends can be small or exalted, the aspirations of pitiful or venerable, activity is unreasonable or admirable. The naturalist, who is limited to the outside world, does not want or cannot see that the whole world is only the material of pleasure, suffering, desires, activity for a person; that the most special naturalist studies the external world not as anything external, but as something cognizable and provocative to him, scientist, the pleasure of the process of cognition, exciting his activity, which is entering into his life process. The naturalist who neglects history, imagines that anyone lays the foundation without having to build at home; he believes that all human development should be limited to literacy.

I am perhaps objected that natural science has two undeniable advantages over history, allowing the naturalist to treat the learned dignity of the historian severally above the scientist's work. Natural sciences have developed precise methods, have received indisputable results and have formed the capital of unchanging laws that are incessantly confirmed and allowing to predict facts. As for the story, it is still doubtful whether it discovered at least one law that belongs to it; it has developed only elegant pictures and in the accuracy of her predictions is on the same degree as weather predictors. That's the first one. The second and most important thing is that modern aspirations for the better and the most just, both in a clear understanding of the goal, in the correct choice of means, and in the proper direction of activity, draw their material almost exclusively from the data of natural science, and history presents an extremely little useful material, both in the uncertainty of the meaning of the events of the past, delivering equally beautiful arguments for directly opposite theories of life, and by the perfect change of the situation with the time. Conceding, thus, in theoretical scientificity, and in the practical utility of the works of the naturalist, can the works of the historian be put with him next to him?

To understand the question posed here, we must agree on how much we attach to the word natural science. I do not mean at all here the strict classification of sciences with all the controversial issues it is excited. It goes without saying that history, as a natural process, could be brought under the realm of natural science,

and then the very contrast given above would not take place. In all the future, I will understand by the term natural sciences two kinds of sciences: phenomenological sciences,

studying the laws of recurring phenomena and processes, and the sciences of morphological, studying the distribution of objects and forms that cause observed processes and phenomena, and the purpose of these sciences is to reduce all the observed forms and distributions to the moments of genetic processes. Leaving aloot a number of morphological sciences, I will pay attention to the fact that I will refer to a number of phenomenological sciences: geometry, mechanics, a group of physico-chemical sciences, biology, psychology, ethics and sociology. Attaching the term natural science just said meaning, I will address the above issue.

The scientific and independence of methods is beyond doubt in studies relating to mechanics, physics, chemistry, physiology and the theory of sensations in psychology. But already the theory of ideas, concepts in an individual and personal ethics use very little methods of the preceding natural sciences. As for the sake of general knowledge (sociology), i.e., before the theory of processes and products of social development, here almost all the tools of the physicist, chemist and physiologist are inapplied. This important and closest part of natural science to a person is based on the laws of the preceding areas of it as ready-made data, but it is looking for its own laws in another way. What? Where do phenomenology of spirit and sociology get their materials? From biographies of individuals and from history. As far as the works of the historian and biographer are not, the scientific conclusions of a psychologist in the vast field of his science, the works of ethics, the sociologist in their scientific spheres, that is, so the same natural science should be recognized as unscientific in its part, the closest to man. Here, the success of scientific science is developed by mutual aids of both areas of knowledge. From the superficial observation of biographical and historical facts, the approximate truth of psychology, ethics, sociology is obtained; this approximate truth allows for a more meaningful observation of the facts of biography and history; it, in turn, leads to the truth already closer, which allows further improvement of historical observation, etc.; improved tool gives a better product, and the best product allows further improvement of the gun, which in turn affects even greater improvement of the product. For natural science in its proper sense, history is a perfectly necessary material, and only based on historical works, the naturalist can understand the processes and products of the mental, moral and social life of a person. The chemist can consider his specialty scientific history and neglect its material. A person who embraces the science of all natural processes and products by word has no right to put this science above history and must be aware of their close mutual dependence.

The previous one decides the question of practical utility. If psychology and sociology are to be continuously perfected as the understanding of historical facts improves, then the study of history becomes inevitable necessary to understand the laws of the life of the individual and society. These laws are as based on the data of mechanics, chemistry, physiology, as on these stories. The lesser accuracy of the latter should lead not to eliminate their study, but, on the contrary, its greater distribution, since historians did not rise so much above the mass of readers in the accuracy of their conclusions, as much as chemists and physiologists cost over it. Modern life questions about the best and fairest require the reader to understand the results of the phenomenology of spirit and sociology, but this understanding is achieved not by accepting bthe opinions of one or another school of economists, politicians, ethics. In the dispute between these schools, the conscientious reader has to turn to the study of the data on which the conclusions of the schools are built; as well as to the genesis of these schools, which understands their teaching as the branch of dogmas, and the situation at the moment when this or that school arose; and finally, to events that influenced their development. But all this, with the exception of these basic sciences, belongs to history. He who leaves aside its study

expresses his indifferentism in relation to the most important interests of the individual and society, or his willingness to believe the word of the practical theory that he accidentally finds out on the eye. Thus, the first question posed, which is closer to modern life - natural science or history, can be solved, in my opinion, as follows: the main parts of natural science are a completely necessary lining of modern life, but are a more distant interest for it. As for the higher parts of natural science, to the full study of the processes

and products of the life of a person and society, such a study stands at exactly the same level with history both in theoretical science and practical utility; it cannot be argued that these parts of natural science are related to more living questions to a person than history, but a serious study of them is completely impossible without the study of history, and they are comprehended for the reader only as well as it is for him.

Therefore, in the interests of modern thought is the development of questions of history, especially those that are more closely related to the tasks of sociology. In these letters I will consider the general issues of history; those elements that determine the progress of societies; the meaning of the word progress for the various aspects of public life. Sociological questions here inevitably intertwine with historical ones, especially since, as we have seen, these two areas of knowledge are in the closest mutual dependence. Of course, this gives real reasoning more generalizing, somewhat abstract in nature. The reader has before him not the pictures of events, but the conclusions and convergence of events of different periods. There are a lot of stories from history, and maybe I will be able to go to them later. But the facts of history remain, and understanding changes their meaning, and each period, starting to interpret the past, brings its modern concerns to it, its modern development. Thus, historical issues become for each epoch the relationship of the present with the past. I do not impose my gaze on the reader, but I pass things on to him in the way I understand them, as the past is reflected in the present, the present in the past.

Letter Two

The Process of History

Let us turn to another meaning of the word history.

The first letter was about it as a field of human knowledge; now we will regard history as a process ythat makes up the subject of history as knowledge. History as a process, history as a phenomenon among other phenomena must have and really have its own characteristics. What are they? What is the difference in the eyes of a thinking person historical from the fall of the stone, from the fermentation of rotting fluid, from the process of digestion, from the various life phenomena observed in some aquarium?

My question may seem strange, because every reader will come to mind the following: the historical process is performed by man, peoples, humanity, and this is a sufficient difference from everything else. But it's not exactly that. First, geologists with some right speak of the history of the earth, astronomers-theoreticians - about the history of the world. Secondly, not everything is in man, in the peoples it is part of the process of historical life. In the daily activities of the most important historical figures, there is a lot that the most careful biographer never recorded and will never record, just as the life of thousands of human units, from the first to their last breath, is of no interest to the researcher. In the life of society, the historian does

not record phenomena that are repeated annually with mathematical correctness, but only notes what changes. Many historians distinguish only some peoples and some races from the entire mass of humanity, calling them historical, and leave the rest of humanity to the share of ethnography, anthropology, linguistics, in short, what science there please, if not history. And they are right in one respect. The questions of science about the life of these peoples and the methods of thinking about them are quite similar to those with which the zoologist addresses this breed of birds and ants. The zoologist describes the anatomical features and manners of these animals, their ways to make nests or build anthills, their struggle with other animals, etc. The ethnographer is the same questions. However, it is more difficult to send a person and have to be described more. Linguist learns not only the way of expressing, but also the meaning of the words of the tongue, but also the zoologist, if he could, very willingly know from birds the meaning of this or that flash of sound. The anthropologist records knowledge, crafts, tools, myths, habits, but the question is his same as the zoologist: write down these facts ras they are. The subjects of studying an anthropologist are more interesting to us, because we are not only studying people, we also sympathize with them. But this should not deceive us about the scientific significance of the attached method. Anthropologist is only a naturalist

who has chosen the subject of human study. He only describes what he has.

But I said that historians, who divide peoples and races into historical and non-historical, are right in one respect. Indeed, there is another thing that makes the correctness of this separation extremely doubtful. There is hardly such an unhappy island, the inhabitants of which would be equally described by two travelers separated from a hundred years. These inhabitants in the period of life that has flowed between two eras have changed. This change is so general that science has every right to assume it, and where there is no information about it, and therefore the anthropologist to his research about any tribe always adds even instructions, more or less hypothetical, of how the culture of the tribe has changed during time and how it happened. But the historian, with some right, considers these questions to his field. In our time, we can already talk about the history of the entire organic world, since from the point of view of transformism, each organic form makes sense only as a moment of general organic genesis, but here the very genesis of forms is still only as a scientific explanation, and not as an obvisible fact. Science has only the distribution of organic forms that have to be grouped, and each special case gets an interest only in the sense of researching the general process. A particular case is no more than a means of research. The appearance of a private form under certain conditions is of interest only in the sense of studying the laws of dependence between these environmental conditions and the forms that appear in this case. In addition, the most studied part of the phenomena of changes in organic forms are changes in plants and animals under the influence of humans, which is already included in the history of man himself.

Of course, there are phenomena in the field of zoology, which are largely similar to what the historian studies. These are phenomena of the development and change in animal customs. Until now, we can only conclude that such phenomena were to be performed, committed and accomplished, but zoologists have not yet managed to observe the same phenomenon in the process of its commission. It is very likely that all cultural animals had something similar to history, or at least for them, there were a number of changes in their forms of their culture. For example, it is very plausible that the current hostel of bees came from the dormitory of a simpler. In vertebrates, even observed changes in their habits, mainly due to adaptation to new environmental conditions. But the "history" of bees, as the "history" of all invertebrates with a complex culture, lies beyond scientific observation. The changes observed in the habits of

vertebrates under the influence of new environmental conditions constitute as little history as little changes in the construction of dwellings, in clothing, in the food itself, inevitably occurring in the colonies of IDPs-people, which are arranged in new climatic conditions. The world of zoologists, as science gives it, is the world of invariably recurring phenomena. Therefore, until now, only speculation can transfer to animals the analogy of human history, but in reality history is limited only by man.

In all other processes, the researcher seeks a law covering the phenomenon in all its repetitions; only in the historical process is not the law of a recurring phenomenon that has occurred, but the change that has occurred in itself. The forms of this crystal are of interest only to the propane observer; the mineralogist erects ugly distorted forms to the same types subject to strict geometric laws. This anatomical anomaly is only an excuse for an anatomist to establish a law that would show between which limits of the deviation the normal structure of one or another organ oscillates. But the phenomena of human life, personal or collective, have ambivalent interest.

Caspar Gauser suddenly appeared on the streets of Nuremberg and 5 years later was slaughtered.[[2] Kepler found the laws of motion of the planets. North American insight has caused a terrible loss of people and money in America and withdrew the economic crisis in Europe. What do we study in these events?

For the psychologist, Caspar Gauser is of interest to a rare specimen of a person who has entered into a society adult, a specimen on which it is more convenient to examine some general laws of psychic phenomena than on other personalities. For the biographer and for the historian, Caspar Gauser is a separate phenomenon of this era, the result of a strange set of circumstances once encountered, as a result of which

this mysterious creature was separated from all social relations, and 5 years later died at the hands of the murderer. When Anselm Feuerbach assumed in him the last representative of the house of Tseringen, he investigated not the recurring, but the only historical phenomenon.

Similarly, for logic, the process of Kepler's discovery is nothing more than an example of the general laws of scientific thinking. Mill and Eull may have argued about whether this process represents a pattern of true induction or not. But for the historian, these discoveries are once a time of event that has not happened, which has no opportunity to repeat, because it was due to an extremely complex set of previous scientific discoveries, social development at the beginning of the XVII century, the peculiarities of events in Germany of this time and even more features of the biography of Kepler. But as soon as this event took place, it became an element of the new mental development, the process of which again cannot be repeated, because it represents the result of the interweaving of scientific, philosophical, religious, political, economic and random biographical elements.

In the group of phenomena associated with North American insightedness, the sociologist will find in the same way a number of examples for the general laws of different areas of social life, but the historian will consider this group in its complexity as a separate phenomenon observed once and which, namely in its integrity and complexity, does not allow repetition.

How historical phenomena represent the material for the establishment of a permanent law of mental phenomena in the person, economic phenomena in the collection of personalities, the inevitable change of political forms or ideal instincts in peoples, so these historical phenomena are of interest to psychology, for sociology, for phenomenology of personal or social spirit, in

short, for one of the departments of natural science in its application to man. But for a historian, they are not copies of an immutable law, but characteristic features of the change that once happened.

Against the previous one can revolt from two points of view. Historical theorists will say that I do not understand the requirements of history as a science: that it, like all the sciences, seeks unchanging laws and facts of historical progress for a historian are important only as much as they understand the general law of this process; that the facts in themselves have no importance and give it to them is to turn history into that kaleidoscope of colorful pictures of the tragic or comic properties, which for the a dozen historians is now the ideal. There will also be readers who, with some right, recognize in the eve of the long-battered thought that only man has a history and that events do not repeat themselves in history, but are constantly new combinations.

The latter I will note that I do not give my idea as news; but sometimes the old one is not badly reminded, and this old one I wanted to remind just because recently there has been some confusion of concepts in the meaning of the word historical law. Many Bokl's adherents, for example, say that he discovered some of the laws of history. I do not mean here to confirm or deny the accuracy of its discoveries, but whatever they may be, they do not refer to the laws of history. He only established some laws of sociology by the help of history, that is, he determined in the allowal of historical examples as the predominance of one or another element acts on the development of society in general and how it will always act if this predominance is repeated. This is not a law of historical progress, as the establishment of such a law was understood by Vico, Bossuet, Hegel, Comte, Bush.

As for the theoretical historians, I think they will agree with me in two points. The first is that all the attempts of thinkers who, like Vico, tried to bring history to the process of repetitive phenomena, were very unsuccessful as soon as it came to a comparison of two periods in particular; therefore, that history represents a process in which it is necessary to define the consistent connection of phenomena, only once represented in the historical set forth in this particulars, at every moment of the process. The second is that the law of historical sequence has not yet been found in its entirety, but is sought. If so, we will look for it.

First of all, it is necessary to understand the very meaning of the question: what is the law of history? In the two above-mentioned ranks of science, the natural word law has a very different meaning. In sciences, the phenomenological law of phenomena formulates the conditions under which phenomena are repeated in a certain order. Since phenomena are not repeated in history, this meaning of the word will not be added at all. A completely different meaning is the same word in the morphological sciences, expressing the very distribution of forms and objects into groups, more or less closely related. In this sense, the word law occurs, for example, in stellar astronomy, when it comes to the law of distribution of luminaries on the surface of the heavenly vault, or in the systematics of organisms when it is said about the law of distribution of them. In this sense, the word law is applicable to history, since it would mean a group of events in time.

But what does it mean to find or understand the law of any distribution of forms? The answer to this will be given to us by the only one of the morphological sciences, where the distribution of forms is quite understandable. This is the morphology of single organisms. We understand both the normal and ugly anatomical structure of the organism, when, with the allowance of embryology and the theory of development, the genesis of tissues, organs and organic systems

were traced back to the elementary cell of the unfertilized egg through all the phases of the embryo, fetus, cub to the stage that we observe. The distribution of anatomical forms is understandable to us, because it is only one point for us a number of consecutive distributions, due to the process of organic development, which is nothing but a set of mechanical, physico-chemical and biological phenomena.

In another morphological science, our knowledge has not moved so far and our understanding is not so clear, but what we understand is understood in the same way. I'm talking about geology. The distribution of formations, rocks and minerals for us is understood only as a trace of the history of the earth, as a result of the genesis of the globe, i.e., as one member of a number of products of continuous action of mechanical and physico-chemical laws within our planet.

In other morphological sciences, the understanding of the laws of distribution would also be nothing but an understanding of the genesis of forms, if only this genesis could be known to us. As long as this last condition is not met, until then we can, through careful observations, learn more and more of the law of distribution as a purely empirical law, but we do not understand it. So, as telescopic vision is amplified, new groups of luminaries appear on the surface of the sky and the law of distribution of them changes or becomes more correct. As the actual knowledge in the morphology of organisms increases, the law of their classification becomes more decisive. But only then could we say that we understand the law of distribution of luminaries when we would have learned with sufficient detail the genetic process of the world matter and could erect the observed star groups to the phases of this process. In astronomy, they did not even try to do this, and therefore the distribution of the constellations and still is only the subject of empirical description, and not of scientific understanding. For the distribution of organisms, the period of scientific understanding began with the first attempts to discover the genesis of the organic world in general: Darwin's theory made it possible to take a huge step in this direction, and at present the law of classification of organisms seems to be quite scientific: to understand this law means to reduce organic forms to their genetic connection. In both cases of the considered, the distribution is at first uncomplicated, almost arbitrary, very easily causes in the thought of primitive man the representation of an arbitrarily active being that scattered the stars across the sky and, as it were, played by a strange variety of organic forms. Scientific understanding sees in the genesis of this distribution the effect of immutable phenomenological laws; at the same time, phenomena are constantly repeated; but, acting in a certain environment, phenomenological laws cause new and new distributions of matter in the world space, and new distributions of organic forms on the earth's surface. The morphology of matter would be to conclude the law of a consistent change in the distribution of matter in space (mechanically) and by heterogeneity of its composition (chemically). The morphology of organisms, as Haeckel understands it, now sets itself the task of finding the law of a consistent change in the

distribution of organisms on the basis of the ever-act laws of biology.

By analogy of these sciences, it is easy to conclude about what it means to find the law of history and scientifically understand it. Here we have the benefit that genesis is given from the very beginning; as in the disorderly placement of constellations and nebulae, or in the variety of organic forms, the superficial observer sees first only a motley series of events; but both there and here the group of genetic connection and the importance of the event begins very quickly.

When you understand the connection of the phenomenon, as in the distribution of forms, objects or events, the first step always consists in distinguishing the most important from the less important. In phenomenological sciences it is easy for the natural scientist to do this: what is repeated in the unchanging connection, it is more important, because there is a law in it; what relates to accidental modifications, it is little and takes note only for future possible considerations. Probably, no researcher has found the same uttered angles of refraction of light for the same refractive medium, no one received the absolutely identical results of chemical analysis, but, reclining the random deviations of the experience, he revealed under them the unchanged law of the recurring phenomenon. That's the only important thing.

What determines the importance of the fact in the morphological sciences? We have seen above that they understand the law of distribution of forms coincides with the understanding of the continuous action of the laws of phenomenological, which condition the genesis of this distribution. Obviously, everything is most important here is the element that contributes to a better understanding of the law of distribution of forms, i.e., an element phenomenological: the solar system is allocated by astronomers from other groups, because the bodies, its constituents, are connected by mechanical phenomena supplied under the law of gravitation; the same is the same for the systems of double or triple stars; in the same way in the descriptive chemistry we bring together potassium and sodium. The laws of phenomenological sciences determine what is more important and less important in the distribution of morphological sciences. For this definition, it is necessary to take into account all the phenomenological laws in force in this distribution, especially those that most affect the distribution itself and its genesis.

What phenomenological laws influence the distribution of events in human history and their genesis? The laws of mechanics, chemistry, biology, psychology, ethics and sociology, i.e., all phenomenological sciences, therefore, it is necessary to scientifically take them all into consideration. Which of these laws are particularly important for understanding history? To do this, you need to take into consideration the characteristic features of the being, which is the only tool and the only subject of history, a person. Special electrical phenomena do not emit a gym of 6 from its zoological group, as their own chemical products do not cause botanical classification; in both cases, biological phenomena deliver the most important instructions. So for the entire group of sciences belonging to man, the criterion of the most important should be attached in accordance with the characteristic characteristics of a person, these features are inevitably determined by his subjective assessment, because the researcher himself is a person and can not stand out for a moment from the processes that are characteristic of .

Perhaps, in the general system of the world, the phenomenon of consciousness is a very secondary phenomenon, but for man it is so predominantly important that he will always first divide his actions and similar actions into conscious and unconscious and will treat these two groups differently. Conscious mental processes, conscious activity by persuasion or contrary to persuasion, conscious participation in social life, a conscious struggle in the ranks of a political party in the ranks of one or another historical revolution have and will always have a completely different meaning for a person than automatic activity under such circumstances. Consequently, in a group of historical events, conscious influences should occupy the first place, precisely in the gradualness that they have in the human consciousness itself.

Based on this consciousness, what processes have a predominant effect on the genesis of events? Human

needs and drives. How are these needs and attractions to the consciousness of the individual grouped? They can be divided into three groups: one group of needs and drives flows unconsciously from the physical and mental structure of a person as something inevitable and is recognized only when he forms a ready-made element of his activity; another group is obtained by the individual equally unconsciously from the social environment, its surrounding, or from ancestors in the form of habits, traditions, customs, established laws and political distributions, in general cultural forms; these cultural needs and desires; etc. Finally, the third group of needs and instincts is quite conscious and for each person seems to be occurring in this person outside of any extraneous coercion, as a free and independent product of its consciousness: it is, firstly, the field of activity, based on a conscious calculation of the interests of the egoistic and personalities, loved ones; this is, secondly, an equally important need for historical progress, the desire to expand knowledge, to the formulation of the highest goal. Subsequently, scientific research convinces man that this group develops in him not freely and independently, but under the complex influences of the environment and the peculiarities of his personal development; however, being convinced of this objectively, he can still never eliminate the subjective illusion that exists in his consciousness and establishes for him a huge difference between the activity for which he sets his own goal and chooses means, critically dismantling the dignity of the purpose and means, and the activity of the measure.

These three groups are distant from each on the basis of the phenomenological process that is most important for a person in all the sciences, corresponding to him, therefore, these groups are scientifically established and their significance for grouping of events of history follows the necessity from their relation to the process of consciousness. The group that is most conscious must be of predominant importance to the history of man by the very essence of this story, as it inevitably has the predominant importance for the historian - a person in the properties of his personality. The expedient conscious activity brings, in the very formulation of the question, the central thread, near which other manifestations of human activity are grouped, as well as the various goals to which a person aspires, one another is subordinated to, for most people - in accordance with the greatest interest of individuals, for the most developed people - in accordance with their idea of moral dignity. Here the scientific nature of construction is obtained from the coincidence of two processes, equally subjective, but of which one is made in the thoughts of a historian, and the other is the result of observation of historical personalities and groups. The law of the course of historical events is from this point of view a certain subject of research; it is necessary to catch in every epoch those goals, mental and moral, which in this epoch were created by the most developed personalities as the highest goals, as truth and moral ideal; it is necessary to open the conditions that caused this world outlook, the critical and uncritical process of thought, which developed it, and its consistent modification; it is necessary to group various worldviews. Then from the motley kaleidoscope of events, the researcher inevitably passes to the law of historical sequence.

At the same time, all the main objects and tools of the study belong to the subjective world. The various goals pursued by individuals and groups of personalities in this epoch are subjective; subjectively world-sortization, according to which these various goals were evaluated by their contemporaries; the subjective and evaluation, applied by the historian to the worldviews of this epoch, in order to choose from them the one that he considers central, higher, and to the whole range of world-sorts, to determine the course of progress in human history, to mark the progressive and regress. But the sources of subjectivity in these cases are different, and the means to eliminate errors that could be a consequence of this method are

also different. The subjectivity of their private goals and their moral evaluation in this epoch is a fact quite inevitable, which is quite scientific, which is subject to the most comprehensive observation and investigation: the historian, in order to avoid error, must only carefully assimilate the cultural environment and the degree of development of individuals in this epoch; he here collects facts as in any other science, and his personal views have or should have an extremely small share of participation in the installation of these facts. If he allows for Cesostris or Tamerlane the complex diplomatic considerations of Louis XIV or Bismarck, he

simply does not know the era he writes about. If he puts Hehleil into the thought of Heraclitus, he again did not assimilate enough of the differences in periods. If it gives cultural phenomena, the expansion of states, the struggle of nationalities prevailing importance in history, he did not understand the characteristic feature of human nature, as it is conscious of man himself. In all these cases, the accuracy, extent and versatility of scientific information is the best means to eliminate errors. But a completely different matter is an objective assessment of the various worldviews of this era or the theory of historical progress established by the historian. Here the most accurate erudition cannot eliminate errors if the author establishes a false ideal; here the personal, individual development of the historian is reflected; in the care of his own development, he can find and the only means of giving more faithfulness to his construction. Consciously or unconsciously, man attaches to the whole history of mankind the moral elaboration that he himself has achieved. One seeks in the life of mankind only what contributed to the formation or destruction of strong states. The other is mainly for the struggle, strengthening and death of nationalities. The third tries to convince himself and others that the triumphant side was always to the right of defeat. The fourth is interested in the facts of how far they have implemented this or that idea he has taken for the unconditional good for humanity. All of them judge history subjectively, in their view of moral ideals, and otherwise they cannot judge.

Let the reader not believe that the historian can obtain an objective criterion for discussing the importance of the event, taking into account the number of individuals who are influenced by this or that event. As for Augustine or Bossuet, the events that had influence on the inhabitants of little Palestine were incomparably more important than the campaigns of Genghis Khan or Alexander the Great, and for the modern historian, the conquest of the vast Chinese Empire by the Mongols would be, I think, less much than the struggle of a few mountain cantons of Switzerland with the Habsburgs. Of course, and here you can put the criterion of more personalities, if we take into account not only all the personalities that were directly influenced by events, but also a number of generations whose lives and thoughts were conditioned by these events. But in such cases, the historian and thinker are very often influenced by illusion. What he considers to be the most important in his subjective moral view, he also has had the most indirect influence on future destinies of a larger part of mankind. One author will find in the mental culture of the new Europe the prevailing influence of the sermon that was once heard in Galilee, and will argue that the influence of Greek philosophical schools was small; another historian would equally resolutely assert the opposite thesis.

Thus, willy-nilly, it is necessary to attach a subjective assessment to the process of history, that is, having learned, by the degree of its moral development, this or another moral ideal, to arrange all the facts of history in the future by which they contributed or opposed this ideal, and to the foreground of history to put into the forefront of the facts in which this assistance or opposition was expressed with the greatest brightness. But there are two more significant circumstances. First, in this point of view, all phenomena are isolated as benevolent or harmful,

as moral good or evil. Secondly, we, with our moral ideal, which determines the perspective of the process of history, we become at the end of this process; everything the previous one becomes our ideal in relation to the preparatory stages, which inevitably lead to a certain goal. Consequently, history seems to us to be a struggle of a beneficent and harmful principle, where the beneficent, in unchanged form or in a gradual development, has finally reached the point at which it is for us the highest good of mankind. Not that the benevolent beginning had to triumph in fact. It is not that every subsequent period is necessarily an approximation to our moral ideal. No; many observers are aware of the very clearly that regressive epochs are very common in history; others are more willing to complain of the predominance of evil in this "judor of weeping," the damage to new generations; others expressly claim that a better future for humanity is impossible. Nevertheless, if these people begin to review historical events, then inevitably everything that is located for them in the future, according to what they consider to be the best. Only those events come to the fore, which contributed to the development of their ideal or most impeded its implementation. If the thinker believes in the present or future real realization of his moral ideal, then all history is grouped for him near the events that prepared this realization. If he transfers his ideal to the field of

afterlife myths, then history is only the preparation of the belief that is associated with bliss in the future world. If he renounced any possibility of the realization of the best, then his ideal remains the highest inner conviction, developed by the history of man's thought, and again, all the past, as important and unimportant, is placed before his eyes as the preparation of this moral conviction, unrealized, unrealizable and in the real future, but realized in the field of human consciousness as the extreme and highest point of human development. This approximation of historical facts to the real or ideal best, we are conscious, this development of our moral ideal in the past life of mankind constitutes for everyone the only meaning of history, the only law of historical grouping of the event, the law of progress, whether we consider this progress to be actually continuous or subject to hesitation, whether we believe in its real implementation or only in its consciousness.

So, in the process of history, we inevitably see progress. If we are supporters of the beginning, triumphing in our time, then we consider our era as the crown of all the previous one. If our sympathies belong to what is obviously weakened, then we believe that our epoch is critical, transitional, pathological, followed by the era of triumph of our ideal or in the real world, or in the mythical future, or in the minds of the best representatives of mankind. Those who believe in the near end of the world—the world seemed to them full of evil—believably believed in the blessing of the righteous. Those who took the primitive state of perfection entered the next step into the theory of progress. Even adherents of the cycles in history (which we, however, will not develop now) unwittingly obeyed this general law of human thought. By the inevitable need of this thinking for man, the process of history always seems, more or less clear and consistently, a struggle for progress, the real or ideal development of progressive aspirations, progressive understanding, and only those phenomena were historical in the strict sense of the word that influenced this progress.

I know that my understanding of the word of the word for a lot of people and many will not like it. Everyone who wants to give history the objective impartiality that is inherent in the processes of nature will be outraged by the fact that for me progress depends on the personal view of the researcher. All believers in the unconditional infallibility of their moral worldview would like to assure themselves that not only for but also in itself more important only in the historical process, which is the closest relation to the basics of this worldview. But, rightly, it

would be time for people who think to learn a very simple thing: that the difference between the important and unimportant, the benevolent and harmful, good and bad is the differences that exist only for man, and completely alien to nature and things in themselves, which is equally inevitable for a person to apply to everything of his human, human (anthropological), way of viewing and for things in their totality the need to follow the processes. For general laws are important, not individual facts, because he understands objects only by generalizing them; but the science of its general laws of phenomena is inherent only to man, and outside man there are only simultaneous and consistent clutches of facts, so small and fractional that man can hardly catch them in all their shallowness and fractionalness. For from the continuous thread of the vulgarities of life, some thoughts, feelings and deeds of a person (or groups of people) stand out from the continuous strands of life; but this allocation is performed only by him, by man; the unconscious processes of nature develop the idea of world gravity, about the solidarity of people in exactly the same way as a vie on the leg of a beetle or the desire of the shopkeeper to tear down. Science does not provide any data on which an impartial researcher would have the right to transfer his moral court about the significance of the general law, the ingenious or heroic personality from the field of human understanding and desire to the field of unconscious and dispassionate nature.

At the same time, I have to speak about the concept of the progress of two remarkable thinkers who seem to disagree with the above definition. "Progress," says Proudhon (*Philosophie du progrès*, 24), "is the affirmation of the universal movement, therefore, the negation of any unchanging formula ... applied to any being; any unfringed system, without excluding the system of the universe; any subject or object, empirical or transcendental, which would not change." It is as if a completely objective point of view, tingily pinning

its own beliefs on the altar of the world process of change. But keep reading the great thinker, and you will learn that for him progress in different areas is a synonym for a group of the ideas of freedom, personality, justice, i.e., that is, what he calls the progresses those changes that lead to a better understanding of things, to the highest moral ideal of the individual and society, as this ideal developed in him, Proudhon. Unequivocally the best existed for Proudhon, as it existed and will exist for every developed person; it was called for Proudhon: truth, freedom, justice, and this unconditional was the goal and essence of progress with the same subjective obligation as the millennial kingdom for the Hiliars. However, Proudhon himself expressed a different concept of progress elsewhere, precisely in the ninth etude of his great work "On Justice in the Revolution and in the Church". Here his gaze is in many ways that is expressed in my letters. He speaks (ed. 1868, Bruxelles, III, 244, and foot: "Progress is more than movement, and by showing that the thing is moving, we have not yet proved that it is progressing"; it sees no progress in "crises defined a priori and in the manner in this order the necessary conditions of our device," in "a number of physical and social transitions independent of the will of man." Progress is what justice and freedom, if we consider them: 1) in their movement in time, 2) in their action on the ability to which they are subordinated and which they change as they move forward. Proudhon even demands that there is nothing fatalistic about the "full and true theory of progress," between other conditions, that there is nothing fatalistic about progress. Below he says (III, 270) that "we inevitably believe in progress." Spencer says (Collection of works, vol. I, II: "In order to correctly understand progress, we must investigate the essence of these changes, considering them independently of our interests ... Leaving aside the side circumstances and benevolent consequences of progress, ask ourselves what he is in ourselves." Then he calls the transition from

homogeneous to heterogeneous and proves that this is the law of all progress. Here, apparently, we are quite objectively looking at the phenomenon. But read the very attack of Spencer to the point of view, and you will see that he comes out of the point of view completely subjective. He accepts the everyday concepts of progress as an increase in the number of people, the number of material products, the improvement of their quality, the increase in the number of known facts and understandable laws, in short, everything that directly or indirectly seeks to elevate human happiness. He only finds in these concepts the ambiguity, the shadow of progress, and not the very progress. He wants to understand precisely these changes, to find the essence of this process and believes that he found it in differentiation, by analogy of organic development, which he wants to call it progress. But whether organic development concludes a characteristic feature of those phenomena from which the author borrowed the concept of progress is very doubtful. The increase in the number of people, the increase in material and mental wealth has the common feature that in it we see something better, more desirable, more appropriately from man and humanity. But what is the best in a newborn animal compared with the embryo or egg from which it occurred? Why is an adult animal better than a newborn? If it is permissible to talk about progress in the development of the animal, it will be just as correct to talk about the goals in nature, about the desires of plants, about the state of the solar system. In addition, it is desirable to know whether Spencer himself would call the transition from homogeneous to heterogeneous in human society, if this differentiation had come to the point that each person would speak in a special language, would have special concepts of true, fair and beautiful? - Spencer's thought is true in general, since experience has proved that in a significant number of cases the approximation of the individual and society to his moral ideal, eSpencer is not the same as the first. And even in those cases when the thought is correct, it indicates only the reason for progress, and he himself still lies in the subjective view of the thinker on what is better or worse for man or for humanity. Note that already in the first edition of his "Basic Principles" Spencer was aware of the inaccuracy of too extensive use of the word progress, replaced it in most cases with a word *pe*(*évolution*) and gave for the latter a formula: "Development is a transition from an indispensable homogeneity to a certain coherent heterogeneity by uninterrupted differentiation and integration" (Sobr. Op., Vopus. VII, page 233). This formula allows less objections to be part of its actual latitude, part of its imperfect clarity, allowing for its very heterogeneous cases to be brought under it, and hardly suitable for it in its direct sense. However, since this is a formula for

development, not progress, it does not concern the issue directly addressed here.

I believe, I believe that the two thinkers taken by me for example differ from the views of progress only in words, but in essence stand, like everyone else, on the same ground, which is conditioned by the nature of human thinking. They put themselves or borrow from others some moral ideal, see in the events of history the struggle for this higher good and approaching it. And everyone does the same.

Letter Three

The Magnitude of Progress in Humanity

Everything said in the previous letter requires, of course, that I put before the reader in a determined manner, in which, in fact, I see the goal of the progressive movement of mankind. I'll do it. But first I would like to remove one objection, which seems to undermine the very basis the scientific nature of my entire reasoning.

I may be told that if history can be understood only as a science of progress, and progress in itself is no more than a subjective view of events from the point of view of our moral ideal, then the scientific nature of history is conditioned by the possibility of a scientifically develop a moral ideal that must inevitably establish itself in humanity as a single scientific truth. Having allowed this consequence (and I admit it), I may object (and objected) that the moral ideals of people were still extremely diverse and in the very essence of the matter, as purely subjective phenomena, should always remain diverse; that we are not here in the field of science, but in the field of faith; the beliefs of one are not binding on another; equally little is required for anyone else's moral ideals; or I cannot recognize these objections as solid and will focus on them for a minute.

If we conclude on the basis of the existing and always existing difference between people, we will have to reject not only the unity of moral ideals, but also the unity of scientific truths. Of the 1400 million individuals who make up humanity, the vast majority not only do not have superficial scientific information, but did not even develop the beginnings of scientific understanding, did not even pass even the first stages of anthropological development. Whole tribes cannot imagine a slightly significant number and do not have abstract words. Fetishism, faith in amulets and fortune-telling, faith in the miraculous not only dominates the wild and illiterate classes of the European population, but also incessantly manifests itself among the so-called civilized minority. Should we conclude from this that science does not exist as an immutable truth for man? Should the results obtained by European scientists be considered as phenomena of thought, which have nothing more right to affirm than stories about ghosts and prophetic dreams? Meanwhile, if the state of affairs in the world that we observe in the present continues, the number of personalities of scientific thinkers will always be suppressed by a mass of believers in ghosts and prophetic dreams. I think that the unity of moral ideals can be considered as a position no less convincing than the unity of scientific truths. Whoever wishes, he can reject both on the grounds that both require special development from individuals and for the majority in the past did not exist, as in the present do not exist. But the persons for whom the science of a mentally developed minority is the only obligatory truth is hardly the right to reject the ideals of a morally developed minority as something completely individual.

All scientific results were achieved not at once, but by developing thought and criticizing the facts. It is necessary to prepare the mind by exercise before it is able to understand and assimilate the scientific truth; therefore, most people remain to our time outside the scientific movement and a considerable number of personalities familiar with the results of scientific criticism, repeat these results only on faith, as they would repeat the story of a miraculous event. For researchers, the fact becomes scientific when it has withstood a number of methodological reconferences; the absence of contradiction, consent to observation, the assumption of only such hypotheses that have real analogues, the elimination of all unnecessary and inaccessible to the experience of hypotheses - these are the requirements of

any new construction that has a claim to enter into a number of scientific truths. These requirements are not easily feasible, and therefore the history of human

knowledge presents a long series of mistakes, from which, gradually, in pieces, developed the exact science. The demand for no contradiction was one of the mighty reasons for the delay of knowledge, because it was necessary to compare the new situation with what was considered indisputably the truth, and this comparison could be fruitful only when the very points of comparison were established critically; it was necessary that special science should be developed from the general mass of philosophical considerations; it was necessary that the truths of the simplest sciences become a lining for the most complex. Therefore, it is not very wise that the strongest minds, on the basis of a lack of contradiction with the seeming truths, have rejected and reject so far some scientific provisions. The requirement of agreement with the observation was no less difficult task; it was necessary to learn to observe, and this is not easy; the greatest minds of antiquity and the notable scientists of modern times left us numerous evidence of very gross observation errors, and until now disputes about the accuracy of the observation made in one or the other case do not cease. We will not dwell on the difficulty of establishing legitimate hypotheses, when it is just as impossible to do without them for the movement of science forward, how it is not easy to point out the limit where the scientific hypothesis passes into a metaphysical consideration; examples of this are daily in the most common works and among the most respected scientists.

All these difficulties explain the slow course of scientific understanding and should convince critically thinking researchers that there is no reason to consider it impossible to improve the application of strictly scientific thinking and to areas where the chaos of opinions now prevails as the most indecency of opinion prevails in the main parts of natural science. The ancient world has developed an understanding of logically deductive, mathematical and geometrical truth; but there are still people who are looking for the quadrature of the circle. The seventeenth century established a method of verification of truth in objective phenomenological sciences; but so far experts oppose each other from experiments on heterogenesis 7,

leading to contradictory results. The importance of psychological observation is still the subject of a dispute. Sociology began to establish some of its provisions very recently. In all these areas, people of different opinions stand still against each other, stubbornly denying the scientific legitimacy of the adversaries, and cannot agree on what observations in these areas are indisputable, what hypotheses are permissible, where there is and where there is no contradiction. Nevertheless, in all these fields, researchers are looking for scientific, general, indisputable truth; everywhere most critics admit that this truth exists that it can be sought and should. Why, why should we tolerate eternal discernment for the field of moral ideals? Why put on the same level a person living instincts and instantaneous instincts with a person trying to analyze moral phenomena and open their laws? Why conclude from the current disputes between thinkers about moral matters, which will never reach scientific results here? Judging by the theory of motion in Aristotle, the undisputedly great mind, it would be possible to reject the possibility of the existence of dynamics at any time.

Thus, there is no impossibility in the development of a scientific way a moral ideal, which, as humanity develops, will become an inevitable true for the circle of individuals, which is increasingly expanding. In this case, it is possible to develop a scientific understanding of progress and build history as a science.

In any case, in the absence of convincing evidence in the impossibility of using scientific techniques in the field of morality, permissively and almost necessarily for everyone who does not pass by indifferently pass by the most important questions for mankind, to try to criticize the development of the moral ideal, the most rational, and the construction of the science of progress - history - on the basis of this ideal. By the same, I allow myself to put at the foundation of all subsequent reasoning a certain indication of what I see as the progress of mankind.

The development of the individual in the physical, mental and moral attitude; the embodiment in social forms of truth and justice is a short formula that embraces, as it seems to me, everything that can be taken into account by progress; and I will add that in this formula I do not consider anything personally belonging to

me personally, more or less clearly and fully expressed, it lies in the minds of all thinkers of the last centuries, and in our time it becomes a walking truth.

The concepts in this formula I consider quite definite and do not permit various interpretations for anyone who treats them in good faith. If I am mistaken, then at least the definition of these concepts, the proof of the provisions in this formula, and its detailed development, are included in the ethics, and not in the theory of progress. Chemical truths have nothing to prove in the treatise on physiology; the truth of ethics has nothing to develop when it comes to their approximation to the process of history. The proposed formula, it seems to me, in its brevity, allows for extensive development, and, developing it, we will get a complete theory of both personal and public morality. Here I accept this formula as a basis for the following and shall proceed directly to consider some of the conditions necessary for progress in the sense indicated above.

The development of the individual physically is possible only when it has acquired some minimum hygienic and material convenience, which is less likely to suffer, diseases, constant worries far exceed the likelihood of any development, makes the latter a share only of exceptional personalities, and all others dooms to degeneration in the minute struggle for existence, without any hope of improving their position.

The development of the individual in mental terms is only firmly established when the individual has developed a need for a critical view of everything that is presented to it, confidence in the immutability of laws governing phenomena, and the understanding that justice in its results is also effective with the desire for personal benefit.

In a modern society imbued with universal competition, the defame of justice seems meaningless. Indeed, the faces who now enjoy the benefits of civilization can only enjoy them by acquiring wealth and increasing it. But the capitalist process of enrichment is, by its very essence, the process of calculating the worker, the process of unscrupulous speculation on the exchange, the process of market trade in its mental abilities, its political and social influence. This path is hardly fair to be the most inveterate sophist, but he will argue that the mental development of the individual is still very weak when the person seeks the opportunity to agree on his personal benefit with justice. He will put a different position: life is a struggle, and true mental development is to be well armed enough for the constant victory in this struggle. Once this was opposed by the inconvenience of reproaches; the danger in constant struggle to be defeated and then not to have one near himself who would support in a moment of misfortune; they contrasted public contempt and public hatred, etc. All these arguments are easily broken

by modern theorists of everyday pleasures: reproaches of conscience are a matter of habit, and from them it is very easy to temper yourself when you make sure that you acquire wealth by law and that one judge cannot bring our act under the article of the Code of Crimes and Punishments; if a vast majority competes on a legal basis for enrichment, for increasing pleasures, then this majority does not feel the kind of life.

So, it should be agreed that with the present system of society, personal benefits are not only not the same as justice, but directly contradicts it. In order to have the greatest amount of pleasure at present, the individual must drown out the very concept of justice; must draw all his critical ability to exploit all and all of them around him to give himself the greatest share of pleasures to their account, and must remember that if it is for a moment succumb to considerations of justice or even the effect of sincere attachment, it will itself become the object of exploitation from those who surround it. The cartridge has to press the worker, or the worker will steal it. The family man has to suspiciously oversee his wife and children, or his wife and children will inflate him. The government has to have a thousand-eyed police, or others will seize power. Stock the wealth, but keep your ears opener, because a friend is offering you a sacrifice only counting on the high percentages; the kiss that the mistress gives you is a purchase kiss. War everywhere, and the weapon must be ready against everyone and at every minute.

So, either the provision of the same justice with personal benefit is meaningless, or the real system of society

is pathological. If the reader finds that the latter is wrong and that is all-to-how it should be, then let him close this book: it is not written for him. But then are the questions: did he, the reader, develop a need for a critical view of everything around him? Has he been infused with the immutability of the law that a society based on the war of all against all is a society that will not be sealed by any legitimacy, no police force; that it is a decomposing society and requiring radical reform? If the reader is instinctively and consciously outraged against this social system, fatally doomed to mutual distrust, to mutual exploitation, if he recognized under the brilliance of modern culture the existence of pathological processes that cannot leave this system at its current grounds, then the need for a critical view of everything around him should lead to a number of questions. Do you have to treat the painful symptoms of this social system or look for the source of this disease and act against it? If the source of this disease lies in the very foundations of the modern hostel, then a radical change in economic, political, general relations between people does not require a different formulation for the very principle of this relationship? Will it not be necessary to take into a healthy basis when reorganizing the pathological social system in a healthy basis not to fight all against all, not universal competition, but perhaps a close and possible extensive solidarity between individuals? Can society be great and firmly free from the existence of solidarity among its members? And what is public solidarity, but not the consciousness that personal interest coincides with the interest of the public, that personal dignity is maintained only by supporting the dignity of all the people in solidarity with us? And if this is the result, to which should be given by the need for a critical view of everything around, then what does this result differ from the above in the text: in a healthy dormitory, justice in its results is also effective with the desire for personal benefit? (1889).

Moral development is only likely when the social environment allows and encourages individuals to develop an independent persuasion; when individuals have the opportunity to

defend their various beliefs and are thus forced to respect the freedom of the other person; when the person was aware that his dignity was in her conviction and that respect for the dignity of a person is self-respect.

The incarnation in the social forms of truth and justice presupposes first of all for the scientist and the thinker the opportunity to express the provisions he considered for the expressions of truth and justice; then it presupposes in society some minimum of general education, allowing the majority to understand these provisions and to evaluate the arguments given in their favor; finally, it presupposes such social forms that would only make it possible that these forms cease to be the embodiment of truth and justice.

Only when the physical development of the individual is possible, when its mental development is strong, when its moral development is likely, only when a public organization contains conditions of sufficient freedom of speech, a sufficient minimum of secondary education sufficient to be accessible to changes in social forms, only then can the progress of society as be considered more or less secure, only then can all data for progress be present and only external catastrophes can stop it. Until all these conditions are fulfilled, until then, progress can be accidental, private, does not guarantee any guarantee for the closest future; until then, one can always expect an era of stagnation or reaction after the era of apparent success. Under the most unfavorable conditions, for a whole society, a different person can be put, due to favorable circumstances, in a position where it will develop far beyond the level of its environment. These favorable circumstances may exist for a group of individuals, but still remain an ephemeral phenomenon, while the whole society will be given stagnation or reaction. The law of large numbers with inexorable rigor will not always slow to prove how little historical significance the development of a small handful of personalities under exceptional conditions. Most of society must be placed in a possible, probable and lasting development, so that it can be said about society that it is progressing.

I am not at all so sure that the reader would agree with the conditions of progress I have indicated, as he hoped for an unquestioning acceptance of a short formula set at the beginning; but this is a common destiny of formulas. Very many agree with them until they are understood; as soon as the explanation begins, the

people who accepted them begin to guess that they, adherents of the same formula, did not quite understand each other. For me, these conditions seem necessary, and I give it to the one who does not agree with me, withholding the formula, to set it other conditions.

But, having set these conditions, I will allow myself to ask the reader: do we have the right to talk at this time about the progress of mankind? Can we say that for most of the 1400 million, which is made up of modern humanity, the initial conditions of progress have already been implemented? Are some of these conditions implemented? And for which of the shares of those 1400 million? And is it possible to think without some horror what the miserable millions of dead generations have done about the realization of progress for a small handful of personalities whom the historian can consider to be a representative of civilization?

I would consider it an insult to the reader if I doubted for a minute how he would answer the question: are the initial conditions for progress been made? There is only one answer possible: all the conditions for progress have not been implemented for any person and none of them has been implemented for the majority. Only small groups of individuals or individuals sometimes found themselves in some places in favorable circumstances to win any progress and to convey

the tradition of struggle for the best other small groups, to which fate also gave a slightly advantageous position. Everywhere and always, the personalities who have developed any progress had to struggle with innumerable obstacles, spend on this struggle the most significant share of their forces and their lives, in order to only defend their right to physical, mental development. Only in especially favorable circumstances did they succeed. Only under the exclusive position of individuals, the struggle for existence took place, and time and effort went to the struggle for increasing pleasures. Even more exceptional was the position of those who took advantage of the struggle of other personalities that have become so successful for them as to fight for the moral pleasure of the conscious development of human principles and their embodiment in social forms. And in all these cases, the struggle required such a share of forces and life that there was very little both of them to realize the goal of struggle, so it is not wise, if humanity, even in part; everything was better furnished, has achieved so little more. It is also surprising that under such unfavorable conditions, some of humanity has yet achieved something that has the right to be called not implementation, but a preparation of correct progress. But how small is this proportion of those who have had? And what did it cost the others?

Of all, humanity has moved more about the conditions of physical development of the individual; meanwhile, even in this respect, there are still a small number of persons for whom the necessary minimum of hygienic and material amenities is realized! What an insignificant minority of 1400 million of humanity enjoys enough and healthy food, has clothes and dwelles that meet the basic requirements of hygiene, can turn to a doctor in the event of illness, public care in the event of hunger or sudden misfortune! What a vast majority spends almost all his life in continuous care of daily bread, in the tireless struggle for its miserable existence, and moreover, is not always able to defend themselves! - Consider the tribes, to whom this struggle and still did not allow to come out of a state almost no different from other breeds of animals. Consider the victims of hunger, epidemics in numerous tribes, deprived of all benefits of rational culture. Consider among civilized Europe the mass of the population who has been condemned all his life to fight for tomorrow's piece of bread. Remember the terrible reports on the hygienic conditions of the worker in the most developed countries of Europe. Look in the mortality tables, which figures correspond to the rise in price of bread by several percent, how the probability of life for the poor and for the rich changes. When these figures appear before you in their terrifying reality, then you can ask ourselves, what share of humanity really enjoys those life amenities, the necessary conditions for physical development for a person, which modern culture develops in its factories, medical faculties, in its committees on the poor? How great is the practical significance of human science and human philanthropy in our time for the lives of most people, for their development? And at the same time, it is impossible not to admit that the increase in material

conveniences of life in Europe is striking and that, undoubtedly, the number of personalities who have the opportunity to enjoy the convenience of healthy food, a healthy home, medical allowance in case of illness and police protection against accidents has increased in recent centuries. On this small proportion of humanity, protected from the most serious need, lies in our time the entire human civilization.

Far, far below humanity stands in the way of realization of conditions of mental development. There is nothing more to say about the development of a critical view of things, about the understanding of the immutability of the laws of nature and the utilitarian significance of justice for the vast number of those who still have to defend their existence against the minute

danger. But a minority, more or less protected from these heavy concerns, contains only the smallest proportion of personalities who are accustomed to thinking critically, who have learned the meaning of the word of the law of phenomena and clearly understanding their own benefits. Too much laughed and resented, citing examples of the domination of fashion, habit, tradition, all kinds of authority in a civilized minority, so that I need to spread about this subject and repeat a thousand times the repeated truth that people who have developed the habit of critically thinking in general, are wonderful rarities. A few more, though, though, there are very few people accustomed to generalizing the phenomena of any one, more or less broad, sphere of phenomena. Outside this sphere, they are as subject to the meaningless repetition of other people's opinions as the majority of mankind. - As for the assimilation of the concept of the immutability of laws governing phenomena, it can be sought only in a small group of persons who have seriously engaged in science. But even between them, not everyone who preaches in words the immutability of the law of nature can be considered assimilating this principle in fact. The epidemics of the newest sorcerers - magnetizers, spirit-builders, spiritualists - gave long lists of faces enthusiastic about these epidemics, and among these names are, unfortunately, people of science. And outside of these epidemics, especially in the moment of life danger, mental upheavals, etc., more than once people of science turned to amulets and spells (of course, in their generalized Christian form), showing how weak in their minds the belief in the immutability of the course of phenomena and in the impossibility of deviating the processes of nature from their inevitable commission. Is it wise after that Christian amulets and spells play a role among the brilliant culture of nineteenth-century Europe as spectacularly as others in the deserts of Africa among our contemporaries or for several millennia in our ancestors. The science of nature has won only something from the wonderful world, so that the culture of our time in the trifles of life presents a motley mixture of rational and prejudiced techniques and faith in the miraculous one is ready to awaken in most of the educated class at the first convenient occasion.

I do not even dare to raise the issue of developing an understanding of the utilitarian side of justice. Under the present social system, the conditions of universal competition lead to the direct negation of the utilitarian significance of fair actions, therefore, it is impossible to expect an intensification of a concept that contradicts the prevailing direction of thought. One can only wonder how healthy human instincts, the evil of prevailing and growing competition, still force people to worship the fictions of justice. But that's right. Almost every most unscrupulous operator of everything around him wants to seem fair, and not only before others, but very often before himself. This is a symptom of an unwitting recognition of the truth of the above position, even among the system, at the root of which is the denial of this situation. But it goes without saying that at present the number of persons who have learned this position in theory and in practice is completely imperceptible. - As little is the conditions of mental progress, even in the minority, provided from a direct struggle for existence, but still these conditions, although part are fulfilled. There is a small group of people who have developed the habit of thinking critically, albeit in a private area of knowledge. The insanity of the laws of phenomena is theoretically recognized by the majority of scientists, although very little entered in a personal belief. Only the utilitarian significance of justice, even in theory, is consciously very little. But what about the conditions of moral development of the individual? Since it is possible to speak of beliefs only in the circle of people who have developed the ability to think critically, then the conditions of moral development exist for this small group. But only one share of it is in countries where the

law protects personal conviction, and does not punish it. Only a small share of this share lives in the social environment, which does not look at the independence of beliefs as a moral vice, does not try to eradicate it from childhood by education, inspiring obedience to the generally accepted, does not persecute it by all means to life as indisgrunting, harming social tranquility. When the personalities of this barely noticeable group of humanity, happier than others set up in relation to the conditions of moral development, have developed a belief, then only a small proportion of them keeps tolerance of the contrary to other people's beliefs and even less attaches to this consciousness that the dignity of a person lies in his conviction. Judge, therefore, for what the most of humanity in each generation is moral progress possible. And in moral progress, each generation repeats the same work, since the strength and independence of persuasion, as well as the willingness to stand for it is not transferred from one person to another, but is developed by every person independently. Progress is only among the personalities who have learned strong and independent beliefs. In the small number of persons for whom this belief is generally possible, there is no means to determine whether this progress exists or not. It could be assumed that it is due to the expansion of the geographical area where the law protects freedom of thought, but the best means of administrative supervision are more preoccupied with it than before, in those places where there is repressive legislation in this regard, so that the future will have to be resolved. For the present, it is not of particular importance in the insignificance of the share of mankind to which this question concerns. I note that Bockle, denying moral progress in humanity, meant quite different.

We move on to the conditions necessary for the embodiment in social forms of truth and justice. The first of them - the opportunity to express their scientific knowledge and philosophical beliefs - is made more or less in a fairly visible part of Europe and America, and this is the most real progress of human history, although it is not without significant inconvenience for people of too determined opinions: the fate of Ludwig Feuerbach in Germany, the former Rochefort, Maroteau, Amber 8 in France, even in England, the difficulties that Bradlo met at the time of joining the parliament. But the second, the sufficient minimum of social education, as we have seen, is realized only for a small minority, provided by the most stubborn struggle for existence and accustomed to think critically: all other members of society are suppressed by daily concerns, or are accustomed to follow the authorities. The third condition - the possibility of discussing and changing obsolete social forms - seems to be implemented where the constitution legitimizes the constituent and legislative assemblies. However, in our time, hopes for these legal public opinion bodies have weakened. Do they represent and can public opinion, i.e. the opinion of the majority of the adult population of the country? We have seen that the conditions of physical development are very inadequate for most people, while the conditions of mental and moral development are for almost all. In such a case, is it possible to allow any constituent or legislative assembly to express in its deliberations and regulations actual public opinion? Since the heavy concerns for the daily bread make it quite impossible for the vast majority of individuals to participate in the legislation in complex forms that are attached to him, and since even the few personalities of this majority, who had chance the opportunity to develop mentally, the real social system in most cases counts all sorts of obstacles, then the public forms are conditioned and changed only by representatives of the wealthy minority. Since this minority is critically developed very little and less than anything else in terms of the utilitarian significance of justice, a fair judgment in this case is chance, and the general rule is the judgment and decision on the basis of the exclusive selfish interests of the minority set by the circumstances of the engine of the legislative machine. By jeopaving on the knowledge of this minority and on its best or worst

understanding of one's own interests, it embodies these interests in the legislation more fully or less fully. But in the most favorable case, the legislation is thus an attempt to meet the minimum of mass needs in order to prevent revolutionary explosions. For the most part, the ruling classes or the governmental minority embody in the legislation the very social struggle that motivates the owner of the capital to look at the masses only as an object of economic exploitation for their own enrichment, and the persons participating in the government to see in the subjects of the subjects of police supervision and

punitive measures in the subjects of the subjects of police surveillance and punitive measures.

Not only the interests of the minority hinder the improvement of social forms; it is hindered by even more assimilated habits, sanctified by the time of tradition. In the eyes of a significant number of personalities of the most developed societies, only some political and some low-minded economic forms have always been discussed and legitimately changed. Everything else remains an inviolable shrine even in the eyes of many of those who more or less tolerate from this inviolable shrine, especially in the eyes of those who do not feel its hardship. There was a time when no political speaker of a free republic could have referred to the abolition of slavery. The time when tolerance for non-believers represented a topic that can lead to a fire. But even in our time in the parliaments of Europe and America, you can safely discuss tariffs and loans, and a radical discussion of the distribution of wealth is impossible. Debate on the responsibility of ministers is allowed, but the replacement of one dynasty by another or the transition from monarchical rule to republican can take place only through revolution. The economic side of family relations is being revised, but it does not apply to the essence of these relations. In many cases, it is not possible to say that the touch of these shrines was expressly prohibited by law or would subject the offender to a certain punishment. An opinion can be expressed if there is a critical and courageous person between legislators. But the habit and tradition do not allow the majority of legislators and a significant part of society to even begin to discuss its motives. Opinion will be rejected by the unheard-of, unconscious, and not because his opponents may seem the arguments of his weak or their interests affected, but simply because this opinion in their eyes is not subject to discussion. With a lack of critical development among the wealthy minority supplying legislators, and with less suffering of the interests of this minority from the inviolable shrines, the latter for a long time remain virtually holy, even after they have long lost their inviolability in the field of thought, after the vast majority feels oppressed, although they have not yet realized the need to change the inviolable forms. Dissatisfaction is growing. Suffering is multiplying. Local explosions are easily suppressed. Governments and the ruling classes resort to palliatives, semi-measures to alleviate too obvious suffering and reduce police surveillance and punitive measures. When a critical minority repeats its demands for reform, it encounters irresistible obstacles. Everything remains as it is, as long as the opinion of the unsuitability of these forms (of course, taken on faith) will not extend to a fairly significant number of personalities and dissatisfied do not yet realize that the path of peaceful reforms for society is impossible. Then the obsolete forms are destroyed, but no longer through peaceful legislative reforms, but through a violent revolution, which in fact in the historical process is largely an incomparably more tool of social progress than radical reform in the legislation peacefully. Governments, of course, always try to prevent revolutions. These revolutions are almost always completely undesirable and opposition parties demanding reforms. But the lack of mental and moral development in the ruling and leadership personalities and groups usually leads to an inevitable bloody clash. The misfortunes of

revolutions are known to all. The great number of suffering caused by them, precisely for the masses, suppressed by daily care, makes them always a very sad means of historical progress. But since it is largely impossible in a different way with serious social inconveniences and, since sometimes even a direct calculation proves that the chronic suffering of the masses, while maintaining the previous system, sometimes far exceeds all the probable suffering in the event of a revolution, it is necessary for the most peaceful but sincere reformers to turn to the revolutionaries. The misfortunes, at the same time inevitable, can be reduced only by a rational discussion of the real changes that the revolution must lead to, while we too often see in history, that it is limited only by the replacement of one dominant group of another, the masses, the masses, to improve the position of which sincere revolutionaries and whose forces of the revolution are committed, very little benefit from the coup.

Noting how little the conditions of human progress are fulfilled, we, of course, will cease to be surprised by the existence of the sad choir of writers, who in all centuries repeated the bitter complaints about the calamity of mankind and lamented the fragility of the so-called historical civilizations. As in our time the vast majority of humanity is doomed to constant physical labor, the resounding mind and moral feeling, the

probability of death from hunger or from epidemics, and always the majority was in a similar position. An ever-working human machine, often starving and always concerned about tomorrow, is no better at all in our time than it was in other periods. There's no progress for her. She cares little about her and the culture that stands above her head with her palaces, parliaments, temples, academies, studios. It was connected in the same time with the ruling minority inviolability of the old custom, the shrine of the general religion. Later, she believed in caring for her patriarchal bosses, distant kings. Even later, I hoped for "popular" ministers, "radical" speakers in parliaments and at rallies, hearing how these people spoke of the "people" with the heat. But history claimed one of these illusions behind another, and civilizations with their brilliance all remained the means of persecuting a minority in view of the constantly suffering majority. Nevertheless, everything again and again before every society raises the question of necessity, for the strength of civilization, to establish the solidarity of interests and beliefs, to establish a connection between the ruling classes and the majority. If this connection does not exist between the mass of the poor and the civilized minority, then its civilization is always not strong. The clash with a foreign conqueror, the preaching of a new religion, a minute explosion of the famine can destroy in the shortest possible very brilliant culture, despite its apparent predominance in material, mental and moral conditions. The only means for civilization to be more durable is to constantly associate with its existence the material, mental and moral interests of the poor majority, expanding to a greater and greater number of persons the benefits of material conveniences of life, developing the action of science, the consciousness of personal dignity and the attractive influence of more just social forms. Only by distributing more evenly the accumulated capital of wealth, mental and moral development, a civilized minority can cause the strength to its own development.

The ancient Eastern kingdoms, just as the kingdoms of Mexico, Peru, and probably the nameless society that left palaces and temples in the forests of Palenka 10, were demolished with all their civilizations the first social storm. It was not a number of accidents, but a completely natural product of the form of these civilizations. When the monopoly of mental development belonged to theocracy, when the monopoly of vital goods and cultural improvements belonged to a small circle of hereditary owners or people who passed beyond the threshold of the royal palace, when the palaces for one and the temples for the few were the

results of the unprison work of the vast majority, when for this majority was not expected to be a significant improvement in everyday life from the preservation of native social forms, nor significant harm from subordination to the alien conqueror, then An alien conqueror came and easily removed from the top of society a small layer of a civilized minority. Pushes, collapsed and overgrown with forest magnificent palaces and temples in Nineveh to rise in Babylon; then Babylon fell to attract labor and capital to Susa and Persepolis. The majority lost only a motley spectacle, and worked without benefit for the Sennacherim as for Nebuchadnezzers; it was connected with the interests and lives of thought with the Amazon as little as Darius; it died mechanically in the troops of Cure, as it perished in the troops of Cresa ... The profound injustice of the distribution of the conditions of physical, mental and moral development gave extreme non- distinction to all these civilizations.

The same phenomenon was repeated when the Greco-Roman world fell. But here, the circle of spread of civilization was wider, its forms are somewhat fairer, so the ancient civilization was also more stable, so it did not so easily succumb to the pressure of external and internal destructive forces; therefore, its traces in the history of mankind deeper and more numerous. It was associated with the interests of a significant economic large number of citizens, the interests of all those who had the opportunity, eliminating the most difficult concerns, come to one of the city centers of thought and political life. The humiliating depotism of the individual was replaced by the idealized despotism of the state and the law. With the theocracy, the monopoly of mental development has disappeared. Accurate science, independent philosophical thinking, conscious participation of a citizen in the political whole expanded the implementation of conditions of physical, mental and moral development. Nevertheless, under a layer of free citizens was incomparably numerous class of slaves, who were given all handicraft labor and who were not associated with the political

life of citizens. Behind the walls of autocratic cities expanded territories subordinated to arbitrariness and exploitation, alien to the scientific and philosophical development of the centers. The pedagogical effect of scientific and philosophical thought was weak, and instead of broadening the circle of knowledgeable, philosophers wrote on the doors of the academies a ban on the unknown to enter. Greek thought rose high and quickly, but the more solitary scientists, who were incomprehensible to society, philosophers, alien to ordinary interests of life stood at this height. The inevitable fate did not take long to wait. Numerous citizens who did not associate their interests with the interests of craft slaves and the subservient territories, did not defend the freedoms of their cities from external violence. In a prolonged struggle, the population of cities, which kept the tradition of citizenship, was mixed with the alien majority, alien to this tradition, and the centers of ancient political life have lost their living significance. Small scientists and advanced thinkers, who did not associate their thoughts pedagogically with the thinking of a significant number of persons, did not defend the rights and methods of their criticism from the fetishism of the masses, from the laziness and inconsistency of the minds of the secured lesserness. Under the influence of the unrest of the time of the Diadochoes of the 11 and Roman conquest, the critically thinking minority drowned in the majority, alien to criticism; the need for ridiculous beliefs suppressed the need for the beliefs of the thoughtful, just as the need for material security suppressed the need for civil life. The Hellenic ideal of a just life was replaced by the Roman ideal of a legitimate form. The circle of exploiting cities narrowed first into the circle of consulars of

12 one city, exploiting the world, then in the circle of associates of one person who commanded the world. When the outer enemies of ancient Rome came to rob him, he fell apart

under their hand, because there was no one to cherish the imperial fission with its heavy oppression. When the new Christian wonderworkers threw into the eyes of the descendants of Aristotle, Archimedes and Epicurus the requirement to think unthinkable, the criticism fell silent, science was buried and philosophy went into slavery because their representatives were solid or themselves fell into the influence of the masses, alien to mental interests. The lack of justice of ancient civilization undermined its strength, despite its remarkable successes in comparison with the previous forms of life and thought.

And the new civilization of Europe can count on its strength only as much as the material, mental and moral interests of the minority, which represents it, is economically associated with the well-being of the majority, pedagogically with its thinking, and vitally with the conviction of most personalities that their dignity is in solidarity with the existing civilization. Who finds that these conditions are fulfilled in the present system of society, that it is not solidarity, but social discord, it must inevitably look for ways by which this pathological state would be translated into a healthy, more just, in which solidarity would be established between the interests of different social groups. The most just civilization in its distribution is the most durable.

But the length of civilization is sometimes bought at the cost of its ability to develop. If the geographical conditions in some way provide civilization from the outside, it can fence itself from the dangers from the inside by preventing individuals from developing in their environment with critical thought, of which there is not much that they cannot be suppressed every time they appear. For other races of mankind, stronger than others who hold their habits for their antiquity, and perhaps in the faculty of the brain less prone to critical development, finally, in a number of generations, the habit of a certain state of thought, repeated with the same immutability as the construction of a hive of bees and the construction of termites, is finally formed. Then in society there can be palace revolutions, bloody wars, changes of dynasties, even the formation of multivolume literature, but its civilization does not change, and the historical life in it ceases. China is a fairly common example of such stagnation. However, it should not think that the highest races are completely relieved of the danger of falling into stagnation. Byzantium has gone far along the same path. The Moscow kingdom was already leaning towards him. But more developed forms of statehood can come to numbness.

Thus, all civilization is constantly threatened by two dangers. If it is limited to too few and too exclusively

set minority, it is in danger of disappearing. If it prevents it from developing among a civilized minority to critically thinking units that revive it, it is threatened with stagnation.

Insufficient satisfaction of the most basic conditions of progress has never and nowhere become a solid affiliation of any civilization, providing it from stops and upheavals, from reactions and coups. Stagnation threatened and threatens all civilizations; if its examples are rare in history, it was only because the desire for stagnation was not even able to eliminate the causes of the fragility of the social order; external enemies and internal diseases did not allow the society to turn to the anthill. Thus, the likelihood of lasting progress in humanity never existed, but, despite unfavorable conditions, incredible things were done, and in some places for a barely noticeable minority of mankind, the science of progress, history, could accumulate some material. In some places, the personalities and groups of individuals could develop physically, mentally and morally, could acquire some truths, translate into the life of small circles a little more justice and bequeath to other generations the means of successful struggle for progress. If the conditions of social progress have not been fulfilled anywhere (i.e., the

conditions necessary for unimpeded and lasting progress in a given society), then the conditions for the progressive activity of individual personalities were often present: a critical attitude to modern culture, a strong conviction and determination to embody it, not paying attention to the dangers. In general, these latter conditions were not as rarely met as it would seem if it took into account the complete absence of conditions for social progress. The mental development of the personality, if it was unsophisticated, then did not always prevent the individual from reaching out to criticism of the existing, sometimes to realize the coincidence of justice with the personal benefit of a developed person. Moral development, no matter how much it was probable under the existing system of society, but was shown in the most backward environments. Under the most difficult circumstances, thinkers expressed their theories of truth and justice and met near themselves sympathy and understanding. The forms of social life, persistently opposed to progress, were repeatedly disintegrated by the explosions of revolutions, if they did not succumb to the pressure of the development of thought. Under the most hostile conditions, progress was made possible. It really happened. When the results extracted in one area disappeared with the destruction of civilization due to its fragility, their tradition mostly survived in another area, let the sprouts and again won a little new soil for history. But humanity could never, at the cost of all the victims and the entire historical struggle, win sufficient conditions for a lasting progressive development. At the meantime, it should be remembered that this is no more than a condition of progress, while its goals are concluded, far away. It is more convenient to see if we are comparable to each of the above basic conditions of lasting social progress with the ultimate goal that corresponds to this condition.

A minimum of hygienic and material amenities is a necessary condition for progress; secured labor, with the availability of conveniences of life, is the ultimate goal corresponding to this condition. The need for a critical view, confidence in the immutability of the laws of nature, the understanding of the sameness of justice with personal benefit are the conditions of mental development; the systematic science and the just social system are its ultimate goal. The social environment, favorable for independent persuasion, and understanding of the moral significance of persuasion is a condition of moral progress; the development of reasonable, clear, strong beliefs and their embodiment is its purpose. Freedom of thought and speech, minimum general education, social forms available to progress are the conditions of the progressive public; the maximum possible development for each individual, social forms as a result of the progress available to each of them is the goal of social progress.

In view of these goals, the conditions mentioned above represent the stage of very low social development. However, they were not satisfied anywhere and never. The true goals of progress seem to most thinkers no more than utopias. However, despite this, despite the complete absence of conditions for lasting progress, history still took place in humanity and progress was made.

But what it cost humanity!

Letter Four

The Price of Progress

Continuing its long existence, humanity has developed several brilliant personalities, which historians proudly call him representatives, heroes. In order for these heroes to act, even so that they could appear in those societies that were made happy with their emergence, a small group of people who consciously sought the development of human dignity, to expand knowledge, to understand thought, to strengthen character, to establish a more convenient system of society. In order for this small group to be formed, it was necessary that among the majority struggling hourly for its existence, there is a minority provided by the most serious concerns of life. In order that the majority of those fighting for the daily bread, for shelter and clothing can distinguish this color of the people, these only representatives of civilization, it is necessary for the majority to exist; and this was not as easy as it may seem at first sight.

In the initial struggle for existence with his animal brothers, man had badly. He does not have such mighty natural tools of attack and protection as other breeds, which were produced among enemies precisely because of such tools; and in the struggle with physical means, the strongest animals devoured it. He lacks organs for lasagna, jumping, flight or swimming to make it easier to avoid danger, while other, weakest breeds, it is these organs that are probably owed their preservation. A person needs to learn everything, to adjust to everything; otherwise he will die. According to some writers, the average-nomadic cubs in continuation of 1/5 of their lives are a helpless burden for parents, while for other breeds this number never exceeds 1/20. Assuming even that in primitive humanity this difference was expressed by more close numbers among themselves, it was still inevitable not in the favor of man. Therefore, it was extremely difficult to survive a person in the environment of the animal kingdom.

One organ in its gradual development could give a person a triumph in this struggle, replacing the advantages of all other breeds and surpassing them. It was an organ of thought. Probably, an innumerable set of bipedal individuals perished in a hopeless struggle with their enemies - the beasts, before the happy units were developed, capable of thinking better than these enemies, capable of inventing means for protecting their existence. They defended themselves at the cost of the death of everything else, and this first, completely natural, aristocracy between the two-legged created humanity. The inherited ability or impermissibility has shifted the inventions of these primitive geniuses to a small minority, set into the most favorable conditions, for responsiveness. The existence of mankind has been strengthened.

If a person has previously struggled with a person, as with any other animal, to take away food from him or devour him, now the struggle of the struggle between people is a serious for the future. The chances were more equivalent here, and therefore the struggle had to be more stubborn and longer. Any improvement in the agility of the body, in the use of the instruments of attack and protection, in imitation of the first teachers- beasts, all invention, a successful unit, caused the death of many units. The dead abandoned cubs; pregnant women died or newly born females; the weakest, less agile, less inventive, less cautious, less reciprocal, died. He withstood a cub who, according to a strong organization, could previously do without care than others, or, by a happy atmosphere, could use care more often; withstood the most powerful body and thought; withstood the happiest of the equally capable. He ate better; he slept calmer; he knew more; he had time to think better. These lucky ones made up the second

aristocracy of human breeds, who could survive the price of the extermination of all their fraters. The tidings of individuals for general protection and for general work was probably the first and greatest cause for the moral development of mankind. From his zoological condition, man took out the first, oldest family grouped near his mother, who for a long time fed her children. Growing up, human individuals, following the example of predatory and some monkeys, were familiar with another public appearance, with a temporary squad for defense or for attack. On the basis of the primitive maternal family, the first vast purely human union was formed - the motherhood. In the hard struggle for existence, man has developed this form of a strong union based on a common cause and

subjugating personal selfishness. The general result of the research of a number of modern scientists indicates to us a closely related human group with common wives, with common children, with common property as the oldest and almost universal purely human form of the hostel. It was the first lasting connection between people, ca connection based on blindly doubt custom, but in this regard, a person assimilated for the future the possibility of a calculated series of actions, the possibility of a life plan. It was the first lesson of the personality, who taught her how much she wins in the struggle for existence, entering into an association to which the individual sacrifices an exceptional egoism, but from which it receives a huge increment of forces, the results of general experience, the general work of the thought of all members of the association and the tradition of a long generation. From this basic human union subsequently developed a patriarchal family, a patriarchal family, different forms of the union of families, developed tribes and peoples. In the struggle against these tribal alliances, increasingly weaker groups had to perish or even into the unions of one or the other species. In the presence of these cohesive forces, all those individuals who did not think of the union in any form or did not adopt for some reason in any form in any way fell apart themselves, have disappeared without any possibility. The infuriating struggle of the ancestral alliances among themselves had to be the more fierce that the struggling had, the more powerful the economic needs of human groups or their clusters became, and therefore they challenged each other with meager means of satisfying these needs. At the cost of this extermination, mankind has bought the possibility of continuous progress of culture; by transferring it from one generation to another, bought the habit of the public and personal affection, the tradition of knowledge and belief.

The struggle continued between the clans, tribes and nations, when the forms of the public became more complicated, formed forms of communal, ancestry, family, tribal and private property, established, caste and state relations and involuntyism. They ruthlessly exterminated the defeated opponents, while the matter was only about the struggle for existence; but the first lesson about the benefits of someone else's life for the convenience of his own could not be in vain. The desire to increase their pleasures prompted to think about: is it not profitable sometimes not to kill the defeated? Is it not more profitable for the winner to develop only the dexterity of the body and thought, having put the labor of obtaining the necessary to another? Those brilliant personalities of prehistoric humanity who thought of this utilitarian principle, laid in it the basis of respect for someone else's life and respect for their own dignity. Thus, they unconsciously set themselves and their descendants in the duty, to the moral ideal, physical and mental development, culture and science. They have provided for themselves and their offspring for progress. They created progress among humanity, as their brilliant and happy predecessors created humanity among the beasts, created human societies and human breeds in the struggle between human individuals and semi-animal groups, created the

possibility of future progress. But this progress of a small minority was bought by the enslavement of the majority, by depriving it of the ability to achieve the same dexterity of the body and thought that constituted the dignity of the representatives of civilization. While the minority developed both the brain and muscles, while its most muscular system developed versa in the activities of military, diverse, temporary, accompanied by leisure and rest, most were doomed to monotonous, tedious and continuous peaceful work for other people's benefits, without having a leisure to work thought, seconding to their masters.

The consciousness of the great importance of culture and science as a force and as a pleasure led itself to the desire to monopolize this force and this pleasure. Direct coercion, organization of society, punishment of law, religious horror, the usual tradition, inspired from the cradle, separated a minority of purebred, knowledgeable, developing from everything else. At the cost of tireless work and the struggle for the existence of this other ofew could choose the best women, produce the best generation, nourish it and educate it better; they could use time to observe, reflection, consideration, without caring for food, shelter and simple comfort; they could achieve truth, weigh justice, seek technical improvements, a better social system, could develop a passionate love for truth and justice, their willingness to sacrifice their lives.

The sermon of truth and justice came from convinced and understanding units into a small circle of people for whom development was pleasure; it formed in this circle of receptive adherents to whom believers from the wealthy minority adjoined. The force or agreement was made from time to time the teaching of the true and just in the law and habit. As developed individuals from an internal need sought to realize justice into affairs and to spread the truth, so the reasoning minority for their own benefit found to be the best part of the conveniences of living with most and expand the circle of those who know to some extent. I have already said that the strength of civilization depended on the consciousness of the need for such an expansion. But understanding has spread slowly; small calculation has always encouraged to give as much convenience to other people, to limit as much as possible the sphere of knowledge available to them. The reluctance to think prompted to see in all the new demands of the times something hostile to the social order, something criminal and sinful, and therefore the monopolists of knowledge were mostly opposed by all means of their progress. They chained their knowledge in traditional theories, in authoritative dogmas, merged this knowledge with sacred tradition, with the supernatural revelation il thereby tried to make their knowledge inaccessible to further criticism. Subsequently, when knowledge became secular and could not already encircle its monopolizers with the mystical mystery of the shrine, there were coterie of official scientists with certain balls of tangerines, with loud diplomas of doctors, professors, academicians. They also tried to rid themselves of the further work of thought, carefully closing their cooterie, pushing away from them and humbling new forces that put too boldly the banner of scientific criticism; the monopolists tried to make the official cause of habit and tradition out of science, as the sacred science used to be. Recognized knowledge became too often the enemy of criticism, the enemy of scientific progress. The weakness of this progress was inevitably aroused by a bad understanding of human dignity and forms of justice. Hence the prolonged fragility of civilizations; hence their constant desire for stagnation; hence, finally, the extreme insignificance of progress in the environment of mankind, which is indicated in the previous letter, despite the fact that for several great people in the period of the millennia and for the progress of a barely noticeable minority is paid for billions of lives, the oceans of blood, inconsistencies in countless suffering and the inexpensive work of generations.

Dearly paid humanity to ensure that several thinkers in their office could talk about its progress. It paid dearly for several small seminaries, where he raised teachers, who, however, still brought him little benefit. If we were to consider the educated minority of our time, the number of lives that died in the past in the struggle for its existence, and to evaluate the work of a number of generations who have worked only to sustain their lives and for the development of others, and if you calculate how many lost human lives and what value of work falls on every person living a somewhat human life, if all this were done, then probably our other contemporaries would be horrified at the thought of what kind of blood. To calm their sensitive conscience is the fact that such a calculation is impossible.

However, it is necessary to be horrified not that the progress of the minority has costly, but only the fact that it has cost so much and that so little has been done for this price. If the minority had previously and diligently taken care of the spread of development in the field of culture and thought, the number of lives and labour lost would not have been so great; the sum that falls on each of us would be less and would not have increased so much with each generation. We do not control the laws of natural necessity, and therefore a reasonable person must reconcile with them, limit themselves to their calm research and, as far as possible, use them for his own purposes. We do not control over history; the past gives us only facts that can sometimes serve to correct the future. For the sins of our fathers, we are responsible only as we continue and use them, without trying to correct their consequences. We have power to some extent only over the future, for our thoughts and our actions constitute the material from which the entire content of the future truth and justice is organized. Each generation is responsible to the offspring for what it could and did not do. Therefore, we, in view of the judgment of the offspring, have to solve the questions: what share of the inevitable, natural evil lies in the process that we call the high-profile name of historical progress? To what

extent have our ancestors who have brought us, to a civilized minority, to benefit from this progress, have unnecessarily increased and continued the suffering and work of the majority, the benefits of progress never enjoyed? In what case can the responsibility for this evil fall before us in the eyes of future generations?

The law of struggle for existence so common to the animal world that we have no reason to blame primitive humanity when this law was attached to it, until the consciousness of mutual solidarity, the need for truth and justice, were awakened in people. Since this consciousness could hardly have awakened, until the people, mutually exterminating each other, have not reached the replacement of the murder by exploitation, then for the entire long period of the struggle between individuals, squads, tribals, tribes and nations we have to look only as a zoological fact.

It is hardly possible to imagine the accumulation of knowledge, the development of the thought of law and responsibility at first, except in the process that occurs in units, placed in especially advantageous circumstances, i.e. in individuals with leisure, better nutrition and upbringing on the account of other individuals who are the first to deliver this leisure time, food and education by increasing their work, if not at the cost of their own lives or significant suffering. You have to have teachers before you learn. A majority can only develop by an action of a more developed minority. Therefore, in humanity, either any development should have been lacking, or it was necessary for the majority to bear the happiest minority on their shoulders, work for it, to suffer and die because of it. This is also the law of nature. In view of it, we have to say, whether we do not want development at all, bought at such a price; or to look

at it as an anthropological fact. But at the beginning of the previous letter, I have already included a comprehensive development in the very formula of progress, therefore, allowing for the rejection of development at all, would fall into conflict. Let us reconcile with the fact that humanity needed for its development very, very expensive to prepare a pedagogical seminary and a more developed minority in order for science and versatile life practice, thinking and technology, having accumulated in these centers, gradually pour into more and more people.

The necessary, natural evil in progress is limited to the previous one, and beyond these laws begins the responsibility of human generations, especially a civilized minority. All the blood shed in history outside the direct struggle for existence, in a period of more or less clear consciousness of human rights to life, is blood, criminally shed and lies on the responsibility of the generation that shed it. Any civilized minority that did not want to be civilized in the vast majority sense of the word is responsible for all the sufferings of contemporaries and offspring, which it could eliminate, if it were not limited to the role of the representative and guardian of civilization, but took upon the role of its engine.

If we appreciate the panorama of history from this point of view to our time, we shall probably have to admit that all historical generations have shed rivers of blood, even without being justified in the struggle for existence, and that almost always and everywhere a minority proud of their civilization has done very little to spread this civilization. Few individuals cared about the expansion of the field of knowledge in humanity; even less - about strengthening the thought and of the search for the fairest forms of society; the individual of a civilized minority, who sought to translate into the cause of such forms, are found in a very small number. Many brilliant civilizations paid their death for this inability to associate with their existence the interest of more personalities. In all civilizations, without exception, most of the people who enjoyed cultural amenities did not think about all those who did not use it and could not use it, and yet about the price that the acquired conveniences of life and thought were purchased. But there have always been a lot of persons who at each stage of civilization recognized this degree as a limit of social development, resented against all criticism of it, against any attempt to extend the good of civilization to a greater number of persons, to reduce the labor and suffering of the majority, which does not use it, and to bring to the idea of more truth, into social forms of justice. These steady terrors were terrified of the thought that all history is an inexorable steeple chase [jump with obstacles] in pursuit of the best, where anyone who has fallen behind immediately comes out of a circle of historical figures disappears in a crowd of nameless slammers with eyes and perishes in zoological

nothingness. Unable to such a jump persuade and others to stop, relax, enjoy peace, as if it is possible for a person if he wants to remain a person. These preminators of stagnation have rarely managed to put a perfect barrier to social progress, but they have often managed to slow it down and increase the suffering of the majority.

In view of this, we must recognize that the benefits of modern civilization are paid not only for by the inevitable evil, but also by a huge amount of completely unnecessary evil, the responsibility for which lies with the previous generations of the civilized minority, partly by carelessness, part of the direct opposition of all civilizational activities. We can no longer correct this evil in the past. The suffering generations of the majority died, not relieved in their work. The current civilized minority enjoys their work and suffering. Moreover, it still enjoys the suffering and labor of a huge number of its contemporaries and can influence the increase in labor and suffering. Since we have brought for this last circumstance and will bear moral

responsibility to the offspring, the historical study of the price of the progress that has come leads to the following practical question: what means does the present generation have to reduce our responsibility? If the living personalities of different development asked ourselves what to do to us not to answer before the offspring for the new sufferings of mankind, and if they all clearly understood their business, then the answers would, of course, be different.

A member of the majority, who fights daily for physical existence, as his ancestors fought in the first periods of human life, would say to himself: fight as you know and how you know how; defend the right to life for yourself and for those to whom you are attached! It was the law of your fathers; your position is not better than their proposition; it is the only law for you.

A more unfortunate person from the same majority in which civilization has awakened the consciousness of its human dignity, but that only she limited herself would say to itself: fight as you know and how you can; defend your and someone else's dignity; die for him if necessary!

A member of a civilized minority, who wants only to increase and consolidate his pleasure, but inclined to seek it more in the field of life than in the field of thought, would say to himself: you can enjoy only in a society where solidarity more or less dominates; counteract in yourself and others what disagrees with this solidarity; from the discord of modern society you suffer and you, as soon as you realize that this discord is a social disease. So, learn your real benefit; reduce the suffering of yourself and in yourself: it is more useful to you.

A member of a small minority group, who sees his pleasure in his own development, in finding the truth and in the embodiment of justice, would say to himself: every usability of life that I use, every thought that I have had leisure to acquire or produce, is bought with blood, suffering, or the labor of millions. I cannot correct the past, and, no matter how expensive my development is paid, I cannot refuse it: it is the ideal that arouses me for activity. Only an impotent and undeveloped man falls under the responsibility of him lying on him, and flees from evil in Bethais 13 or to the grave. Evil must be corrected as much as possible, and this can be done only in life. Evil must be healed. I will absolve myself of responsibility for the bloody price of my development if I use this very development to reduce evil in the present and in the future. If I am a developed person, then I am obliged to do this, and this duty is very easy for me, since it coincides with the fact that it is a pleasure for me: looking for and spreading more truths, understanding the most just system of society and striving to translate it, I increase my own pleasure and at the same time I do everything I can for the suffering of the majority in the present and future. So, my business is limited to one simple rule: live according to the ideal that you have set yourself as the ideal of a developed person!

It would be so easy and simple if all the personalities understood the matter, but the trouble is that very few people understand it. The previous rules are followed only by a part of the first category and few of the rest. The other part of those fighting for their physical existence defends themselves not quite energetically; not

because he did not know how to do it, or did not know it, but by lack of determination, by apathy. Most of the second category are sacrificing their dignity for daily bread and humiliated in their own eyes, without having the opportunity to break out of their position. Most persons of the third category do not understand their own real benefit, acts according to routine and does not know how to counteract even to the small extent the disease of society, which brings the suffering of each individual, therefore, to them; that is, in an effort to avoid suffering, it does not know how to reduce in itself those of them that arise from social discord. The majority of

the persons of the last category either put idols in the place of truth and justice, or limited to truth and justice in thought, and not in life, or does not want to see what a small minority enjoys the benefits of the progress of civilization.

The price of this progress is growing...

Letter Five

The Action of Personalities

My last two letters lead to the same result at the end. Society is at risk of stagnation if it drowns out critical thinking individuals. His civilization is in danger of being destroyed if this civilization, whatever it may be, becomes the exclusive property of a small minority. Consequently, however little, the progress of mankind, but what is lies solely on critically thinking personalities: without them, it is certainly impossible; without their desire to spread it, it is extremely fragile. Since these personalities generally consider themselves entitled to be considered developed and since it is for their development and paid the terrible price of which is discussed in the last letter, the moral obligation to pay for progress lies with them. This payment, as we have seen, is to extend the convenience of life, mental and moral development to the majority, in the introduction of scientific understanding and justice into social forms.

Let's talk about these personalities, the only tools of human progress. Whatever he is, it depends on them. It will not grow out of the ground, as weeds grow. It does not multiply from floating embryos in the air, like infusoria in a rotting liquid. It will not suddenly be the result of mystical ideas, about which so much was interpreted ago by forty years, and many are now still interpreting. His seed is indeed an idea, but not mystically present in humanity; it originates in the human mind of the individual, develops there, then passes from the brain to the brains of other personalities, grows qualitatively in the increase in the mental and moral dignity of these personalities, quantitatively in increasing their number and becomes a social force, when these personalities are aware of their unanimousness and decide on a unanimous effect;

If a person who talks about his love of progress does not want to think critically about the conditions of its implementation, then in essence it has never wished, and has never even been able to sincerely wish him. If a person who is aware of the conditions of progress is idly by hand, that it should be realized by himself, without any effort on its part, then she is the worst enemy of progress, the most ugly obstacle to him. All complainers about the debauchery of time, about the insignificance of people, about the stagnation and retrograde movement, the question: are you, sighting among the blind, healthy among the sick, what have you done to promote progress?

At the same time, most of them refer to the weakness of forces, lack of talent, a small circle of action, hostile circumstances, a hostile environment, hostile people, etc. "What kind of people we are!" they say, "and they taught us not to be educated, and we will not be able to write a magazine article, and the prophetic eloquence of the Lord offended, and there is no place in the service, and grandfather did not leave capital, but you will earn only so that you sit naked. If both are capital, but a place is great, and talent, then we would show ourselves."

I'm not talking about those who have been fighting all my life because of a piece of bread. In the last letter, I mentioned them, and not a single accusations are falling on them. If progress has passed over their heads, not

even giving them development, then they are only victims of his. If they were affected by mental development, if the consciousness of the best litter in them hatred of lies and evil, but the circumstances crushed in them all manifestation of this consciousness and limited their life to care for the daily bread; if they still retained human dignity, then they remain their own existence with their own existence. Before these imperceptible heroes of mankind, who did not perform a single bright cause, the greatest historical figures are insignificant insignificant. If the first were not, the latter could never have done any of their undertakings. Meanwhile, as notable heroes fight and often even die in the struggle for the best, at this time, despite unfavorable conditions, imperceptible heroes support in society the tradition of human dignity, the consciousness of the best, and when one hundred of the great figures manages to implement his ideas, he suddenly sees near himself a group of strong people, hardened by work, unshakable in their convictions, happily stretching his hands to him. From these inconspicuous heroes, the ground for transformation is created in every great historical moment. They keep the full opportunity of the future. In a society where they would not be, all historical progress would cease at once. The further life of such a society would be of no moral significance from the life of other social animals.

But these energetic figures only make the possibility of progress. Its implementation never belongs and cannot belong to them for a very simple reason: each of them, who has taken to make progress, would have died of hunger or sacrifice his human dignity, having disappeared, in both cases, from a number of progressive figures. The realization of progress belongs to those that have gotten rid of the most oppressive care for daily bread, but from these latter, every critical-minded person can make progress in humanity.

Yeah, everyone. Don't tell me about the lack of talent and knowledge. For this, you do not need any special talent, nor extensive knowledge. If your talent and knowledge are enough to be critical of the existing, to realize the need for progress, then your talent and knowledge is enough to make this criticism, this knowledge is life. Don't miss a single case where life really gives you an opportunity. Suppose your activity is petty; but all substances consist of immeasurably small particles; infinitely small tremors are composed of infinitely small tremors. The amount of benefit received from your activity, neither you nor anyone else is able to estimate: it depends on a thousand different circumstances, on numerous coincidences that are impossible to foresee. The most beautiful intentions led to disgusting results, as unimportant, at first glance, the action grew into incalculable consequences. But we can expect with some probability that by giving a number of actions the same direction, we will receive only a few results directly opposite to this direction, although some actions will coincide with the convenient conditions in order to be noticeable results in this very direction. Maybe we won't see these results, but they will certainly be if we did everything in our power. A farmer who has treated the soil and sows seeds knows that many seeds will perish, that he will never protect the fields from the poison, from crop failure, from the night predator, but after a crop failure he carries a handful of seeds on the field again, waiting for the future harvest. If every person critically thinking will constantly actively strive for the best, then no matter how insignificant the circle of his activity, no matter how small the sphere of his life may be, he will be an influential engine of progress and pay his share of the terrible price that its development cost.

But is there really petty and important areas of activity? In what areas do people have the right to a monopoly of progressiveness? Aren't the writers? Aren't the artists? Aren't the scientists?

Look at this progressive writer, who writes so magnificently about the good of society and even more skillfully exploits his brethren or in his person gives ideas, which, apparently, serves, to be instigation to opponents. And I am not yet talking about the different “dark cohes” for which literature is the tool of the most disgusting of thought, belittling of human dignity, an instrument of stagnation and social corruption.

Look at this progressive artist who sings freedom of speech, although he is not averse to participating in censorship institutions, and who has never thought of being bad from good outside his studio. And I do not mention all those - their own name legion - which, according to the modest ladder of the poet, musical,

picturesque, sculptural, architectural creativity only climbed, to pensions, orders, high ranks and huge houses.

Look at this progressive professor, who is ready from his erudition, depending on the circumstances, to make an arsenal for any direction. And how many soulless arguments and experimental human devices, which, watching all his life the processes of chemical substitution and decomposition, the growth of cells and the contraction of muscles, for the declination and conjugation of Greek terms, for the interruption of sounds in Sanskrit and zende, the distinctive features of the utensars of the times of Alexander Nevsky and Ivan the Terrible, never thought that their minds.

Neither literature, nor art, nor science saves from immoral indifference. They do not or condition progress in themselves. They only deliver guns for him. They accumulate strength for him. But only that writer, artist or scientist, does serve the progress that he did everything he could to apply the forces acquired by him to spread and strengthen the civilization of his time; whoever fought evil, embodied his artistic ideals, scientific truths, philosophical ideas, journalistic aspirations in works, lived the full life of his time, and into the actions strictly appropriate to the quantity of his forces. Who made less, who, because of his personal calculation, stopped on the half-road, who, because of the beautiful head of the bang, because of interesting observations of infusoria, because of a selfish dispute with a literary rival, forgot about the huge amount of evil and ignorance against which to fight, he can be anything: an elegant artist, a wonderful scientist, brilliant publicist. By moral significance, as a person, he stands below a waking scribble, all his life tirelessly pronounces to equally vague old truths about the struggle against evil and ignorance; below the half-sighted teacher, with heat injecting half-understood knowledge into the minds of undeveloped boys. They did all that they could, and they did not have anything else to demand. If hundreds of readers are one or two more materialless, more impressionable, and apply in life those truths that they learned from the scribble, then there was progress. If the heat of the teacher lit, although in a small number of students the thirst to reflect, to work himself, the thirst for knowledge and labor, then there was progress again. I am not saying how immeasurably lower - for all their artistic talent, for all their teachings, for all their journalistic celebrity - the mentioned gentlemen stand in comparison with those completely invisible figures of progress, which are mentioned above and who keep in themselves all the possibility of progress for the future.

I will be told that I am unfair in terms of both art and science. A beautiful work, not even meaningful by the artist, is still an increase in the developing capital of mankind; not to mention another action of art, only through a beautiful man passes from the world of vulgarity to the realm of truth and justice. It excites attention, increases impressionability, and therefore there is already an instrument of progress, regardless of the thought that animated the artist.

Similarly, every new fact of knowledge, no matter how small and insignificant, is for modern life questions, is an increase in the capital of human thought. Only by classifying and studying all the beings of nature as they really are, man gets the opportunity to classify and study them in relation to the human good, by their usefulness and harmfulness for the majority. Today, the entomologist will be pleased that his collection added two or three previously unnoticed bugs, and after a few days, you will see, the study of one of these bugs will give the technique a new means to reduce the cost of a useful product, therefore, in part to increase the convenience of the life of the majority. And then another of these bugs became the starting point of the scientist's research on the laws of the development of animal forms and functions - the laws by which humanity developed from its zoological state, bringing a lot of sad experiences fatally into its history; laws that indicate to man that, only fighting for its development, he, next to the inevitable zoological element of his being, can develop another element in himself. Today, the linguist has enthusiastically noted the peculiarities of the conjugation of the verbs of an ancient language; tomorrow this feature will connect several languages, until then scattered; the day after tomorrow, this connection will understand a number of myths of the prehistoric period; and there, you see, it turned out to be an opportunity to trace the influence of these myths on the teachings of Christian churches, the minority of the majority

thought, and, therefore, it became more convenient to find means for developing progressive activities. Art and science in their works are tools of progress, regardless of the mood and desire of the artist and scientist, even against their desire. As long as the work of art was really artistic, if only the discovery of the scientist was really scientifically - they already belong to progress.

I did not think to say that art and science are not the tools of progress, that the work of art and scientific discovery as facts do not serve progress. But undoubtedly, both metals stored in the soil and silk produced by a silkworm are also tools of progress, facts for him. An artist who has only art in mind and has never thought of his human influence can represent a huge aesthetic power. His work is beautiful; his influence can be enormous and even very useful, But its strength, by moral dignity, is not higher than that, of course, the enormous force that scattered the nuggets of copper on the earth, concluded iron into the swamps and lakes, and no one will argue about the benefits of metals for human civilization. Aesthetic power in itself is not moral strength. It becomes an moral, civilizational, progressive force, regardless of the artist, only in the brain of the one who, inspired by the beautiful work, has moved for good; in who has become better, more impressionable, more advanced, more energetically, more active, more active under the influence of the impression received from the work of the artist; how the metal became a civilizational force only in the brain of the one who invented the first useful tool from it. The artist as an artist is at a level with any powerful physical or organic process that has no human significance. Both the sound and the blood circulation serve as a source of thought, desire for good, determination, but they are neither thought nor good, nor determination. For the artist himself to be a civilizational force, for this he must invest in his works humanity; he must develop in himself the source of progress and determination to realize it; he must proceed to work imbued with progressive conception; and then, in the process of creativity, he will be a conscious historical figure, because through the ideal of beauty he persecuted by him will always shine for him and the demand for justice will always shine for him. He will not forget the struggle against evil, which is obligatory for everyone, and for him, especially the more natural, the more natural power in him is.

The same can be said about the scientist. The accumulation of knowledge, in itself, has no higher moral significance than the accumulation of wax in the hive. But wax becomes an instrument of civilization in the hands of a beekeeper, in the hands of technology. They are very grateful to the bees, very rattenant of them and realize that without the bees wax would not have been. But still bees are not people; the moral figures of the civilization of bees can not be called, and the allocation of wax according to the internal need is only the material of progress. An entomologist who collects beetles, and a linguist marking conjugation, if they do this only out of the inner pleasure to contemplate the collection of beetles or to know that the verb is so-and- so, not lower, but not higher - the bee that secretes its lump wax. If this lump falls into the hands of a technique that turns it into a wax patch, or into the hands of a chemist who will open with its new generalizing law, the lumps will be the material of civilization; if it melts in the sun uselessly, then the work of the bee is gone for a vain for progress. But in both cases, the bee had nothing to do with it; it sat down her need, processed food into a lump of wax, brought this lump into her building, as the animal should, and then flew for a new food. Similarly, the fact of knowledge becomes an instrument of civilization only in two ways. Firstly, in the brain of the one who uses it in technique or in generalized thought; secondly, in the brain of the one who produces the fact of science, but not out of pleasure to contemplate it as a new lump of wax, but with a premeditated purpose, as a material that refers to a certain technical application or a certain scientific and philosophical generalization. Science and art are powerful instruments of progress, but I have already said at the beginning of this letter that progress is carried out only in personalities, only individuals can be his engines; and in this respect the artist and the scientist as a person may not only not be powerful figures of progress, but can become completely outside the progressive movement. Other, real, people, may be less talented and less scholars, can give human significance to the material accumulated by great artists and great workers, but they will attach human importance to these works by their understanding. They will bring these works into the progress of history.

I have deliberately dwelt on science and art as the most powerful elements of civilization, to point out that these spheres in themselves do not constitute a progressive process; that neither talent nor knowledge does not, by themselves, man is the engine of progress; that with less talent and knowledge in this regard can be done more if you do whatever you can do. Yes, I repeat, every person who is critically thinking and decides to bring his thought to life can be a figure of progress.

Letter Six

Culture and Thought

Let us assume that a person who is critically thinking has become aware of herself as a possible and obligatory figure for the progress of mankind. The question is, what is required to act in the name of its consciousness in order to become a real organ of progress?

Of course, first of all, it should be critical of herself: to her knowledge, to her own strength. The field, which lacks knowledge, it is necessary to study or leave aside. The cause for which she lacks strength, it is better not to touch until you gain enough strength to commit it. Not that the whole sphere of activity is thus closed to someone; but it is necessary that a person, addressing this sphere, clearly raises and decides the question: what can I do in this field with my knowledge and with my strength? Only by solving this issue can you rationally set yourself

and life's task.

But, beginning with it, the individual has before him several teachings, as if opposed to each other, and the reader, who is familiar with the famous view of Louis Blanc on individualism and the public, or brotherhood, perhaps seeing the great significance attached by me to the person in history, suspected the author of these letters of emphasizing the propensity of individualism in the sense of the word, which was given to him by the famous French socialist. I will not dwell on this issue for long, because I consider it a more question about words than about the case.

Louis Blanc says (*Histoire de la révolution française*, 1847; 1, 9-10), that "individualism sees a man as outside society, gives him an exaggerated sense of his rights, not giving him his duties, grants him to his own forces and declares *laissez faire* instead of any government." Below, he says that individualism "leads to oppression by anarchy." For "brotherhood," we find Louis Blanc more loudly than certain concepts, but in the quest attributed to this principle, "to organize society in the future is the work of man - in the image of the human body - the work of God," it can be seen that the personality, at the rule of the beginning of brotherhood, is considered a Blah as subordinate element of society as an individual unconscious organ of the body is subject to the conscious human self. Individualism, as Louis Blanc understands it, was the desire to subordinate the common good to the personal selfish interests of units, as well as the public, from his point of view, is inclined to take the personality, in its particulars, by the interests of society. But the individual only subordinates the interests of society to his own interests when he looks at society and at itself as two principles, equally real and competing in their own interests. Similarly, the absorption of the individual by society can take place only when it is imagined that society can achieve its goals not in individuals, but in something else. But both are a ghost. A society outside of personalities does not enter into anything real. The clearly understood interests of the individual require that it seek to achieve common interests; social goals can be achieved exclusively in individuals. Therefore, the true social theory requires not the subordination of the social element to the personal and not the absorption of the individual by society, but the fusion of public and private interests. The individual must develop in himself an understanding of the public interests that are the essence and its interests; it must direct its activity to the introduction of truth and justice into social forms, because it is not any abstract desire, but the closest egoistic interest of it. Individualism at this stage becomes the realization of the common good by the help of personal aspirations, but the common good cannot be realized otherwise. The public becomes the realization of personal goals in public life, but they cannot be realized in any other environment.

So, the life task of the individual, if it is a critically thinking person, does not oppose its interests to the interests of society. But perhaps you might think that these two-half of the conditions for progress can be met each separately. The development of the individual and its embodiment in social forms of truth and justice can be separated mentally, and there is a task that different thinkers solved differently. Questions arise: should a person mainly work on himself, setting his goal personal perfection independently of the social forms, others, and participating in public life only as much as its forms fully meet his requirements? or should he direct his activities mainly to the development of these social forms as possible better results for the present and future, even if the forms in which he has to act were extremely unsatisfactory, his activity is very insignificant?

Both decisions, made in their exceptionalism, lead to a distortion of the individual and its activities. By creating his moral ideals, the individual can never take into account all the

historical conditions of society in its integrity and in its diversity; therefore, the ideals of the individual will always be and must be far above historical reality; therefore, the individual would have in most cases a reason to move away from social activity. The more developed and perfect it is, the sooner she would have to do it and watch her hands, with useless irony, how things go their order, that is, how they are guided by individuals with weaker moral development. Such self-improvement would be equal to social indifference. However, it would be contradictory in itself. A person who can pass indifferently by public evil, when she could, at least part, help him, is incapable of developing anything more than the apparent power of thought, scholastic and quite useless set of loud rules or mystical self-exaltation in alienation from everything real. In addition, if the environment in which the person in question lives allowed it to develop to a critical attitude to the whole environment, then this medium is not yet certainly bad; in it can develop both another and a third, as long as they would have introduced the same conditions, that is, just to eliminate in this environment the most shy, suffocating forms. The best in it is possible, and if a person does not see it, then she did not develop itself enough, but only seems to be developed for itself.

But, quite adjusted to these social forms, it is easy to imperceptibly move to the complete subordination of these forms. By being content with the smaller and less result of their activities, one can finally be satisfied with the absence of any result. Then the public figure descends to a very unenviable stage of squirrel running in the wheel, or a podium, pronicking a fiery speech in an empty room. By giving a sideward a demand for personal dignity, which is to not descend below this level in its activity, the person not only refuses self-improvement; it renounces the ability to assess whether it benefits or harms society; whether it lives in it as a producer or as a parasite.

Both of the above requirements are inseparably related to one another. Personality cannot develop otherwise comprehensively, as a critic of the real one. Criticism of the real world, nature, points to man the unconditional limits of his own and foreign activities, inevitable laws against which to arm themselves is ridiculous. Criticism of the real past, history, allows him to appreciate the inevitable ground on which he stands, together with all his other contemporaries, the soil that allows processing, but on the condition: to take the very ground into the consideration of such as it is. Criticism of real society teaches a person to distinguish people with an independent desire to progress from people living with someone else's thought, and from supporters of reaction, teaches to distinguish the main evil from the secondary, today's question from the question that can be left to tomorrow. The self allows a person to weigh his forces and determine his activities without self-humiliation and without arrogance. But all these forms of criticism are nothing but the development of one's own personality. At the same time, they are impossible or ghostly if a person does not take part in the most lively in social matters and suffering, if its criticism is not just a pre-emptier for useful activity.

On the other hand, social activity has human meaning only in self-development, with the constant verification of oneself, one's strength, their knowledge, its beliefs, his ability and his determination to defend

these beliefs. The forces are exercised and growing at activities; the experience of life and its tasks increase knowledge; in the struggle, persuasion and the ability to defend it are growing stronger. The consciousness of his participation in the public business is already the beginning of the elevating, causing development. As a person can develop normally only in interaction with social life, so useful social activity can take place only with the self-development of the

individuals involved in it.

This is the limit for which a person, without losing his dignity, cannot go into his participation in public life. Where there is still the possibility of revitalization, raising the level of public interest; where there is still hope to bring humanity into the mechanism of life, to awaken the thought, to strengthen the conviction, to arouse hatred and aversion to ordinary evil, there the individual can and is obliged to stand in the ranks of figures of social progress. But if she realized that near her vulgarity was woven by a fabric that a lonely person could not break through; if a person needs to be assisted by others for the cause, and these others live as parasites on the body of society, in no way of thinking about his demands; if the burrow, formalism and incoming, the bureaucracy, and the bureaucracy crushed to the bureaucracy of any thought of the state benefit; if the deplories and parades are over. His forces are not sufficient to stop the social evil even in his slightest share, [but] he will at least not attach them to the continuation and reinforcing of evil. Among the public persecution, he will join those inconspicuous keepers of the tradition of progress, which I mentioned in the previous letter. Maybe a minute will come when his participation in public life will be possible. If it does not come, then he will give to another generation a tradition of truth and justice, which for him remained only in the field of consciousness, which he could not or could not have been able to realize. In this case, even then it makes up some merit that he did not bow to the universal evil, did not become his tool. Another, with a better understanding, with more energy, with more strength, would be able, perhaps, here to be a positive figure, would be able to fight and, if not win, then at least show other examples of struggle. Not everyone has equal strength. Having developed in this era, under these conditions, sometimes those people are an exception that are able to eliminate from common evil, treat it critically and protect themselves from it in their private life.

But as soon as the opportunity to act appeared, as soon as there are elements of struggle and life in society, the right of man has a developed one from this struggle. As opposed to the dirty puddles, it is still necessary to find it. No matter how exhaustingly pushing between hundreds of half-people to find in a hundred or two available to awaken life, you still have to look for. You can foresee in advance that there will be a lot of failures. Even those people who seem to be accessible freshly thought, in most cases will succumb to cowardice or petty motives, run after a greasy handout or donate a thing because of a loud word. Many will leave; many will run away; an even greater number will leave the banner because of personal quarrels, sometimes in the heat of the battle. Preachers of advanced ideas and the inexorable struggle for them, having seen these ideas in deeds, in their sharp real situation, will be afraid of the same thing that was so beautiful, gently and innocuous on a piece of paper, will renounce their past, their former like-minded people and followers and turn to caricatures of secluded grummers, pale and cowardly insignificance. There will be direct brazen traitors to their past because of personal interests. The most chances of struggle will change, and when, apparently, the ranks of the defenders of progress will be thicker and irresistible, it may suddenly turn that it is a ghost, that it is enough to crush two or three forward figures so that the pseudo-chwarts of progress hid in the corners, change the banners or renounce it. All this, of course, is very disgusting and outrageous, but if the fighters of progress had only to triumph, their business would be too easy. Nevertheless, for the success of the struggle, it is necessary to act in the environment that is given to each historical process in the present. It is necessary to arm the weapons that are more convenient in this environment and rfor the type of battle that lies in the present. Only those who are conscious of themselves powerless have to go aside. The one

who feels or imagines that he has the strength has no moral right to spend them on a small, private range of activities when there is any opportunity to expand this circle. Developed man, as his development expands, must pay for a greater price spent by mankind on this

development; therefore, it is the moral duty to choose as a wide range of social activities as is available to him.

Hence, it is born to understand for yourself: what elements in the complex system of society represent the soil of action and what are the tools of activity? where is more or less shiny, but in itself a dead form and where is the living force?

The needs determine the processes of the world of organic, the development of vegetation, the reproduction of animals. They constitute one of the most important issues of physiology, human psychology and sociology. They also constitute an inevitable point of exodus to explain any historical phenomenon. Everywhere where there is an action of will, there is a need at the basis of the action; therefore, all elements of historical phenomena are reduced to different needs of personalities. Needs are facts common to the masses, but the variety of physiological and psychological characteristics in individuals has a consequence of the variety of drives caused by needs. Here you can already specify the difference between two classes of needs.

Some of them, common to all living beings, cause unconscious or very unconscious reflection activity, elementary technique of adaptation to the environment, develop various instincts of the animal world, and in human society cause all those actions that we call habits, everything that in human life belongs to the tradition; everything that he does mechanically, without reasoning very little, why he does rso, and not to do so, and not to do so, and not to the other. I have already said that this group of physiological and habitual needs brings together all classes of the animal world, represents no difference to man in comparison with other vertebrates or with invertebrate animals, and even in the last resemblance represents the most striking examples of its manifestation, namely in societies of ants, bees and other creatures close to them. These needs are the most durable, so to speak, the most naturalistic element in the life of society. They give those immutable economic and statistical laws, then a mutual definition of the physical conditions of the country and its civilization, which underlie human history. They cause the first technique, therefore, the first knowledge; under their influence, the first convergence of people, like other animals, occurs. The social life, which expises from this source, is already a cultural life, and a person unthinkable without needs is thus unthinkable without any culture. Along with some of his other counterparts from the world of insects and vertebrates, it belongs to the animals of cultural.

With the first individualized drives, the second group of needs enters the organic world, more complex, more diverse and less general. It is observed in any certain form only in the higher classes of vertebrates (in birds and mammals), is produced quite and here only in some families, genera, species of beings, is expressed in the choice, apparently arbitrarily, in various attachment and disgusts, passions, which cannot be reduced to the general need for the change in the variability of instincts, passing under completely similar circumstances. This second group of affective needs plays a broad role in the intimate biography of individuals, but very insignificant in the history of mankind, in its whole, because the life expectancy of personalities prevents them even when they are placed in a very influential position, to leave too noticeable trace of their passions in the life of society, especially since the effects are changed in all personality by their very nature and most part in the diversity of the passions.

The physiological and habitual needs would lead any culture to the ever-recurring forms of the hive or anthill. The needs of affective would cause personal dramas, but they could not create stories. It occurs only under the influence of the work of thought. It is due to a new kind of needs observed only in man, and here only in small groups of personalities for whom the suffering of generations has developed exceptional development. These are progressive, historical needs, developmental needs.

Already the first technique and the first calculation of benefits represent the work of thought, and the culture of societies will diversify as their thought develops. Under the influence of its work, needs are reproduced,

attractions change; the calculation causes a number of expedient actions that push back direct attractions; the most attractions, in the form of passions and passions, become sources of activity calculated due to the best satisfaction of affect. Finally, there is a moment where the criticism of thought is not aimed at satisfying direct attraction, but at the very attraction. Then thought compares the attractions and distributes them according to the dignity they had before the critique of thought. On the other hand, the thought itself becomes a favorite goal, excites affect; the satisfaction of this affect, directed at the product of thought, becomes a new, purely human, higher need. The very development of thought as an exciting goal, as a truth sought, as a desired moral good, appeals to the need for the development of the individual. Under the continuous work of criticism, in view of development, in general, as goals, all needs and attractions are arranged in different perspectives, as the best and the worst, as the higher and lower needs. It is the need for truth and justice, regardless of the benefit: the beginnings of science and art are created. It is a need to set life ideals and embody them with moral life. A person becomes able to counteract his attractions, his needs and indulge undividedly the idea, representation, life goal, sometimes a ghost, sacrificing to them all and often without even thinking to criticize them. As soon as the work of thought on the basis of culture led public life to the demands of science, art, morality, then culture passed into civilization and human history began.

The results of the work of the thought of one generation do not remain for the generation following it in the sphere of thought alone. They turn into life habits, in public traditions. For people who have received them in this form, their origin is indifferent; the deepest thought, repeated habitually or according to legend, is not a higher phenomenon for humanity, as the usual actions of beaver and bees for beavers and bees. The invention of the first axe, the first burned pot, was a huge work of elementary technical thought, but modern mankind uses axes and burned clay with as little consciousness as the bird winds its nest. The first Protestants, alienating the motley magnificence of Catholic churches and gathering near their preacher, acted under the influence of clearly conscious thought; their present descendants mostly go to this temple, and not to another to Sunday's sermon only because their fathers and grandfathers went to such a temple and listened to similar sermons, just as the stork, returning from the flight, sat on the same. Even in the higher sphere of human thought, the same phenomenon is repeated: the current teachers and current students repeat the idea of Archimedes about the laws of equilibrium and lever, the thought of Newton on world-grabbing, the

thought of Proust 14 about the law of chemical proportions, the thought of Adam Smith on the law of supply and supply; but this is done much more often according to pedagogical tradition, that so taught, so teach and so to teach, and therefore, and therefore, as a matter of the life. It must be assumed that beavers and tear the trees, fused them and build their

buildings as a result of the same pedagogical and technical legend. In general, part of the civilization of the fathers, in the form of habits and legends, is nothing more than a zoological cultural element in the life of descendants, and the idea of a new generation should be critically worked on this familiar culture of the second formation, so that society does not indulge in stagnation, so that among the inherited habits and legends it will be seen by those that provide the opportunity for further work of thought on the path of truth, beauty and justice,

And in each generation of human, the same thing is repeated. It receives from nature and history a set of needs and drives, which are largely due to cultural habits and legends. It satisfies these needs and attractions of everyday life and inherited public institutions, artwork and routine technique. All this is its culture, or zoological element in the life of mankind. But among the inherited habits of any civilization is the habit of criticism, and it causes a human element of history, the need for development and the work of thought in view of this need. Criticism of science brings more truth to world-inspection; the criticism of morality expands the application of science and justice in life; the art criticism causes a more complete assimilation of truth and justice, gives life to more harmony, culture - a more human elegance. As far as cultural principles prevail in society and the work of thought is suppressed, so it approaches the rank of ants and wasps, as if, nor is its brilliant culture; it is no more than a difference in the degree, in the form of needs and drives. As far as the work of thought in society, the critical attitude to its culture is so more human and more isolated from

the lower animal world, even if the struggle caused by the work of thought, the critique of the existing one, had the consequence, in particular, of sad paintings, resorted to the weapons of social or mental revolution and disturbed in society calmness and order: very often only by temporary excitement and disorder, only through the revolution can you buy the best provision of peace. When Traizbul 15 with the Athenian exiles came to Athens to resent the fatherland against the oligarchy of thirty tyrants, he, of course, made excitement and disorder. When the eighteenth-century humanists and the realists of the eighteenth fought the war against scholasticism, they made an extreme excitement in schools and a terrible mess in minds. When the English colonies of North America were deposited from the metropolis, it was a clear rebellion. When Garibaldi and his thousand came to the shores of Sicily, there was no trace of respect for the order. When Darwin castened the idol of a unchanged species, he confused the botanical and zoological classifications and destroyed their basis. But for the freedom of Athens, for the new European science, for the political ideal of the North American Republic, for the overthrow of the Neapolitan Bourbons, for the majestic generalization of the development of the organic world should have paid some disorder and excitement.

The culture of society is an environment given by history for the work of thought and conditioning the possible for this work in this epoch with the same inevitability, with which at all times puts the limits of this work the unchanging law of nature. The idea is the only figure to communicate the human dignity of public culture. The history of thought, caused by culture, in connection with the history of culture, which changes under the influence of thought, is the whole history of civilization. Only events can understand the history of mankind in the rational history of mankind in their interaction.

Needs and attractions are given by nature or are generated by culture and cause social forms. To bring truth and justice to these social forms is a matter of thought. That nature has invested in social forms, the thought cannot and should only take note. The thought cannot take away from a person the need for food and in the air, cannot destroy sexual desire, cannot make

sure that there are not minors near adults, cannot change the process of its propagation so that the individual is not an inevitable organ. But all culturally invoked into social forms is subject to criticism of thought. Culture must be taken into consideration when thinking as a historically given environment, but not as an invariable law. If we compare the culture of different eras, we will easily notice how the most basic elements of culture are subject to variability. Nevertheless, for those who lived in the era of the domination of this culture, this culture represented an environment in which every person had to act, unable to make the environment of their activities different. Natural needs and attractions, under the influence of criticism of thought, must develop in themselves social forms, which enclose the greatest amount of truth and justice, allowed by this state of culture.

So, we have a certain task of progress: culture must be recycled. Before us is also a certain, the only real figure of progress: a person who determines his strength, is available to it. Thought is real only in the personality. Culture is real in social forms. Consequently, the individual remains with his own strength and with its own demands face to face with social forms.

Letter Seven

Personalities and Social Forms

Let's say that the personality decided the most important of his life questions: she weighed her strength and determined the case.

There are various social forms before it. There may be instances that these forms, in essence and in their width, correspond to a person's beliefs about truth and justice. Then he is blessed: he can act in these forms without fighting them or being ashamed of them. He is blessed, but in this case he has nothing to consider himself a model of progress. He, as a critical-minded person, in his usefulness does not cost anything higher than other personalities who do not think critically. All of them are borne by the wave of progress, the movement of which they obey. He only knows better than others what is being done.

But this is a story of Shegerazade! Where, when all social forms have satisfied even in a rather moderate way the requirements of scientific and justice? If a person sees everywhere good, everywhere well-being, everywhere reasonableness, it can be sure that she has not thought out much critically, did not look at the inattention or by innate moral nearsightedness. She lacks the determination of the plaid lacks the strength to become a quite critically thinking person.

He who thinks critically, uncontrollably seeks not pleasure in the contemplation of the existing good, but the limit for which this good ends, where evil begins as a hostile opposition to progress or as vulgarity and rutin. Let all those who have not developed a personality enjoy beautiful people, how beautiful these people are; different secluded parts of public life, how much these corners are secluded; various cheerful feasts of life, how much fun there is in these feasts. People - not personalities - it follows: for them, an independent struggle is impossible.

But a person who is critically thinking, digs in the depths of the thoughts and actions of a beautiful person in order to find where this person ceases to be beautiful, and appreciate him in the name of the unity of his shortcomings and his merits. One can safely indicate his weaknesses and hope that he himself will see, understand and correct them. Another - tired

and broken - can support and give him a new energy for further, faster movement. The third, turning off the path, you can send a sheavy on previous activities. The fourth can be forgiven his weaknesses in the name of his deeds, when he is unable to wrest from himself what he takes part of his strength, but directs everything else to promote progress. From the fifth, you can resolutely tear the mask and denounce its vulgarity or opposition to progress. But all this requires the study, the study of evil in man, the study of his weakness, along with his strength, his enchanting sides, even more than his brightest virtues.

Similarly, a critical thought only for a moment rests in secluded corners, in quiet shelters of life. A submissive wife and affectionate children, a secure existence and a prominent place, impeccable reporting and impeccable conscience, a huge erudition and celebrity of the scientist, the indisputable talent of the artist and a good fee for his works - all this is beautiful, all this is good, but all this is just a mechanism of cultural human life. In this motley shell, in this eternal trouble, a person can spend his whole life not by a man, but by a tursuing ant, contributing only to the fact that year after year, generation after generation, fathers and mothers who give birth to children, capitalists living their incomes, officials, commissioning deeds, scientists, writing dissertations, artists, caressing the aesthetic taste of generations.

The human anthill turns into the society of people only when criticism with its inexorable requests begins to violate peaceful bliss or a carotid routine of modest corners. Is it truly sincere, humane, consciously you love each other, faithful spouses? Do you develop children, not just nascent of them? Did you really earn your capital and your position, a happy speculator? Did you really work for the benefit of society, an honest official? Did you really move science forward, which wrote a lot of scientist? Did you really create modern poetic works, artist? Is all these forms in which you are dubbed, by which you hide as a shrine that you eat and for the development of which your whole life, are these forms, as they are the essence and what you have made them, intelligent human content? Shouldn't they be different in the name of truth and justice? Is it not necessary to fight against them to revive them? Are they not the idols in which you worship your routine, your fear of thought, your selfishness in the narrow sense of the word? Is it not necessary to overthrow these idols to put in their place a real shrine?

But here, I feel, objections are raised from all sides. How! Personality! A lonely, insignificant, impotent person thinks to be critical of the social forms, developed by the history of peoples, the history of mankind! The individual considers himself entitled and is able to overthrow, as an idol, that the rest of society recognizes as a saint! This is criminal, because before the mass unit has no rights. This is harmful, because the blissfulness of the mass, satisfied with social forms, is more important than the suffering of a unit that denies them as evil. This is pointless, because a number of generations who have developed these social

forms are in sums smarter than any individual. It is insane, because the person is powerless to society and his history.

First of all, about the right. Either there is no progress, or it is an epilation into social forms of consciousness of lies and injustice. I am conscious of truth and justice in other forms than those that are present, point out lies and injustice in what is, and I want to fight against this conscious lie and injustice. Where is the right that denies my right to do so? In the living? But let them prove to me that I am wrong; let them argue with me; let them fight against me; this is their right; I do not deny it; but I also have the right to prove to them that they are mistaken, have the right to argue with them and fight. In general, society? But this is an abstraction

which, like an abstract, against me, a real being, has no right; and in its real content it falls apart into individuals with no more disposition than I. In history? But all the real content of history lies again in the activities of personalities. Some of them died, and against me, the living, the dead have no right; others are alive and have the same rights as I am. So, no one can take away the right to fight for truth and justice from me, if I myself will not take it away from myself in the name of the harm that can come out of my work; in the name of distrust of my personal reason, because of the historical reason of society; in the name of my impotence, in view of the enormous powers of organized society. The first point has already won the identity; there are still three.

What harm can be because I will point out to the public at lies and injustice in its forms and will seek to bring truth and justice into life? If I speak and I will not be listened to, if my actions are unsuccessful, then only I will suffer. If I am obeyed and society will settle with greater truth and justice, then this will not be harm, but a benefit, because truth and justice in social forms are the condition of the greatest pleasure for the personalities and the expansion of pleasure to the greatest number of personalities. Of course, if one part listens to me and takes me to my side, and the other will resist, then the struggle will begin, which will temporarily resent the peace of all that enjoyed the convenience of the social order. Some will not enjoy because their soul will now constantly be conscious, that they are enjoying because of unjust social forms. Others will not enjoy because their opponents will be hindered by them, and even more will be hindered by the fear that their prosperity is about to come. I do not argue, this is a situation unpleasant for all who enjoy the amenities of this civilization. But can it be called unequivocally harmful? Hardly. The previous letter provides several examples of what benevolent consequences sometimes stem from some disorder introduced into the established life. I have already said in a letter of the third and fourth, that until now the amenities of progress are enjoyed by only a very small minority; that for its development the price has been paid, which has been considered impossible; that this price can be paid only by the desire to spread the truth in society and embody more justice in it. If this is the case, then the struggle for such an incarnation is not only not harm, but the only way to deliver this civilization strength. At all times, most have suffered, therefore, suffering is not something unprecedented in humanity; it is only necessary to strive for suffering to be the least useless for history, and what sufferings can be more useful than those that lead to the embodiment of truth and justice? First, if the lucky ones who enjoy the amenities of this civilization will pay for this enjoyment of some suffering, they will not pay for this and a small share of what the previous millions suffered for them. Secondly, if you already count the harm, it is necessary to remember that history does not end with the living generation, that this will be followed by the other and unconditional amount of harm caused by any action, is measured by the sum of increments of evil, following from this action for the whole future. If I can really promote the embodiment of greater truth and justice in social forms, the number of evil will decrease for a long series of subsequent generations who will take advantage of the share of good born out. If I give up this, their suffering will increase, but in modern society — or, more precisely, in a minority that enjoys the conveniences of the modern social system — there will be somewhat less suffering. In fact, this is doubtful, because in society as less truth and justice, so much more suffering in it for some, a decrease in dignity for others. So, on the one hand, the undisputed harm to a more or lesser series of generations; on the other hand, the dubious benefit for the living generation; can there be a question of the question in which

the solution should fall in the direction? And what, in fact, is it nuisance? Let's believe that several people will understand that the form that was the truth for them yesterday is not in essence truth and it cannot be enjoyed by a developed person. Is the trouble of consciousness of error evil? Suppose that the public ant will take one step on the way to become a human society. Is the humanization of men evil?

So, the benefits of the struggle for truth and justice are at least indisputable, if only it is a matter of real truth and justice, and if success is possible. I am only conscious of the harm of the struggle, and therefore I can take away the right of struggle only when I doubt the understanding of truth and justice, or I will be convinced of my powerlessness to realize my conviction. Let us see how much the struggle of a person against social forms can be recognized as meaningless.

The person, who critically analyzed her knowledge and his mental powers, supplemented her knowledge in a given industry, directed her thought at it and came to a certain conviction. This belief turns out to be inconsistent with the form developed historically. And now they say to man: submit, for against you the spirit of the people, the experience of mankind, the mind of history. Is there enough reason for the person on the basis of these arguments to renounce one's conviction as unreasonable?

What is the spirit of the people? Physical characteristics have reported to a number of generations, living under the influence of some environment, the inevitable natural foundation of the nation? A small minority of it, which has historically lived, created it a culture that has spread to varying degrees and in different forms in different layers of the people and, in its diversity, has entered into folk ntraits. From time to time there were personalities who had the opportunity to act on a minority, and through it on the majority. These individuals introduced a new thought into the former cultural forms or changed some cultural forms in the name of another culture, sometimes they made these changes on the basis of a new thought. At every moment of their history, the people in their lives are the result of these three elements: the naturally needed, historically familiar, personally thought out. Their combination was and constitutes a people's spirit. It is inevitable only that is conditioned by the physical and climatic. Everything else is a habit that is constantly changing under the influence of the thought of personalities and their actions. If the individual thinks little and act little, then the habit does not change in the continuation of the long series of generations; culture retains its features; civilization falls more and more into stagnation; the spirit of the people receives more and more definite forms that can be described in almost the same way as the more and more described the more animals. If the individuals are active and their thought is not limited to a close circle of the minority, but seeks to penetrate into the majority, then habits are barely established; culture is replaced quickly in the minority and spreads somewhat more slowly to the majority; civilization risks becoming more fragile than numb. The spirit of the people is then extremely difficult to define, and for the most part, the writers who interpret themselves about him do not understand each other. In society, undoubtedly, there are, on a common natural basis, several layers of historical habitual culture as a result of a faster change in its minority and slower distribution in the majority. According to his development, the writer timed the people's spirit to one or another stratum, the most kind, and sees a real folk history in one or another normal epoch.

Ask the French: where is the normal France expressing the true people's spirit? After the fall of all the legitimate, electoral and overtook by the power of the monarchies, after the shameful

fall of Caesarism, after so many experiments of the republic, strangled in the blood or sold by its official defenders who changed it, you will find in the literature, in society, in the current autocratic House of Representatives of all parties, which will prove that true France, with its national spirit, was embodied precisely in the history of the period. One will point to ancien régime and Louis XIV with his zealous Catholicism, with his Rasin and Boual, the other in 1789 with his "rights of man", the third - on Robespepper or on Babeuf, the fourth - on the small corporal 16, 16th the fifth - on the noisy era of parliamentarism under Louis-Philippe, the sixth will not be able to point out. And everyone will bring the argument that this is the era of the true people's spirit of France.

Ask our compatriots: where is the true people's spirit of Russia? Who will point to Moscow Ivan Vasilyevich Grozny with "Stolvagin" and "Domostroy", who - to the Novgorod veche bell, who is on Vladimir the Red Sun, to the mythical Svyatogor, and then they will go to list the Great Peter, the Great Catherine, Speransky with its transformations. Who will stop for 1854, who is in 1861, who is in 1863, who even on 1889 17. And everyone will argue; everyone will prove that this is the truth of the Russian people's spirit, in a decree. Which one is right? What has the development of the Russian people's spirit stops? In prehistoric Slavic life? On a layer of Byzantine culture? Or on the layer of Peter's civilization and bureaucracy? Or is this spirit, while remaining, is able to perceive and accept more and more elements? - If others think otherwise, then let a different person, with a variety of opinions, think the latter and act in accordance with this belief. Let me assume that the people's spirit has some wider ability to process new elements than the zoological breeds of bulls and hyenas. Among the infinite variety of concepts of the people's spirit, or, more precisely, of the true and most just one for a given people, allow the critical-minded person to express and implement his opinion of truth and justice, hoping that it can enter into an element in the people's spirit as the many forces that have entered it before. Why does the author of "Domostroy" have more of me entitled to the expression of the people's spirit? Why can one order introduce a new living element into this spirit and the other cannot?

To this judge is only a critique of history, a critique of the people's spirit, the criticism of justice. L this criticism is made and can be made only in the personality. It is in the name of the people's spirit, but not zoologically invariably, but the human developing personality must criticize the people's spirit, to understand that it is natural necessary, how much cultural elements cannot be changed at the moment and that they are subject to processing in the view of a more precise truth, greater justice. The people's spirit in this epoch is the spirit of critically thinking personalities of this era, who understand the history of the people and want to bring to their present as much truth and justice as possible. Similarly, the experience of mankind is nothing but the understanding of its history by the same critical and energetically desirous individuals.

As for the mind of history, it is no more like a word, a ghost for dreamers, frightened for cowards if this mind is something outside the formula: the majority has always been subject to necessity; the minority has always sought to enjoy; few individuals wanted to understand and realize truth and justice. A person who clearly understands the past and energetically desires the truth is, in nature, a legitimate connoisseur of the true experience of mankind, a legitimate interpreter of the true mind of history.

So, if a person has realized himself a clear understanding of the past and the energetic desire for truth, then he cannot and should not renounce his persuasion developed by him

because of the historical forms of society, because reason, benefit, right on his side. He only has to weigh his strength for the coming struggle, not to waste in vain those he has, increase them, as far as he can, appreciate the possible, achievable, calculate his actions and then decide. So, there is one last paragraph.

The struggle of the individual against social forms, enclosed by habit, traditions, law, organization) of society, physical force, moral halo, they say, is insane. What can a person do against the mass of personalities, firmly united when many of them are as strong as this lonely fighting person?

But how was history going? Who moved her? - Lonely fighting personalities. How did they achieve this? - They were done and should have become a force. Therefore, the fourth paragraph requires a more complex answer. Before social forms, the personality is really powerless, but its struggle against them is insane only when it cannot become a force. But history proves that it is possible and that even this is the only way that progress has been made in history. So, we have to put and solve the question: how did the weak personalities appeal to the social force?

Letter Eight

The Growing Social Force

“One in the field is not a warrior,” says an old proverb, and a person who is in the face of society with accustomed to social forms and with a desire to embody justice in them as an impotent unit, of course, is insignificant. Nevertheless, such personalities created history, becoming a force, the engines of society. How did they do that?

First of all, it must be recognized that if the person in question is a truly critical-minded person, then he is never alone. What is his criticism of social forms? The fact that he understood more clearly and deeper than the other shortcomings of these forms, the lack of justice in them for the present. But if this is the case, then many people, under the weight of these forms, suffers and corrosive, rushes and die. Only they, as not sufficiently critically thinking personalities, do not understand why it is so bad for them. But if you tell them, they can understand, and those who understand it will understand it as well as the one who has expressed the thought for the first time, and perhaps even better, because they may have suffered the loyalty of this thought much more complete and versatile than its first herher. So, in order not to be completely alone, a person who begins to fight against social forms must only express his thought in such a way as to be recognized: if she is faithful, then he will not be alone. He will have comrades, like-minded people between the people of the freshest receptive thought. They are unknown to him; they are scattered, do not know one about the other, feel lonely and powerless before their evil, crushing them; they have become perhaps even more miserable when they reached the word that understands them of evil, their pressing. But they are there and there; and the moreless the thought is, the more true, the more true. It is an invisible force, imperceptible, not yet manifested in action, but already power.

For the action of force to manifest, an example is needed. In order for a person to feel not alone, it is necessary that she learns that there is another person who not only understands how hard it is for her and why it is so hard, but also acting against this evil. You don't just have a word, you need a business. We need energetic, fanatical people who risk everyone and are

ready to sacrifice everything. We need martyrs, whose legend would have outgrown far their true dignity, their real merit. They will be credited with energy that they didn't have. In their mouths will put a better thought, the best feeling to which their followers will be finalized. They will become inaccessible, impossible ideal before the crowd. But their legend will inspire thousands of energy that is needed for the struggle. Never said words will be repeated. First half-understood, then understood better and better, and the thought, never animating the original of the ideal historical figure, will come to the cause of later generations, as if its suggestion. The number of deaths does not matter. Legend has always multiplied them to the last opportunity. Conservatives of social forms, as history proves, with commendable self-densation, always put a sufficient number of killed fighters on the worship of the crowd, so that there was an opportunity for opposition against one or another social form to make a long martyrology of his heroes. At the same time, the phase of struggle critical thinking personalities have before themselves already real power, only a non-simplistic force. It is spent for the most part useless, because of the empty little things that are primarily striking. People die because of the manifestation of evil, and its essence remains intact. Suffering does not decrease, and perhaps increase, because as the struggle strengthens, the anger of opponents grows. Among the wrestlers themselves, discord, decay begins, because the hotter they fight, the more jealous they watch each other. For all the energy of the figures, with all the victims, the result is insignificant. The power manifested itself, but is wasted with the gift. But it is a power that has become aware of itself.

So that the power is not spent in vain, it is necessary to organize it. Critically thinking and energetically willing individuals should desire not only the struggle, but also victory; for this it is necessary to understand not only the goal to which you aspire, but also the means by which you can achieve it. If the struggle was serious, then among the fighters against obsolete social forms are not all only individuals fighting in the name of their suffering and who understood this suffering only from someone else's word, with someone else's thought. Among the fighters there are also individuals who have critically thought out the state of

affairs. They have to find each other; they have to unite and give unsettled elements of the historical force to the harmony and harmony of the unsettled elements of the historical force. Then the force is organized; its action can be directed to this point, concentrating for a given purpose; its task is now purely technical: with the least waste of effort to do the greatest work. The time of unconscious suffering and dreams passed; the time of heroic figures and fanatical martyrs, the utter waste of power and useless sacrifices passed. The time has come for calm, conscious workers, calculated blows, strict thought and steady patient activity.

This phase is the most difficult. The first two phases develop naturally. Suffering gives birth to thought in one; thought is expressed and spreads; suffering becomes conscious; there, and here more energetic personalities are broken out; martyrs are; their death increases energy; their energy increases the struggle; all this is caused in the inevitable sequence, one by one, as any phenomenon of nature. There is no epoch where this phenomenon would not be repeated in large or smaller sizes, sometimes it has reached a very wide distribution. But from all the parties that fought against the obsolete forms for truth and justice, very few prevailed. The rest died, disintegrated or numb; they disappeared when the new time caused new protests, formed new parties, and the time of the former had passed irrevocably. These parties did not get the victory only because they, having passed the first two phases, did not know how to create a third for themselves, because the third phase is not created by themselves. It must be thought out in all its parts: in the causes and consequences, for purposes and means. It should be

wanted, and you want to be firmly, despite hundreds of personal troubles, despite the tedious, monotonous activity, imperceptible and unappreciated in most cases. It must be prepared, supported and protected by all, patiently enduring the failures, taking advantage of every circumstance, not losing sight of anyone and nothing. This is a phase, humanly thoughtful, artificially created and which is desirable to survive as soon as possible, because in all its continuation of the party they are subjected to the highest degree of dangers facing all living things and which we have already talked about, mentioning the progress of civilization: the danger of disintegrating due to the fragility of communication; the danger of escaping into the stagnation of a unilateral desire. In this phase, these dangers are all greater for the parties precisely because only in this phase the Party lives the life of the organism; all heterogeneous organs are directed to one activity. The decay and eroding threatens to death only to the body. Before that, the personalities were subject to attractions, and the attractions are strong, because they come out directly from the circumstances. Now the individual must obey the thought, which is only strong when clear, but the clarity of thought constantly threatens the most versatile attractions. Let us see what the main difficulties of this phase are, because only by defeating these difficulties does the individual become a truly organic force in society in the struggle for truth and justice.

Critical individuals who must agree to organize the party, because they are more capable and energetic than others, are in themselves a more definite individuality. They have developed their habit of thinking, and therefore it is more difficult for them than others to become on someone else's point of view and obey her. They have developed the independence of activity, and therefore it is more difficult for them to force themselves to act not quite as they seem better than anyone. They were able to better defend their independence among the social routine, and therefore they are more comfortable with acting alone. And yet it is these people who independently think, independently acting, accustomed to moral solitude, now it is necessary to come together, to unite, to think together, to act together, to organize something strong, a single, but strong collective force, a single one, single by an abstract unity; their own individuality, which they have saved from the prolonging influence of the routine, to which they are so accustomed. They create the body, but they themselves go to the position of the organs. And they do it voluntarily. It's all very hard. Constantly in danger of separation, discord between these energetic personalities. But now discord has a completely different meaning than in the previous phase. There, with the predominance of individual action, in the period of propaganda by example and personal energy, it is not particularly important circumstance that energy is spent: only it would be, there would be a hero who can be put on the pedestal and his name and an example to be encouraged by a new matter. Two enemies, who have spent forces on a useless struggle

between themselves, can stand next to the pantheon of offspring like Voltaire and Rousseau. But now decay is death, a renunciation of the victory of the common cause, of the future of the Party. And independent individuals agree with the firm intention to give in to some of their usual views, to abandon part of their usual actions, if only the most intimate, the deepest beliefs of their convictions can triumph over time. The whole force of their thought is again directed to criticism of their own spirit, own activity, and not even for the purpose of knowing whether it is true and true, but in order to decide the question: is this exactly connected with the essence of my aspirations, my conviction, that I cannot give up this particular, without losing my own dignity, without sacrificing everything that is dear to me in itself; I cannot, even if it was about the possibility of triumph for my ideas, Only by quite clearing to yourself, where

the concession can be made and where the betrayal of the cause begins, the identities that relate to this common cause can organize a strong and energetic party. If they converge with a determined thought not to give up no iota, they have nothing to converge. There is no common cause for them. Each of them will willingly turn others into the tool for their own system of thought in the form of how this system was developed in it in its integrity, with everything significant and accidental in beliefs and habits. But such gatherings for each other's conversion into moral slavery is not the organization of the party, but an attempt to turn everything into a mechanism for the motives and goals of one person. Everyone must separate in his opinions essential from the usual; everyone must enter into an alliance with determination to sacrifice the usual, though very expensive, for the benefit of the essential; everyone must look at himself as an organ of a common organism; he is not a lifeless instrument, not a meaningless mechanism, but still only an organ; he has his own structure, his departures, but it is subordinate to the unity of the whole. This is a condition, and an inevitable condition for the life of an organism. This is a condition of consonant action, a condition of victory.

But if the discord is periculatory, if concessions are necessary in the usual, if the individual must obey the common cause, then concessions in the essential were equally disastrous; just as the figures need to remain thinking personalities without turning to machines for someone else's thought. He who yields a substantial from his conviction has no serious conviction. It serves not to understand, thought and desired, but a meaningless word, an empty sound. Of course, victory is impossible without a strong union, without unity in actions. Of course, victory is desirable for every fighter. But victory alone cannot be the goal of a thinking person. It is necessary that the victory has some kind of internal significance. It is not who wins; it is important that *ч*won. The triumphant idea is important, and if the idea of concessions has lost all its content, the party has lost its meaning, it has no cause and there is only a dispute about personal predominance. Then the Party of the Fighters for Truth and Justice is no different from the Rutiners of the social system, against which it fights. On their banners are written words that once meant truth and justice, and now nothing is meant. And they will repeat these loud words a thousand times. And young people will believe them, putting their understanding into these words, their soul, their lives. And she will lose faith in her leaders and in her banners. And they will drag the renegades in the dirt of yesterday's shrine. And the reactionaries will dare these banners, defiled by those who carry them. And the great, immortal words of new people will wait for them, who will restore their meaning, will make them in the matter. The old party, which has sacrificed everything to win, may not win, but at least petrify in its unsubservant stagnation.

Thus, the organization of the Party is necessary for victory, but in order for the party to be a living organism, it is equally necessary to submit to organs to the whole and the vitality of organs. The parties were formed from the thinking, convinced and energetic allies; they clearly understood what they have come together for; they cherish their own convictions; they have firmly decided to do everything they can to triumph for these beliefs. Only under these conditions can they hope to avoid both dangers that threaten them: do not disperse and not fall into stagnation.

Let's say the conditions are met. Critically thinking and energetically willing personalities converged and organized the party. But already under the very conditions under which such an organization could have

occurred, it is obvious that there will be very few people who fully satisfy the demands that the organizers of the party have to be put, even between critical-minded individuals. But they have, firstly, the allies of possible between the same critical-minded individuals, and secondly, the allies are inevitable in the masses, who have not been refined to a critical mind, but suffering from the very social disorder, for the elimination of which the party is organized.

Let's talk about the first first. This, as is said, people of critical thought, people of the intelligentsia, but in this case we lack something to become organizers of a strong party. Some, with all the power of thought, did not think that only in the organization victory is possible, and remained on the point of view of the solitary, heroic fighters of the previous phase. Others thought, but did not dare to sacrifice for the common cause of personal self-love, the usual way of action for them. The third did not sufficiently separate the insignificant from the essential. On the contrary, the fourth, of the passionate desire of victory, are ready to obey cat all, to sacrifice essential, to turn into a mechanical tool and blame those who are not able to do this. There are other categories. It is obvious that people who organized the party of struggle for truth and justice, in their small number, must first of all increase their strength with all materials, near them scattered and able to enter the organization. It is not so much the number here as the importance of the participants, their independent thought and energy will. In particular, those of them are important, which can become independent, energetic centers that carry the life of a new organism further and beyond. So, especially the first three categories of personalities that did not join the movement, are important. The first to explain the practical meaning of the case, the latter - its theoretical essence; the second must simply be brought to the matter. All of them can be very useful in the future; all of them are possible allies, and an understanding of common good should make them look at them in this way. From this point of view, the activity of the organized party is determined in relation to all the elements, both included in it, and which can subsequently enter it.

But the public party is not a party of cabinet scientists. It fights for truth and justice in a specific form. It means a certain evil that exists in society. If this is indeed evil, then very many who feel the vastness of this evil suffer from it, but do not clearly understand its causes or means of struggle against it. These are the inconspicuous heroes I spoke about above and that make the possibility of progress. This is the real ground of the organized party. The latter is precisely because it is organized that it is aware of the existence of a significant number of personalities who must meet her demands, must reach out to her precisely because they suffer from the evil against which she resurfaced. It may very well be that these suffering masses of imperceptible keepers of a better future do not recognize their supporters at once, feel distrust of them, will not be able to see in the struggle that begins on the basis of a developed critical idea, the struggle that they themselves call in instinctively, on the basis of dark instincts and beliefs. That doesn't mean anything. The party must still organize in view of the union with these social forces, the union of the inevitable, if not today, then tomorrow. Unrecognized, incomprehensible at first, supporters of the struggle for a better future must in all their words, in all their actions, keep these allies in mind, not only possible, but inevitable.

The party was organized. Its grain is a small number of developed, thought-out energetic people, for whom critical thought is inseparable from the cause. Around them are intellectuals who are less developed. The real ground of the party is in the inevitable allies, in social groups suffering from evil, for the fight against which the party was organized. The established difference of the material from the irrelevant in personal opinions determines both freedom of action within the party and its tolerance from the outside. As pi would disperse the members in

its paragraphs, recognized as insignificant, they are still useful and inevitable allies in the future. All members of the party, valid and possible, are under its protection. Every thinking person who enters the body of the party becomes a natural lawyer not only of the one who now belongs to her, but also to the one who can enter it tomorrow. A lawyer should not distort his client's case; he only pretends to be what he really speaks in favor of the client, and keeps silent about everything that can hurt him. This silence is not

a lie, because the opposing parties have their lawyers who do not spare and should not spare the opponents. A lawyer who obviously distorts the truth would only hurt this and his banner, but to his own authority as an intelligent and conscientious lawyer. But a lawyer who would suggest the best arguments to the opponents would not be a lawyer at all. The mutual advocacy of party members is its most powerful connection, the most energetic opposition to the opponents; it is one of the best means for an organized party to attract persons who have not yet joined it. As a single thought, the single goal is the inner strength of the party, so the mutual legal profession constitutes its external force.

Beyond the non-essential freedom of action of the members of the party and its tolerance for persons outside it standing. Which of its members has crossed this limit, it is no longer a member of her, but its enemy. Which of the personalities, outside her, is at odds with her in significant matters, he is also the enemy of her. Against these enemies, the Party directs and must direct all the power of its organization, fighting as one person by all means, concentrating its blows. Each member of the Party is a natural lawyer of his actual and possible allies; in the same way, he is the natural prosecutor's supervision of all recognized enemies. And here is not the perversion of the truth: this is not the responsibility of a conscientious prosecutor. Attention is required to the actual offenses of opponents and the appearance of all the accusing circumstances. The lawyer's case to defend the accused. Too petty accusation in the same way in the eyes of the attentive public helps the case of the accused and harms the authority of the prosecutor, as the obviously biased defense of the lawyer has the opposite of his own desire. But to lose sight of the mistakes of opponents, to give them a means to hide their misdemeanors completely disagree with the task of the person of the party. A careful and steady struggle with enemies is a manifestation of the life of the Party, as the unity of thought is the basis of this life, and the mutual advocacy of its members is the connection of the party.

Thus grows the social strength, moving from a secluded, weak personality, first into the sympathy of other personalities, then in their disarray assistance, until a party is organized, giving the struggle direction and unity. Of course, this party is meeting with other parties and the question of victory becomes a matter of number and measure. Where is more power? Where are the smartest, better understanding, more energetic, more skillful personalities? Which party is better organized? Who will have time to better take advantage of circumstances, it will be better to defend their own and overcome enemies? Organized forces and the interest of history is already fighting here on the principles written on their banners.

There is nothing new here; I knew this before, the reader will say.

And it's great if you knew it. In history, there is nothing to look for fables, unprecedented creatures, but there you can find out, as it was, it will be. The struggle of the individual against social forms and the struggle of parties in society as old as the first historical public organization. I only wanted to remind the reader of the old truth about the conditions of struggle of weak personalities with the enormous power of social forms; the conditions of work of thought on cultural habits and traditions; about the conditions for the victory of the party of

progress; about the conditions of the living development of civilization. Personalities who have developed a critical thought have thus acquired the right to be leaders of progress, the right to fight obsolete social forms. This struggle is useful and reasonable. But the personalities are only possible leaders of progress. They become real figures of its own only when they manage to fight, will be able to become of the insignificant units by a collective force, a representative of the thought. The path for this is one, and it is indicated by the indisputable testimony of history.

Letter Nine

Banners of Social Parties

I have stated in recent letters my opinion that all social progress inevitably depends on the activity of individuals; that they can only give civilization strength and save it from stagnation; that they have the right and opportunity to be critically disposed of the social forms in which #sweep; that the path of the struggle for

the new against the old, for the growing against the obsessive, inevitably leads to grouping parties under the banner of various ideas and to their clash in the name of these ideas.

But how to find out, in the clash of parties, who is fighting for the past, for an outdated person? Who stands for the living, for the growing? - The question may seem strange, because in practice, it seems extremely easy to discern whether the ideas that were in motion to you two, three, four years, two decades ago, or the ideas of the self-nominated hardship, from which would be turned away in the preceding period with laughter, with fear or disgust. The last mental fashion, the last article of an influential magazine, the last word of the beloved preacher is the living, growing. The party in which voluntarily or unwittingly betrayed the ranks of adherents is the party of reaction. This technique is the easiest, and it is followed by all the sheeps of human herds with the most stupid sequence; it is followed by all the talkers without belief with the most amazing flexibility. The probability of success, the probability of prey on a public feast for a person who becomes one or the other party - that's what they call the pursuit of time. If they were right, the word progress would have made no sense, history would represent something like a meteorological table on which it is possible to celebrate the days of rainy and clear, days when the wind has stumbled from the south-west or from the north-east, but where it is very difficult to go further than the statistical figures. Then the letters I write today would have no reason to be written in my eyes, since social meteorology is as interested in my physical. Only in exceptional cases and exceptional countries that rains and drought represent a simple sequence. We live in a zone of changeable weather; on the basis of yesterday and the third year of the wind, it is quite difficult to predict its direction for tomorrow; we are suffering from a change in the weather, but do not understand it. Stock up if you want and you can, with galoshes and umbrellas, warm clothes and houses with tightly locked windows, but will you really investigate the dependence of today's rain on the one that was going on last Thursday? In the present position of our knowledge, it would be an ungrateful work in physical meteorology, as in the political. Science is no further of the placement of meteorological stations for people most at risk, and further indicate to the approaching hurricane a few hours before its onset.

Unfortunately, I cannot allow such an easy reception to distinguish between progressives and the reactionaries I am mentioned above. Having put the demands of progress at the

beginning of the third letter, I am obliged to be consistent, to assume that they determine the difference in the parties. A defeated party can be a party of progress. A little-read book written in ten, fifty, a hundred years ago, can conclude more live historical principles than the most independent journal article. Yesterday's fashion can be reviled by the better instinct of the future than today's. Yes, imagine, I prefer our magazines of 1861 to the magazines of 1867 and even 1890. I prefer Kant Schelling, Voltaire Cousin, and I find that Lucian has much more life elements of progress than Katkov 18. This, of course, will outrage other progressives who are aware of themselves standing every day at the level with the most fashionable direction. This will cause a contemptuous smile of those eternally calm figures who "game in the direction" seem like a children's fun. This will perhaps please the stupid fans of "Domostroy" and Byzantium, who will imagine that from this point of view they can get into true progressives. I give them all to be indignant, smile and rejoice.

If we assume that progress lies precisely in the development of the individual and in the embodiment of truth and justice in social forms, then the question posed above is much more difficult to solve the signs of a progressive and reactionary party, since external distinctive features for them is not at all. Alas! That's right. In the words of human civilization there is no word that is certainly always and everywhere would be only on the banners of progressives or on the banners of reactionaries. The greatest ideas, which in most cases were in the eyes of the best part of thinking people the most life-giving beginning of society, in some periods of history served as a lurk in the ranks of the parties that hindered the development of mankind. The most reactionary elements in some epochs became tools of progress.

To understand this, let us examine separately those ideas that can be called common principles of personal and social life, and others corresponding to the private forms of the latter. Both, in different combinations,

usually serve as banners for struggling parties, both in cases where the parties are essentially selfishly calcifying goals, and in those when they fanatically believe that their adherents, and only they are the representatives of unconditional truth and justice. Both of these groups of ideas can become both a source of development and a stagnant tool; both in reality were in turn both, but the causes of this phenomenon are different for these two groups.

As for the general principles: development, freedom, reason, etc., they were subjected to this fate precisely because, according to the vastness of their meaning, they remained extremely obscure to the majority, could be repeated by some without any definite meaning and be for other tools of very small and reactionary goals.

The word development could be considered in the sense of fatalistic, as an inevitability, which is to be viewed not only as an existing fact, but which represents the beginning of a legitimate one, requiring mental recognition and moral worship in all its manifestations. For fetishists of the historical process, pathological cells of social cancer are elements of as human development as healthy cells of the public muscles and nerves. But it is different for the one in the eyes of whom history has human meaning: it knows that these and the other are equally necessary natural consequences of previous processes, but that only the latter determine development; the first are elements of destruction and destruction. The first type of development (if you already use this word here) should be counteracted in the present and in the future, as far as possible. The second kind of development (which alone, in fact, has the right to this name) should be promoted.

The senseless use of the word freedom is so familiar to anyone who has thought about history that there seems to be nothing to say about this: freedom for the strong to torment the weak, freedom for the poor to die of hunger, the freedom for the poor to distort the physical, mental and moral abilities of children are very well-known forms of this principle. Justice was deified with legitimacy, even if it was the law of the Dragon. The truth meant mystical propositions that were inaccessible to understanding and requiring only dumb repetition. Virtue was considered to be the sacrifice of the worst, real blessings to the benefits of the best, and not the struggle against evil, but non-resistance to evil. The fulfillment of duty was seen in espionage and barbarism; in the denounce of the seminarian-Jesuit to a comrade; in the extermination of entire peoples of the Madianites, the Amalekites, the ammonites of 19; in treason, the word given to the inveter, in the autodafe of the Inquisition and in the massacre of Bartholomew's Night. The sanctity of life was found in the denial of the development of the individual, in the denial of real truth and human justice, in the stupid self-mumpsy, in the animal state of the hermit, in the madness of the saint, in the belief in the unthinkable, in the persecution of unbelievers and otherwise believers. In short, all the worst, the most animals, the most contalicious, humiliating, the anti-human aspects of man have found defenders under the guise of development, freedom, reason, virtue, duty, sanctity. Only criticism, constant, inexorable criticism could protect the person from fascination with a loud word in a high-profile place in a camp, completely dissenting with her desires, instincts, with all its in kind. The general principles were in this case the most ordinary sign, and very often two fighting parties, significantly opposite, declared themselves defenders of the same great principle. All sectarians called themselves true believers, and other churches called themselves pagans. All philosophers have argued that the true, rational understanding of things is only in their system. For the benefit of Rome, apparently, both Caesar and Cato stood. Justice was demanded by both slaveholders and opponents of slavery. Thinking people had to be searched for: where the party had a real meaning? Was it not the requirement of freedom (as in the French clergy) only a requirement of the right to oppress others? Was not the call for justice (as serfs, slaveholders and capitalists) only a desire to legitimize the immoral fact of history even when his immorality was already conscious?

It would seem that the possibility of serving as a banner for opposite parties, which is in the too broad sense of general principles, does not exist for private social forms. Family, law, nationality, state, church, association with a scientist, economic or artistic purpose, represent a certain task that is not particularly difficult to understand and, therefore, it is not difficult to say whether there is another of these forms an

element developing, progressive or dead, reactionary. Unfortunately, it is not at all so, but for a completely different reason than the one that sometimes converts great general principles into loud phrases. General principles, precisely in their generality, receive a certain meaning only with a clear consciousness of the real content to which they are addressed. Private social forms, precisely in particular, but neither progressive nor retrograde: they all make the possibility of progressive the influence of cash, as all of them can serve as the most painful delay in the way of its development. The historical significance of each of them is determined by a combination) condition under which there is one or another form in this epoch, and a combination) of all social forms in this epoch. The conditions of social growth inevitably put in place at a certain time this form as an instrument of progress, and at this time society can develop only if all other social forms obey one leading one. But the conditions change: what was yesterday the prevailing, the basic requirement, today becomes only one of the demands of

the individual and society, among many others. The forms of a social union, presenters yesterday, today demand equality, and tomorrow - predominance; and society must move on to a new combination if it wants to remain progressive. The form that prevailed yesterday and for the predominance of which yesterday was fought by the progressives rightfully of yesterday is obliged to give way to its primacy, and whoever defends it will be a reactionary ... The new combinations, in turn, will have their time, after which they should be replaced by the newest. One who worships as a fetish of a temporary combination of social forms risks inevitably becoming a like-minded reaction, because there is not a single combination that would once for all satisfy the requirements of progress. Social forms for the thinking man should be no more than a hesitant historical clothing, which has no independent meaning, but gaining its significance only because, as far as these forms in this combination correspond to the requirements of this era, namely, the free development of personalities, the fair treatment between them, perhaps wide participation of the individual in the benefits of civilization, the consolidation of these benefits, the elimination of the danger of stagnation.

The kinship relationship between people, which marked the beginning of the union of the family and the family, apparently changed its progressive meaning more than once. It is difficult to get a clear idea of the social form in which the primacy lived - the predecessor of man or even primitive man, the traces of which archaeologists are more likely to guess than observe in the tertiary layers of the earth's crust. But this zoological form of society was inevitably a backward social form in comparison with the ancestral union grouped near the mother; a union that is more likely to raise up before our imagination modern social embryologists as the first purely human union (I spoke about it above, in the fourth letter). This maternal family almost everywhere gave way to the patriarchal family and then developed by the last patriarchal family. The struggle between these two forms, in its progressive sense, is already completely unclear to us. Perhaps, and even probably, the triumph of the patriarchal family and the patriarchal family over the maternal genus was the triumph of the egoistic principle over the social because of the somewhat greater provision of human groups, some weakening of the struggle for existence, and therefore the relief of egoistic passions to achieve their separate goals. But perhaps the personal criticism of a minority, more profitable and had a more leisure, could not develop except through the patriarchal form with its exclusive position of patriarchs and clans. Perhaps, indeed, there was an era for mankind, when the patriarchy was the main developing principle of the union, when economic, political, religious, partly scientific demands of mankind were resolved best with the absolute predominance of the Patriarch over the offspring, with the strongest hierarchical connection of generations. However, let us leave aside the very difficult question now whether the patriarchal life was progress in comparison with the period of motherhood; we cover the term of ancestral connection of all forms of primitive union, in which the common cause was inextricably linked with the related relationship within the union; then the motherkinal family with common wives and common children is suitable for this concept; and the patriarchal family, which the betrayal of the Semites, which was created in the further form of the art. In all these forms, the tribal union, as the first union that united people and forced them to create a solid bond for mutual protection, was a major progressive principle. Despotism,

hatred of a foreigner, petty genealogical pride, prejudicial intercourse with dead ancestors, enmity of the tribes and then, of course, were the consequences of this principle, brought a lot of suffering. But still, in comparatively, this form could either give the least amount of suffering to society as possible, or could determine at least the sole possibility of a wider work of thought

in the future, and consequently of reducing suffering in future generations under the influence of this work of thought on the path of truth and justice. In any case, we have to say that the birth canal was then progress. No matter how the tribes were cut between themselves because of ancestral revenge, still in this massacre, perhaps, less personalities than with a lack of protection of the personality of ancestral connection. No matter how difficult the custom of certain units, and subsequently, as it would unceremoniously exploited the work and life of members of his tribe, but the unity in the activities of the tribe, united by the ancestral custom or the authority of the patriarch, allowed this tribe to protect from hunger and dangers a greater number of persons in their midst, than would be possible for these persons in scattered activities. No matter how inhuman the people of these groups treated foreigners, turning them into slavery, exterminating or eating them, but still in the family union a person learned to the idea that he should stand for life, for the well-being, for the dignity of not only their own personality and not only people, personally dear to him, but also for life, for well-being, for the dignity of other people associated with him, ideally because they have equal.

Only the law became in the fence of the individual, bloody vengeance became a disastrous social prejudice and from the element of the progressive passed into a reactionary one. Once a free economic association has brought personalities more secure and beneficial than the ancestral and community union, the protection of the economic feudal principle has received a retrograde character. As soon as the thought has developed in man that the dignity of every man is in solidarity with his own dignity, the insult of every man is an insult to him, the idea of the advantageous connection of people of the same origin turned into an obstacle in the way of civilization.

In another epoch of human life, the law became the prevailing principle, and by the beginning of progressive. He ensured the life of the weak from the arbitrariness of the strong. It, having consolidated the treaties, gave the community the opportunity for free and broad economic development. He was one of the most powerful tools for educating people the concept of their moral equality, of human dignity outside of any random circumstances of origin, property, etc. But the law was not always and is not a progressive element. I will consider in another letter the inclination to stagnation which inevitably develops with the intensification of the formal element of the law in society; I now be content with only a few instructions. The law is always a letter; social life in its continuous organic development inevitably grows in categories incomparably more diverse than the legislator could foresee, and quickly develops the conditions under which the legislator, even the most conscientious, wrote his formula. Anyone who wants to squeeze the whole variety of life into the established formulas of the Code will not be a progressive figure. The one who will take the side of the outdated law due to the new historical needs is the reactionary. Of course, almost all of the well-maintained societies contain the possibility of abolishing obsolete laws; but sometimes the egoistic interest of a government or an influential minority supports the formal existence of a law that is antipathetic to all the natural aspirations of a social consciousness. If the formidable war of 1870 did not undermine all the foundations of the second Bonapartist empire, perhaps for a long time this empire would have stood as a legal form over France; however, the number of its real adherents was so insignificant that it did not find a single defender on September 4, 20, and at the same time a government, which changed it, did not differ in either political or mental or moral qualities[.3] In such cases, the letter is all in the code and finds even sometimes energetic interested defenders; but true, life, progress is not with it. Whereas from a legal point of view, the requirement of the prosecutor-provider, but the truth is on the side of

the jury pronounced against the obvious: not guilty. While no matter how legal the executioner acts, putting the criminal on the wheel, or the police, protecting the instruments of torture, but progress on the side of the lawless crowd, tearing the martyr out of the executioner, destroying the shameful guns. Whereas the decree of the Senate is

correctly legitimized, that Caesar-Augustus Domitian is God and that the sacrifices before his statue should be made, no matter how correct the demand of Hesler 21 bow to his hat, but perhaps the story is not on the side of the ragged preacher who says: no, Domitian is not the god and his statue to make sacrifices; she should not be on the side of a semi-mythical shooter.[4]

In the era of the last Caesars and the first barbaric kings, the church, as a social form, received the dominant value and all the public principles obeyed it. When, on the one hand, the Roman fiscal, on the other hand, the robbery of barbarians took away from the majority of all means of subsistence, when neither the ancient law nor the new social needs were strong enough to protect the individual, then the bishop in the name of the spiritual connecting authority became a progressive social figure. His concern was one-sided, but still it was a concern for the suffering population. His trial was wrong, but it was still any approach to justice. He could sometimes publicly condemn a wild act even in the emperor, whom no one judged. He could, with the fear of the torment of hell and revenge of the saints, stopped, although sometimes the predatory impulses of the barbarians, which could not be stopped by anything. No matter how wild the statutes of Cassian and Benedict were 22, but they brought under these conditions the only way to preserve the tradition of knowledge, simply literacy and elementary culture. Consequently, in this era for Western Europe, these were positive elements of progress. But in the very near future, such an idea of the social significance of the bishops and monasteries became the beginning of the reactionary in the West. The crudest patrimonial court became fairer than the church court in civil cases. All abuses of feudalism, the central state administration, letter law were negligible before the abuse of the intervention of the Catholic hierarch in the affairs of society. The independence of the church, as a hierarchical element, before the state became the idea of retrogrades. The dominance of theologians over other branches of study was the most harmful delayed development. Only there the hierarchical organization was an assistant to progress, where it did not become the leader of society, but a participant in the struggle for other leadership principles, for nationality, for the expansion of the culture of the upper race among the lower, etc. Let's take another example, which I pointed out in the fifth letter. Science, of course, in its process of conquest is an element of progress; but a scientific association, as a social form, is very likely, in a certain case, by the delay in the development of society, when all its forces should be directed at questions of life; when every member of society, indifferent to these issues, is its enemy; when no one has the right to consider himself a progressive figure, if he looks with the neglect of the Olympian. At these moments, if the learned association understands its human significance, it attaches to its work a direction that meets the needs of society, or its members, pushing to the background their research on new forms of infusoria, about the cover of the dresses of Coldwick, about the conjugation of the Celtic verbs, give their abilities, their time, their lives to life. Then the creator of a new branch of geometry, Monge, spends all days in the workshops, eats dry bread and writes instructions for the workers. Then the participants in the creation of scientific chemistry, Bertoll, Fourcroix, devote themselves to extracting nitrate and teaching people taken from plough. Then the creator of comparative linguistics, Wilhelm Humboldt, directs the full power of his mind to the revival of Prussia. Astronomer Arago sits in the council

of founders of the republic. The founder of cellular pathology, Virchow, smashes Bismarck in parliament. But the scientific association can do otherwise. She can, proud of the unearthly calmness of her cabinet searches, to use its influence on the spread of indifference to the sufferings of the masses, respect for the official status quo, or at least consider inferior to its dignity to participate in the fleeting issues of the day. In this case, all the learned dignity of her labors will not save her from the inevitable sentence of history. The scientific association preaching in the name of science—of course, the misunderstood science—indifference to questions and the one that is eliminated from participation in them will be an element of reaction, not an element of progress.

We will be happy with these examples. All of them prove one thing: the beginning of development did not belong and does not belong to any of the said social forms, but each of them can become a more or less influential instrument of progress in this era, under this situation. The undisputed defenders of each of these

forms, under any circumstances, preach an unequivocal principle of the reactionary principle, since under all circumstances the same form or even the same combination of forms can not prevail with benefit mankind. Forms must alternately rule and give way to one another for the correct course of history.

How do you know at the moment of history where progress is? Which of the parties is his representative? There are great words on all the banners. All parties preach the beginnings, which under certain conditions were and will be the engines of progress. That's good, and it's not bad. But how to choose?

An unknown, unthinking, ready to follow someone else's authority can not choose without mistake. No word had the privileges of progress; he did not squeeze into any formal framework. Look for its content by word. Study the conditions of this time and this social form. Spread knowledge and belief. You can't do it without it. Only one's own understanding, one's own conviction, own determination makes personality - a person, and outside the individual there are no principles, there are no progressive, no progressive, no progress at all. It is not important that is not the flag, it is not the word, it is written on it, the thought of the flag-bearer is important.

To see this thought more conveniently, you need to understand what is the process by which people sometimes hide very bad things under great words.

Letter Ten

Idealization

Part of the world and slave of nature, man never wanted to confess his slavery. Obeying unceasingly unimaginable attractions and random circumstances, he never wished to call his motives directly incomprehensible and his actions - the result of accidental influences. In the most intimate depths of his soul, we already find the desire to hide one's dependence on the unchanging laws of the unconscious substance, to decorate with something shakyness and inconsistency of their actions. He did this with the help of idealization.

The process is done in this way. I did a good or bad thing under the influence of a minute, without even thinking about whether it is good or bad. When it is done, an assessment is. If I

think it's good, I'm very happy. But if I confess to myself that I did a good job without even thinking about whether it is good, then I will win a little in my eyes. Maybe I figured it out, but I don't remember. And now I remember: indeed, I quickly realized that this is good, and the speed of considerations increases my dignity: I am a good and very quickly illustrating person. But let's say that I am gifted with a good enough memory so as not to make a mistake on this. That's great. I did a good job without thinking, not counting, but by the inner drive of my nature. So, my nature is so imbued with good principles that I do good things without even having to be fully aware of the mind as good they are. I am not a good person in the development of the mental, but in nature. I belong to exceptionally good people. And that is another technique, suitable for religious thoughts. I did not do a good deed from myself: it was inspired by me from above, a deity who directs the will and the actions of people without the participation of their reflection. I was chosen as a tool of God in his intention to do a good deed. The apparent modesty of the last reception hides even more self-improduced than the techniques previously considered. In all cases, from a completely unimaginable act, which accidentally found itself in a good deed, idealization brought conclusions: that I am a very good and remarkably quickly illucible person; that I am an exceptionally good person by the very nature; that I am a person chosen by God for good deeds. When it is bad, the methods of idealization are somewhat different, but subject to similar categories. First, the last reception is suitable here without any change. I did it not from myself, but I was an instrument of anger and judgment of God. God has chosen me to a cause that only seems to the weak human mind; but the higher mind judges differently, and if he decided that his chosen one should do this work, then it is not inherently bad. The rationalist will speak not of God, but about the supreme law, which governs events and brings good consequences out of bad deeds; about the highest harmony of all things, where the actions of

individuals are separate notes, the sound of which cuts the ear, if they are heard separately, but necessary for the harmony of the whole. It turns out that the evil thing, as a necessary element of universal harmony, was not at all bad and it should be done, and I from the perfecter of the bad business became a useful participant in the world concert. But most of all, people use the reception of the intended highest calculation. The matter taken by itself, we put, we will, not badly, but the memory quickly unfolds a long series of great principles, trying them on my act, and if any of them, although from afar, will have by measurement, then the imagination suggests what I meant precisely this principle when I did. I fought with a friend and killed him on a duel: I defended the great principle of honor. I fascinated a woman and threw her with the child on the street without means of subsistence: I followed the great principle of freedom of attachment. I made a treaty of unfavorable for the peasants and brought them legal claims to poverty: I acted in the name of the great principle of legality. I informed the conspirator: I supported the great principle of the state. In the difficult time for literature, I am trampling in the dirt because of personal anger, the last organs of the ideas of my own party: I am a fighter for the great principle of independence of opinions and purity of literary mores. There is hardly such a bad thing that could be decisively brought under any of the great principles. It turns out that from the highest point of view, my business is not only not bad, but good. - Again, an incomprehensible act, despite the fact that he was shown in its harmful but his consequences, exposed me as a defender of great principles, a useful participant in world harmony, a chosen weapon of higher will.

The area of idealization is very extensive. In all the elements of its development, it relies on the desire to give a conscious character in the imagination of a person to the unconscious and

semi-conscious, and the actions conscious to translate from a more elementary stage to the highest. But it is necessary to distinguish between the cases of idealization inevitable, since they are conditioned by the very nature of human thinking; then a vast realm of the false idealization, against which the work of criticism in the name of truth and justice must be directed; and finally, some cases of idealization of the true, where the same criticism has to defend the real and legitimate needs of man against their negative ones.

The only idealization, which is completely inevitable for man, is the representation of free will, as a result of which he cannot in any way get rid of the subjective certainty that he arbitrarily sets goals and chooses for them means. No matter how convincingly objective knowledge proves to him that all his "arbitrary" actions and thoughts are nothing else, as necessary consequences of the previous series of external and internal, physical and mental events, but the subjective consciousness of the arbitrariness of these actions and thoughts remains inevitable as a minute-long illusion, even in the very process of proof of universal determinism, dominant and in the external world, and in the spirit of man. The inevitable must be accepted invariably. This unwitting idealization of its motives becomes the fruitful basis of the vast scientific and philosophical fields of human thought in the field of human activity. Definitely as is the real or illusionable of the goals that a person sets for himself and the means he chooses to achieve them, these goals and affinities are located in his mind in a certain hierarchy of goals and means of the best and worst. But academic criticism is taken for the work of establishing the right hierarchy among them. The indisputable truth is opposed to a probable hypothesis, erroneous reasoning, fiction of fantasy, a contradictory view. An inexpedient remedy differs from the means of expedient, harmful from useful. Moral impulse is distinguished from the whole mass of inducements of the unreasonable, random, passionate, egoistic. The areas of his motives, thoughts, and actions in which a person himself cannot open the trace of conscious will is opposed to him by the area of his other motives, thoughts and actions, in respect of which a person cannot get rid of consciousness, that he wanted them, that he was responsible for them and that other people, like him, as he himself, as well as all this, on a par with the first regions, to the world determinism. As inevitable for the human mind as the objective laws that prevail in nature, the main intimate idealization of the arbitrary setting of goals and arbitrary choice of means, sets a hierarchy of morally better and morally the worst goals in front of each person, leaving it only the ability to critically test whether in this criticism it should be modified by this hierarchy, to be recognized as the best and worst. The solution and the choice of one or the other act as a

result of this decision is always inevitable, but the criticism of ethics can recognize this choice as the highest or lower meaning behind this choice and to assign the same convictions to the individual for this choice and to others to divide the same beliefs. This allows us to compare the field of theoretical knowledge with the field of moral consciousness and in the last area to emerge from the original, subjective fact of free will for oneself, regardless of the theoretical significance of this fact; gives a solid basis of practical philosophy and allows me in these letters to talk with the reader about the moral duty of the individual, about the moral necessity of the struggle of individuals against the obsessive social forms, about moral ideals and about historical progress, from which it follows.

If the beginning of responsibility before himself for everything that a person realizes in himself as a manifestation of his will must be recognized as inevitable idealization, and therefore cannot be eliminated, then it is the only idealization that has the right to such a privilege. Anything that can be avoided should be allowed only on the basis of criticism. As we

proceed with this requirement for the phenomena of idealization, we notice how widely it has attached her method of understanding unconscious processes. At the same time, she did not limit herself to a person, but tried to humanize, comprehend the whole world. Observation indicates three groups of idealization, emerging from a person's desire to bring consciousness and mind into all phenomena, or at least most of them. First, phenomena were presented to man as actions of supernatural, extrawordly personalities, spirits and gods, endowed with consciousness, reason and will. Secondly, the phenomena were presented to him as manifestations of a single conscious and rational essence of the world. But in all the ancients, rising to the primitive periods of human life, was the third method of idealization of the world: the objects of the external world in almost all areas were considered cby beings, gifted with consciousness, reason and will, or the dwelling of such beings, and the phenomena of the world were presented as deliberate actions of these beings. Science has recognized the world of spirits and gods as a fictional product. It recognized the "soul of the world", and "unconditional spirit", and "unconditional will" products of metaphysical creativity. But she had to continue to deal with the question, still unresolved in all its particulars, about what objects of the external world should attribute consciousness, reason and will and to what extent. Prehistoric man has long been ready to spread to almost all objects the idea of a conscious life similar to human consciousness. Then the criticism of thought increasingly narrowed the circle of conscious objects. There was an attempt to recognize the mental processes behind one person, but then it turned out to be necessary to extend them to many animals in different gradualness. Currently, there is a tendency for other researchers to allow consciousness and at a very low stage of development of organisms and even almost in all matter, inhabiting as if thinking "humans" even gas atoms. But in man, critics have discovered a long series of shades of rationality of actions. She found in it a group of phenomena purely mechanical, unconscious. Then another group of phenomena, where the lowest animals of the instincts are admitted, but act with unstoppable force, without any participation of reflection. Then another new group, where the routine course of thought is as mechanical as mechanical, although it is impossible to say that consciousness or reflection is absent here or that the speed of action interferes with its assessment; nevertheless, the assessment of personal responsibility to oneself is only subsequently, when the matter is done or more than half, or completely. Even further we find a very complex group of actions performed under the influence of strong passions and passions; here for the most part there is both reflection and moral assessment of responsibility before oneself, but the power of affect, or passion, prevails so much that a person obeys it in spite of reflection and moral requirements. Only behind this group is the area of actions in which a person is a reflective and quite responsible being. There are people whose majority of life goes away without any action they can be considered belonging to the latter group. The largest number of human actions should be attributed to the third group, i.e., to actions committed under the influence of routine, habits and legends, how to perform their actions, often quite complex, all cultural animals. The assessment of responsibility, as we said, comes in continuation of the action itself or at the end of it, and sometimes does not come at all. The degree of life development of a

person is determined by the share that is the last, quite conscious group of actions, in all his actions.

It can be seen from the previous one that the search for a reasonable motive for the act cannot be recognized by the reception always rational; that mechanical or zoological motives are more often involved in human actions than human ones. As far as it is necessary to keep

this in mind the criminologist for the weighing sentence and for the construction of criminal law, it is so necessary for a historian and a public figure for a critical attitude to human actions in the past and in the present, to the aspirations of people to idealize their and other people's actions, looking for reasonable motives for them, at last, in order not to make a mistake in the hope of persecuting practical goals.

As limited in humanity, the circle of actions that can be called reasonable, but the desire for idealization, involving action intelligent, is very broad, and therefore most people want to present all mechanical, routine, passionate actions as reasonable actions. Others make this process of idealization quite sincerely, while others only for the elevation of my self before other people's eyes or to achieve self-serving goals. But the lack of knowledge and flexibility of thought does not allow a significant number of people to do it themselves. Then they are very happy when others will do it for them, and willingly molest those people who allow them to give their stupidity for reflection, their animal attractions for moral and political principles, their routine for conservative theory, their cowardice for devotion to the state, their meanness for heroism, their kindness for their kindness for their work for the right, their personal anger for the struggle against lies. This is what gives the parties who write great words on their banners, the greatest number of adherents. Always, when raising such a banner, there are people who need it to cover up with a loud word of the small content of their activities. Therefore, the calculating proclaimers of the great principles, by the protection of which the leaders have in mind to realize the egoistic interests of their class or circle, in most cases, the more likely they gather the parties of adherents, or this party becomes more extensively, the more conveniently the more conveniently the mechanical, animals, and routine and passionate aspirations of the personalities with a new banner. In this case, it is more convenient to make idealization that in the continuation of human history, each of the loud words has actually actually been the motto of the advanced party, the formula of progress, and therefore in such an era of poetry and philosophy, custom and tradition were completely sincerely and lawfully surrounded by a word of a halo of greatness. False idealists it remains to point out these praisers, obviously sincere and talented, and draw from the arsenal, arranged by them, weapons for their own purposes.

In view of such a phenomenon, criticism should be even more strictly related to the loud words written on the banners of the parties, and even more carefully consider how far the idealization of the humiliating or legitimate drives of the individual is hidden under them.

In the previous letter, I separated two groups of great ideas, corresponding to common principles and private social forms. We'll do it here. Relatively general, the reception of criticism for the disclosure of false idealization is very simple: it is only necessary to understand in what sense the parties use the words of reason, freedom, the common good, justice, etc. It is necessary to check how much the meaning given to all these words corresponds in this case to their actual progressive significance. This, of course, is possible only when criticism itself has previously understood the real meaning of these words.

For private public forms, the task is more difficult. I have already said in the sixth letter that social forms are developed by natural needs and attractions. How natural these needs and instincts are, the same forms, developed by them, are legitimate, but not further. Meanwhile, in history, the form developed by one need was often convenient, for lack of better, and to satisfy other needs; consequently, this form turned to an organ for a variety of functions and in this form, subjected to sincere and false idealization, was proclaimed by the banner of the parties, the most essential instrument of progress. In this case, the matter of criticism is double. First,

she has to understand what real aspirations of the parties are hidden under the word written on their banners. Secondly, it must be sought by the natural and therefore legitimate need, which has caused to exist

the form exhibited on the banner of the Party as its main principle. The first way of criticism destroys the false idealization of those who exhibit form, in essence, perhaps, and venerable, in defense of aspirations that have nothing to do with it. In the second way, criticism fights against those who made the fetish out of the loud word, without understanding its meaning, and against false idealizers of another kind, namely those who deny the legitimacy of the need, quite natural, and this cause either a distortion of human nature, or, most often, hypocrisy. The latter task has not only negative, but also positive: when it opens a natural need, a natural attraction, a natural attraction, criticism thereby recognizes these foundations as legitimate and requires the construction of social forms on the basis of the sincerity of the feeling, i.e., on the basis of a sincere attitude to the natural needs and drives that lie in the nature of man. This realization in the social forms of moral ideals rooted in the very nature of man constitutes the legitimate and human idealization of his natural needs, as opposed to the ghostly idealization of them under the guise of historically formed cultural forms, which do not correspond to them at all. This human idealization is a completely unscientific idealization, because the element of subjective opinion is present in it only as it is completely inevitable in any study of mental phenomena. The need is a real mental fact that should only be studied as much as possible in its features. Since the need is established as a natural need, it must be satisfied within its healthy functioning, and it is necessary to look for social forms that best satisfy it. I may be mistaken in determining the natural need underlying this social form; I may be mistaken in the conclusions which, in my opinion, must be derived from a sincere attitude to this need. A more skillful researcher will open new sides in the latter and therefore build a more faithful theory of the corresponding social form. But the possibility of mistakes and their consistent elimination do not undermine the scientific nature of the general reception. Reducing social forms to the needs that cause them, sincere (i.e., direct, alien to extraneous considerations) attitude of the researcher to these needs and the requirement to adapt to them social forms can take place outside all personal arbitrariness, outside any dogmatic blinding, outside of any work of creative imagination. This process can be done strictly methodically, eliminating all sources of personal error. Consequently, he is also taught and the result of his - the theory of social forms, as they should be on the basis of clearly understood human needs - is the product of the true and scientific idealization of the corresponding need. Thus, every need allows for the legitimate and human idealization, which belongs to it, just as it can only deny it that is made by culture; this is the relation to its thought. Denying the law of nature, we will not destroy it, but only we will summon its pathological manifestation with the predominance of hypocrisy in a public form. Ghostly idealization cannot change the law of nature to the hair and brings to moral forms only falsehood, which always gives a more cunning and less moral personality the opportunity to oppress a person less cunning and more moral.

But it is this deceitfulness and injustice that is introduced into social forms by petty egoistic interests under the guise of ghostly idealization, causes constant irritation against available social forms and informs them of fragility. The only way to give them more strength is precisely to introduce real vitality into them, that is, in replacing their ghostly idealization with the true. This is mainly the process of work of thought on cultural forms, which constitutes the movement of civilization. - As the reader sees, in this process, there is, in fact, nothing negative, destructive, revolutionary. The thought seeks to constantly deliver to the public forms

of more strength, finding their real foundations in real human needs; studying these needs, it binds social forms with science and justice. What denies the criticism of thought is precisely the element that tells the social forms of fragility. It destroys exactly what threatens the destruction of civilization. It seeks to prevent the revolution, not to cause.

Turning to the most elementary human need, to the need for food, we are already meeting a false idealization in the form of an artificial need for expensive delicacies, developed culture, and in the form of the ghostly blessing of gift feasts developing parasitism. At the same time, the false idealization of asceticism, denying that each person should be fed, has led naturally to senseless forms of fasting, to an equally meaningless accumulation of precious metals in the temples of the gods, where no one needs these treasures, and to the

conversion of herder centers to the asylums of immorality and ignorance. Science contrasted both these ghostly idealizes recognition of the need for natural and lawful and the construction of its satisfaction on the basis of physiology and sociology. If it idealizes the need for food, it idealizes it correctly, indicating how much food is needed by a given person, in the extent of what value it can be assigned by a person without violating the fairness in its distribution, and developing the technique of culinary art for a healthy, economic and tasty preparation of the proper amount of food.

What can be said about this elementary need of nutrition is applied even better to all others, and the progress of all social forms was always precisely precisely precisely in the stricter distinction of the natural needs that cause them, in a more sincere attitude to these needs, in the scattering of ghosts, related to them, and in idealization only by the way that is indicated by the very essence of the need. Let's look at the main forms alternately.

The first strong human union, the maternal family, contained, as a necessity, all social functions, tried to simultaneously satisfy all the needs of the individual. The same state of affairs continued when the genus of the maternal, having moved to the paternal family, developed patriarchal families. The poverty of cultural development was the result that this social form should have met at once and the needs of the upbringing of the growing generation, and the needs of economic support for individuals, and the need to protect them from external enemies, and the needs of the fencing of one family personality from the violence of another, and the need for the accumulation of knowledge, and the needs of creativity. The heads of the family or patriarchal family were at once both the leaders of children and all-rounded industrialists, political figures, judges, guardians of the traditions of theoretical and practical, lyricists in prayer, epics in myth, actors in the cult, all this is because the generic ties gave them a certain position in their tribe. Habit and tradition embraced family ties in its complex patriarchal form with poetic charm, greatness of the sacred union, armor of the law, confusing of public opinion. At the same time, asceticism denied not only the existing cultural forms of the family, but recognized sexual desire for desecration of human dignity and preached abstinence from sexual intercourse. The result of the false idealization of the family was the terrible abuse of power of the head of the family, the conversion of marriage - to the sale and sale, the subordination of children to parents - into slavery; he appeared in the family devoted by the mask of decency, surpassing all the excess of obvious debauchery; it reached the destruction of all human relations in its environment, provided only hypocrisy and humiliation of the person. Similarly, ascetics, preaching abstinence from sexual intercourse, could not destroy sexual desire if they did not resort to radical measures of the cops. And there were only two outcomes: either a distortion of human nature, or hypocrisy, covering an even more exquisite attraction to

what was clearly denied. Most of the fanatical sectarian sectarians in this way have come to distort the physical organism of a person; but others, for example, Shekerers 2323, apparently managed to distort a person in this respect mentally. In the same place, where fanaticism ceased to act, there was hypocrisy under the angelic clothes of monks and nuns who renounced everything flesh, often hidden even more animal motives than among the laity. The famous processes in this case proved that the so-called shelters were actually made by the arenas of orgies that have passed not only all the stages of natural needs, but looked very far away and in the field of attractions that the new Europe has recognized as unnatural. It also happened that the mystical denial of sexual desires was put up in the enthusiastic ecstasy of some sectarians with an artificial exaggeration of these very drives. In all these cases, we see that asceticism caused among society the emergence of false aspirations in groups of people who had a special purpose to deny or distort the main attraction of human nature and made it personally.

Progress in the history of the family and family union followed three ways, of which the most essential was the gradual allocation from the activities of the head of the patriarchal family of those attributes with which he was clothed, as a necessity, only with a very undeveloped state of culture. First of all, the generic connection, based on ill-conceived custom, gave way to other public connections in which personal thought

worked in the form of calculation, affect or belief. Critical thought developed an industrial system of separation of works, first by inheritance in castes, then by personal drive; developed a political system of state defense of personalities from external enemies with a variety of participation of subjects or citizens in management; developed a legal system of courts less involved in the interests of the defendants; developed a methodological preparation for scientific work, independent of the authority of the heads of the family or family; developed samples of art, who made the arts.

As the number of attributes of the head of the patriarchal family was limited, the thought had a better cultural ground for the struggle against false idealization in this area. The panegiritude of the family was opposed to her satire. Skepticism and cynic attacks fluctuated its shrine. The law began to protect family members from the despotism of their head and allowed for divorce. Public opinion sought other ideals. In parallel with this, on the basis of science and justice, critical thought struggled with asceticism, which denied sexual desire at all. Physiology proved the unnaturalness of asceticism; political economy proved its ruinousness to society; history proved the phantom of its legends and its failure to carry out its own ideal.

Instead of these false ideals, pale under the rays of critical thought, the real idealization of sexual desires was precisely the above path - the requirement of sincerity. As a physiological attraction, it was an undeniable natural fact. He was made by the fact of the work of thought as a free choice. Since ancient times, this choice is idealized as a choice in the name of attraction to beauty. The progress of idealization lies only in the fact that beauty or attractiveness turned as the thought work only in the form of choice, and its real basis was mental and moral dignity. The idealization of love - regardless of family connection and in spite of asceticism - was glorified almost as long ago as the traces of the human word have been preserved; but it constantly sounded something false, when next to the songs of Saadi, trumpirdurs, minnesingers, near the Maderileg of the XVII and XVIII centuries, with the lyrical outaves of Schiller's contemporaries, there were cultural habits. As long as the woman stood in a patriarchal family below a man both in cultural habits and in the development of thought, until

then, the moral ideals remained different for those who love, and, therefore, the idealization of mutual attraction did not represent a trace of equality. The woman sought to find in a man the moral ideal of strength, mind and energy of character, social influence and civic activity, but this ideal was not an ideal for her, but an idol, because she herself refused to implement it in life. A man was looking for only the aesthetic ideal of beauty and grace in a woman, considering this very ideal humiliating for himself and allowing even the rudeness of forms as an element of dignity. Therefore, on the part of a woman, there could be no question of the correct idealization of sexual desire. Condemned to worship the idol, which, however, concluded a legitimate attraction to moral strength, she in this case brought all the oppression of the obligatory cultural forms of the family. All the work of thought in the process of idealization through a legitimate attraction to beauty was the benefit of a man to whom culture has appropriated the right of free choice. The real idealization of mutual love is possible only from the time when a woman arouses respect for herself in the name of the same ideal of moral dignity that is set for a man. Then the union of love appears to be a mutual free choice of two beings, mutually attracted physiologically and convergent, because everyone respects in another human dignity in its all-round manifestation. Physiological attraction remains a legitimate basis for the convergence of individuals, but it is subject to legitimate and human idealization; the union of individuals is strengthened by the fact that, striving for the same moral ideals, they mutually perfect and develop each other with their union. This very turns the most by chance to attract a lasting moral rapprochement, not imposed from the outside, not mandatory in the name of cultural habits and legends, but developed by the personalities themselves. External obligation ceases to have any value before a stronger connection. Mutual respect makes the connection sacred, and the freedom of relations eliminates all hypocrisy, and mutual trust makes the most capable of mutual assistance in the economic struggle, in the work of thought, and in public affairs, and in pedagogical duties for a growing generation. With its correct, scientific idealization, the task of the family in the present has two sides, and each of them takes into account the necessary conditions of natural needs,

relies on the sincerity of free affect and sets the obligatory goal of human activity in the name of justice. Sexual attraction as an inevitable source; personal sympathy as an intimate bond, freely defining choice; the mutual development of two equal beings to participate in the progressive activity of society as a social goal is one side of the family ideal of modernity. The upbringing of the child to adults as an inevitable source; the preparation of the educator for the matter of education as a personal attraction, the free choice of favorite occupation; the development in the future of thought, capable of critical work, persuading, ready for selfless work, as a public duty - this is the other side of the same ideal. - Thus, a sincere attitude to natural attraction, eliminating ghostly and false cultural forms, puts before the family (if it is a new ideal.

Let us take another need, manifested in the first steps of human culture, the need for economic security, which has created various forms: property, heredity, use, economic dependence between capital and labor, etc. As soon as the broad ancestral union has disintegrated into family unions, the customs or law competing among themselves economically under the protection of custom or law, immediately from the elementary methods of temporary and more or less prolonged appropriation of objects, the care of the education and protection of monopoly reserves, personal and family were developed as necessary. With the low development of society, the possibility of earning for the person was little provided. Today, hunting, robbery, convenient weather conditions gave a person the opportunity to purchase a

lot, but then this extraction could not be repeated for a long time. And it was necessary to live not only today, but tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow. In addition, the family had old people and children who are unable to get their food. I should have thought about providing them. The simplest and most rational solution was to stock up on a good day in case of possible failure of other days. A clever hunter, a happy robber appropriated to himself everything he could take to secure time for the future. The thing he captured, became his exceptional, monopoly) property even when neither he nor his family could use it. The children also became monopoly owners of what was mined by the father, and this was the case even when they could get their own food. While society stood at such a low level that no one could vouch for a few days ahead of the frenzied death fence, such a monopolization of property by the person far beyond the immediate needs of her and her family was almost inevitable. Everyone had to defend themselves and their loved ones by all means. The struggle for existence was for man, if not the only one, then at least the prevailing law. But the situation of society began to improve; cattle breeding and agriculture have reached the point where the probability of ensuring for some period of the future exceeded the likelihood of death from all sorts of accidents. Monopolization of all the captured or inherited lost the importance of necessity, which justified it in a more difficult time. Nevertheless, having lost its legitimate meaning, it remained a tradition, dating back to time immemorial, a cultural habit that led - with the help of improved technology, with the help of the work of slaves and mercenaries, with the help of advanced methods of predation - to the monopolization of huge property in the hands of one class, one circle of persons, one family, one person. Hence the form of the economic system of society, based on monopoly private property, where the minority of hereditary owners is surrounded by most slaves, mercenaries and beggars[[5]]And here we see the poetic, religious, metaphysical idealization of this system. Wealth, luxury, predation, conquest, hereditary aristocracy, the fat bourgeoisie had their own singers, their theorists, their praises, their commandments for their protection and their tedeum's 24, glorifying them. In the same way, here, asceticism denied all property, all economic labor and developed the parasitism of poverty in the name of God. The criterion of thought here was preceded and helped by the natural development of the conditions of such a system. The habit of predation and monopolization, transferred from a wilderness to a more civilized society, had to transfer there and the elements of the way of life of primitive savages: the struggle of all against all and the fragility of the same that they tried to ensure with such efforts. The aristocracy of the owners was physically and morally. Personal and family attachments fragmented the property, and family members spent in insanely winding the wealth accumulated by predation, plundered from each other and ruined each other to cdeliver a fater piece. The state seized, as much as possible, the shrine of private property. Hungry mercenaries and poor plundered what was able to plunder. The system of society became

so shaky that an energetic push from the outside or the explosion inside carried away a brilliant minority civilization. In addition, the mutual struggle of the owners destroyed them one by one. In recent periods, monopolies-owners have to sacrifice more and more of their property to the army, to the police, to prisons, the poor, on the accidents of economic crises, etc. In view of these facts of history, the economic criticism of socialism develops and equally amazes the chanting monopolizers and parasitic ascetics. Critical thought organizes the struggle of associative labor against monopoly capital and sets a new economic ideal. It recognizes the need for economic security, but requires a system of a society where the individual would be secured, but at the same time, the need to monopolize property that exceeds its immediate needs. Idealization, appropriate needs, and here is not new. This is the

idealization of labor. But before, labor was idealized as a humble instrument of capital, as the obedience of the worker, lying in the laws of the world, in the statutes of Providence, as a mystical punishment for the sin of the forefather.

Socialism puts another ideal for the workers. It is the struggle of productive good labour against unhearted capital; it is labor that provides the worker, who conquers him human development, political significance; it is a work that enjoys all the amenities and even the luxury of life, without having the need to resort to the means of savages, to the monopolization of property by the person, because the convenience and convenience of life become available to everyone.

From the elementary needs we have considered in their ghostly and their true idealization, let us move on to the more complex principles developed by human history.

Letter Eleven

Nationalities in History

Multiple conditions of the terrain, climate, historical circumstances bring together during the long period of the offspring of clan unions of different origins. For the most part, all these unions assimilate the same language, differing only in shades of dialects, assimilate more or less similar mental inclinations, some similar habits and legends; history distinguishes the group formed in this way from other similar groups in the disappearance of the transitional stages; a historical product of the birth and culture, a special nationality, is formed. Once it is separated, it begins for her, as for all living things, the struggle for existence, and its successive generations pass on one very simple desire: protect your existence as much as you can; spread your influence and subjugate everything around you; eat other nationalities physically, politically or mentally as much as you can. The more vigorous the nationality, the better it makes the first requirement. The more human it is, the more it loses its last. Its historical role is determined by its ability to influence other nationalities while maintaining its own and others' characteristics.

As a product of history and nature, nationality is the beginning of a perfectly legitimate one, but the ghostly idealization has not slowed to cultivate in its own way this great principle. Since this or that nationality at the present moment of history has become a real representative of the progressive movement of mankind, the theory of the identification of various social ideas developed by the universal human thought appeared, with different nationalities. Since most of the history of nationalities was held in mutual slaughter and mutual educating, the doctrine of false patriotism appeared, the doctrine by which the citizen placed in his dignity the desire to eat all others in his nationality. Since in political history the principle of nationalities played an important role, the political theory of the division of land into state territories by nationality appeared.

Let's look at these theories.

It is not once possible to find in historical works and reasoning the idea that the other nationality is the main figure of progress in this regard; that it draws a certain idea in the general movement of mankind forward; that with its victory the development of mankind is associated with its destruction, its stagnation or a long stop on the path of progress. There are even thinkers - including minds even very remarkable—that

determine the common historical significance of the main nationalities with different ideas of the human mind or with different psychic phenomena of the personal spirit. What rational meaning can be given to these historical constructions?

If we consider as a historical fact that in this epoch the leading personality of a certain nationality, the most remarkable phenomena in the literature and in the life of this nationality had the general characteristic of it all that individuals were imbued with one dominant idea, and literature and life served as an expression; if, in a word, we see in the idea of this nationality a generalizing formula for one phase of its civilization, then we can agree with the previous expressions and recognize the importance of it. Indeed, in each epoch of civilization of a somewhat developed society has its own characteristic features, its guiding ideas, and the more social forms contribute better to the comprehensive development of the individual, the healthier society, the more heal the intact in its civilization, the more fully and decisively this civilization expresses its idea. It is clear that in such a case, the civilization of this nationality affects as the ideal center of other modern nationalities and on subsequent periods of mankind and this influence is the more progressive the leading idea of this nationality in the present era contributes more to the development of personalities and the introduction of justice in the forms of social life. As far as the last condition is fulfilled, so and we can say that this nationality in the epoch is a representative of progress, that with its historical fate either the success of mankind or its stop on the path of development is associated.

But usually mean by the national idea something more. It is believed that this idea is not limited to a certain epoch, but connects all epochs of national life; that it generalizes the entire history of this nationality. Such a fact can be imagined in three ways:

Or the civilization of a certain system has entered such a habit of the nation that it turned into a culture, into an anthropological sign, so that the thought of individuals can no longer come up with an improvement in the life of society or is immediately suppressed by social forms at its very occurrence. Generations follow one another, but life forms and guiding ideas remain the same. In other words: the history of society prevails in complete stagnation and the history of society turned to zoological shipment. - It is somewhat strange to talk about the progressiveness of civilization, in this way that serves the embodiment of the idea. Nationalities that have reached such a state have no effect on the development of mankind. No one desires victory for them; no one regrets their death; they are doomed to historical death in a clash with something alive, unless they are able to awaken living elements in themselves.

Or an idea guiding the whole history of this nationality must be considered something innate to all the personalities of this nationality, an anthropological element inherent in the structure of their brain and determines the development of the whole range of generations, no matter how diverse the forms of culture for different generations, however widely, the development of thought in them or, no matter how fantastic its deviations were. It is necessary to find the causes of the community of the cerebral or mental structure of individuals in the unity of their origin. In other words, from this point of view, the national idea exists only in the nationalities formed by the birth. Beyond tribes, it is unthinkable.

Where are the historical nationalities? In modern Europe, some Germans could claim tribalism, since for all other nations the mixing of tribes is a historical fact. But even the Germans are easy to see multi-mileage; for this, it is only necessary to look at the famous work of Reel "Land und Leute" 25. In ancient history, Rome represented a mixed nation. Many scientists suggest the same about Greece based on very likely data. Persian civilization was

actually a madolatic civilization. It is better not to address more ancient epochs, because science has nothing to grasp there to obtain any solid conclusions on this issue. If the unity of origin cannot be considered probable for any historical nationality, then the proposed understanding of the national idea has no place.

Finally, you can imagine this. The personalities of the same tribe or tribes under the influence of the same

climatic, soil, economic and cultural conditions produce some common mental inclinations with great diversity in everything else. These mental inclinations, common to all, and constitute a national isolation, whatever they may be. As long as they are not there, and there are no nations; as soon as they are obtained, they can be formulated in a special idea that is continuously manifested in the entire subsequent life of nationality. As the latter influences on the history of mankind enters this history and the corresponding idea. The triumph and death of nationality cause both the elevation or weakening of its idea. - The first provisions of this construction can, of course, it is possible, and now some thinkers have already set themselves the task of studying the phenomena of the psychology of peoples. But the point is how much it is possible to recognize in the separate national inclinations something progressive, taking them at the same time as a constant element.

If the comparison between the life of the individual and the life of nationality had any meaning, except the external likeness of two different processes, it could be recognized that unity in the life of a thinking person corresponds to unity in the life of historical nationality. There are moments when a developed person comprehends his existence, weighs his powers, is imbued with a certain conviction, sets himself the common goal of life and lives in accordance with this goal, sometimes deviating from it due to external influences or internal hobbies, but finding in this goal the unity and meaning of the whole process of their development. If there could be an analogy of this phenomenon for society, it might be imagined that in a certain epoch the national consciousness was awakened; that it constitutes a conscious goal of national development; that individuals seek to do this goal by passing on their aspirations for a conscious national goal to the descendants, which thus pursue the same goal in a new phase imbued with the same idea. And so it comes from generation to generation until the strength of development in nationality is exhausted, as it is depleted in the person when decreeping, or until the historical catastrophe breaks the nationality, as a disease or violence kills the individual.

But such a comparison is fantasy. The common between the life of the individual and the nation is only what for each of the destroyed nationalities was in history a minute of appearance on the historical stage, a period of historical existence, the era of agony. Then everything is different. For the personality, the physiologist will indicate how the same processes that develop the embryo into the baby develop, develop the baby into a mature being, and then lead the old man to inevitable death. For society, all attempts, so far, made, to give something similar to such an explanation, must be recognized as unscientific. In addition, in the historical life of society, sometimes phenomena are repeated several times, which, with a strict analogy, should be recognized as the eras of youth and deceit. As for the death of historical societies, their natural death history does not know, but only a series of murders of some nationalities by others, so that even the question of whether a historical nationality can die naturally cannot be considered resolved. Consequently, it would be fairer to compare nationalities with a person who is born, sometimes several times younger and decrepit and is

most accidented to be killed if possible. Such a person belongs to the field of fantasy.

Even more fantastic is the assumption of the transfer of the national idea from one generation to another as a conscious tradition. No one has ever indicated for any historical nationality even the shadow of a conscious tradition of any idea, confirming his instructions with something similar to a scientific fact. Generations of this nationality, as we saw at the beginning of this letter, pass on to each other only one very not perfect aspiration. His demands are common to all nationalities and do not contain any idea. This is nothing but a natural struggle for existence. These demands were directed by animals, led people in their clashes with the beasts, led the primitive people in their clashes between themselves, and now direct nationalities in their clashes. There is nothing progressive in these demands. Of course, without a struggle between individuals, there would probably be no success of progress; without a struggle between nationalities, the success of civilization would hardly have been generalized and propagated. But the necessary conditions for the beginning of progress are not yet progress, and the tradition of struggle between nationalities only precedes

understanding of their just relations with each other, the understanding with which the struggle ends and the general progress of nations begins.

Outside the conscious tradition of the national idea, it remains to allow the unconscious transmission from one generation to another of some constant ideal aspiration. Take for example two indisputably historical nationalities, of which, relative to the first, it is even possible to allow unity of tribe, although the antiquity of the appearance of this nationality does not allow a completely scientific solution to the issue.

The Jews, despite their small number, played a historic role in ancient times; they also played a historical role in medieval Europe; they are not in our time devoid of historical significance, so that some writers linked the revolutionary upheavals of Germany in the late forties with the influence of the German society of numerous Jews living in its midst, the Names of the Socialist Jews are sufficiently insipulated inscribed both in the chronicle of the science. The very anti-Semitic movement of the last decade represents in a pathological form the recognition by the enemies of the Jews that the latter, in its isolated whole, constitute a social force in one way or another influencing the most essential functions of modern society. - It is for a moment that the same idea was represented in history by the prophets of the first fall of Jerusalem, medieval Kabbalists, Talmudios and translators of Averroes and contemporaries of Heine, Rothschilds. Meanwhile, there is hardly a nationality where the separation and strength of tradition were greater than that of the Jews.

For another example, let's take France here, for convenience, we will look for at least some features that appear in its history. Of course, recently such a goddamn thing could, apparently, recognize the inclination to administrative centralization. This converged the Convention, the Doctrinators 26 and Napoleon III; politicians centralized the management; university professors centralized teaching; Auguste Comte, with the help of his positive religion, wanted to centralize all manifestations of thought and life. If the trait, common to the various parties of the modern period, is not an element of the "national idea", then hardly we will find anything more characteristic. But who has ever sought this trait in feudal France? And it is impossible not to assume that the French nationality was already isolated during feudalism. - Let us take a few moments of the indisputable influence of French literature on Europe. In the 12th century, we meet the medieval French epic, which was imitated everywhere; the scholastics of the University of Paris in the XIII and XIV centuries were teachers of Europe; court poets of the

17th century again found imitators; "Encyclopedia" of the XVIII century, in its turn, dominated European thought. Compare these four epochs; we add perhaps the less influential era of the new French romanticism and eclecticism. What common idea do we find in all these phases of French thought, which influenced more or less on the development of mankind? - If we abandon completely artificial stretches, then we will have to abandon all the idea of the historical course of French thought. - The same can be said about any other notable features both for France and for other nationalities. The general idea that penetrates the entire history of a nation is not at all.

Thus, it seems that it is possible to recognize as a national idea only the meaning of the temporary generalizing formula for the civilization of some nationality or of some state. On the basis of the general mental inclinations and events of history, this nationality in a certain ancestry of its existence can become, by the nature of its civilization, a noticeable representative of this or that idea, and, therefore, in the name of this idea, can take a certain place among the progressive or reactionary figures in some period of human history.

Having destroyed the false idealization of the deification of ideas with nationalities, criticism must proceed to the true idealization of this beginning. It is we who have seen that nationality is not in essence its representative of a progressive idea, an organ of progress, but can only be done by them. In such a case, the true idealization of the principle of nationality should be indicating in which this possibility is feasible.

On the basis of what is said in the ninth letter, we easily conclude that whatever the idea penetrates the civilization of a given nationality in a given era, but if nationality remains too long a representative of the same idea, it will almost inevitably pass from progressive figures into reactionary or vice versa, because no

idea can be recognized as a monopoly forever progressive. On the other hand, we have now noticed that the same nationality during its history can be made alternately by a representative of different ideas. Sometimes it will be at the head of the movement for the idea of progressive; in another period, another idea will be written on its banner, the most reactionary way influencing humanity.

It follows that, and stubbornly holding the once learned idea, and changing its leaders, this nationality may not remain a progressive figure. Conservatism and the revolution in the sphere of thought do not equally represent the same guarantee in progress. In order to remain in history with the role of a progressive figure, a nationality that has once received such meaning must hold on to its guiding idea for the time being, constantly blaming new circumstances, new demands, new thoughts, the question of how much its idea remains progressive. Changing the guiding idea with the same purpose, nationality must again be only from criticism of the modern demands of mankind, its modern thought, the beginnings that should, in the name of progress, write on its banner as promising the best development for personalities, the most complete expansion of justice in social forms.

It follows that any nationality can, under lucky circumstances, become a historical progressive engine. The better it understands the modern demands of mankind, the more fully embody them in the form of its culture and in the statements of her thought, the more likely it will be to achieve this historical situation for it. Of course, it is necessary to have the existence in the social system of some conditions, which I spoke about in the third letter: it is necessary that the social environment allows and encourage the development of independent persuasion

in the individual; it is necessary that for a scientist and a thinker there is an opportunity to express the provisions he considered to be the expression of truth and justice; it is necessary that social forms allow change, only it will only turn out that they cease to serve as an expression of truth and justice. Outside these conditions, the progressive historical significance of nationality is a perfect chance, since nationality itself is an abstract and it can only be spoken of metaphorically, that it understands or embodies anything. In essence, only individuals can understand and embody, which, as was said in previous letters, are the only figures of progress. They can only make the nationality to which they belong, to the progressive element of humanity or give it a reactionary character.

Therefore, true national patriotism for the individual is to comprehend the natural demands of their nation by a critical understanding of the demands of universal progress. I have pointed out three of the natural aspirations of nationality above, but their significance before rational criticism is different.

The requirement to maintain one's nationality as an independent and separate unit is quite legal, since it corresponds to the desire that the ideas in which a person believes, the language he speaks, the life goals that he sets for himself, enter into a living element into the future and would be reborn according to the demands of progress in humanity, but would not be extinct. Only those who have become convinced that nationality have made it an inseparable element the beginning of stagnation or reaction cannot be abandoned. But what nationality can't do?

The desire to eat foreign nationalities, destroying their peculiarities, is an anti-progressive fact. A person who put such an ideal has as little rights to the name of a patriot as a person who preaches the benefits of alike of the social human culture to the mores of a flock of wolves or a herd of rams, has no right to the name of the human thinker. Such "patriots" desecrate the banner of nationality and seek, consciously or unconsciously, to humiliate their native people, imposing a stain of atrocity on them, preventing them from becoming one of progressive figures. Such a "patriot" was a Cato-censor with his famous chorus: "Carthage must be destroyed!" And the subsequent history of Rome proved how little morally and politically Roman citizens had benefited, for the most part from the destruction of Carthage; how soon after that the Romans surprised even the Jumurt, and their civil consciousness was expressed in a number of street incisions, bloody proscriptions and in Caesarism. The organ of such "patriotism" in Russia was in the sixties "Katkov literature", which multiplied and flourishing in recent years. As a denial of progress, the desire of some

nationalities to eat others is a denial and true patriotism.

Introduce the most truth to the thought of your nationality; put in service its social forms of justice, then it can imperfectly become close to other nationalities, the thought of which contains less true content, the forms of the public of which are less imbued with justice. It will influence them; it will subjugate them to themselves morally, without having to eat them, that is, to deprive them of an independent historical life. Every true patriot may wish such an influence of such subordination; to such a meaning of his fatherland he has a rational right to strive; to this historical domination of his nationality over others he has the right to promote by all means, because it contributes to this and the progress of mankind. Progress is not an impersonal process. Someone has to be his organ. Some nationality must first of others, and perhaps better, more fully, become a representative of progress in this epoch. A true patriot can and must desire that it be his nationality; that he thus contributes to this historical significance. Precisely because it is more familiar and familiar to him that it is easier for him to

learn the methods of thought and action of his fellow tribesmen, he can rather remain a patriot, pursuing universal goals. Rational patriotism is the desire to make its nationality the most influential figure of human progress, at least exposing its special characteristic features.

To do this, a true patriot will first strive to bring his father the conditions of the social system, without which the incredibly progressive development of society and which is mentioned above; he will try to give the greatest possible dissemination among his compatriots of hygienic and material amenities; he will be a propagandist of a critical understanding, a scientific view of things, social theories, the most permeated by the demands of justice; he will be an active participant in the reformist. He will then strive to better understand the modern tasks of science and justice. Finally, he will try to make his fatherland the highest representative of science and justice among modern nations. Outside of these aspirations, there is no patriotism, but only its mask, worn by dumb chatters, selfish publicists or the calculating exploiters of the animals of the passions of mankind.

If there were no clashes of nationalities in the name of the random interests of their rulers or in the name of the animal of mutual etire, the question of the importance of the national element in progress would have dwelt. But now these circumstances give the historical importance of the strength and material power of the national organization. The national question in practice raises the question of the state.

Letter Twelve

Contract and Law

Much debated whether the treaty served as the basis for the state or the state preceded it. The historical school laughed a lot over the theorists, who imagined how the semi-animals, which had no intercourse between themselves, suddenly came up with: it would be better for us to make a contract and live in the state; let's do so. We agreed; they entered into the debate, how best to be, decided and became a state. It is clear as a day, the historical school argued that such a conscious contract presupposes all that should have come out of it as a consequence. As is obvious, but just as clearly the characteristic feature of the State was simply as clearly: the legitimate obligation of its members to support its system and to compel those who do not wish to fulfill this obligation voluntarily. Therefore, a valid or fictitious treaty binding all members of the State is assumed here. The wording of this treaty is the law. These two principles themselves are so important and are often subjected to ghostly idealization that I find the best to consider them first especially and then move on to the question of the state.

One of the first and simplest manifestations of thought is concern for the future. The child age ends for the individual when she begins to think about the means to secure a better future. If it is permissible in any sense to apply to society a very common, but very inaccurate comparison of the development of the social with personal, then it can be said that the childish age of society ends when the beginning of a contract is established between people. With this tool, people try to provide themselves in advance from accidents.

Behind the variable will of personality, for the unforeseen calculation of the best, the most convenient, the most useful, which will be done tomorrow, for the need to resort to strength or to persuasion at the very moment of need arises, more or less voluntarily accepted. Man connects his own future. The treaty is guarded by the formidable, invisible gods in this life and

in the future. It is guarded by a more sensitive punishment of the law. It is guarded by inner self-respect, the honor of the man who gave his word. It must be assumed that this tool turned out to be very real, because for most social forms, thinkers tried to really or fictitiously apply the beginning of the contract. The physiological craving of two lovers brought under this principle, just as the attitude of the citizens to the state; even the religious life, the veneration of Jehovah, the Jews found it convenient to present in the form of a treaty between the god of the Jews and the people chosen.

In essence, the contract is only an economic principle, since a purely quantitative comparison of services is possible only in the sphere where there are mathematical quantities, and from social phenomena only economic have found a measure in value. Only what is appreciable, and can be equivalent; and where it is impossible to define equality, there the contract is always fictitious, because it is unfair. The contract involves a service provided for another equal service. Therefore, in everything that is estimated, he will absolutely attach. The exchange of goods for goods, work for value are the simplest cases, but in them already manifests the phenomenon of regressive. And these cases allow the exploitation of man by man, the exhaustion of forces and means of one person in favor of the monopolization of forces and means by another. A treaty is a prudence only when both individuals are equally established in their understanding of the value of commodities, the role of labour and capital; when both need to be exchanged equally; when both apply equally to it. But such a case is exceptional, and when it occurs, there is hardly a need for a formal contract. The treaty has to be viewed as a weapon against deception, against harassment. But weapons of this kind are necessary in a progressive sense only to provide the weak against the strong, because the strong already secured by his power from deception and oppression. When a lawyer concludes a contract with a person inexperienced in the laws, then it is not for the latter to wait for the submission of expressions in the contract that further restrict the counterparty by an unforeseen paragraph of the law. When a capitalist-made manufacturer enters into the condition with the proletarian-employer, oppression can take place only on the part of capital. Therefore, the contract is a progressive principle only when it protects the weakest from an arbitrary change in value on the part of the strongest. When a smarter, more knowledgeable, richer man concludes a contract with less intelligent, less knowledgeable, less rich, then the moral obligation of the contract must lie with all its weight on the first. The latter could not understand, not to appreciate the conditions, they adopted, could not be able to evade them, and each such circumstance, destroying the fairness of the treaty, undermines its moral force. Its fulfillment may be important in the eyes of society for the maintenance of public order, state law, sacred custom, but not justice.

An even greater agreement is one of the limits of the conditions of progressive development, namely, of the conditions of justice, when it requires from both contracting parties or from one of them such services which are not subject to any kind of assessment or not rewarded by any value. The first case is presented wherever the economic element does not cover the entire scope of the activity within the contract, or even does not concern this activity at all. All actions that are conditioned under normal relations between people by love, friendship, trust, respect, cannot take place for an obligation among people who preserve human dignity, therefore, cannot be the subject of a treaty. The second case occurs when a treaty extends to the lifetime of the contracting, or to a substantial part of it, for which no calculation of the mind can predict all possible combinations of circumstances. Here he who undertakes to render an uncompromising service is as dislike as he who accepts such an obligation. It is carried out

under the influence of fantastic ideas: what I wish today, I will wish tomorrow; such as I am today, so I will remain in the continuation of my life. For economic circumstances, such a calculation for the distant future does not present an irresistible difficulty. The value of the service changes, but the value of monetary units also changes, and for a person who is part of numerous

such obligations, the loss on one is often balanced by the benefit on the other, which, together with the enormous economic importance of the service rendered at the appropriate time, sometimes rewards for any risk. But for services that are not subject to evaluation, it is not so. Without units of objective, therefore, not being able to be replaced by others, these invaluable services rely in their moral meaning only on the inner conviction of the individual. Moral is only an act according to a belief; the developing element in the individual can only be considered acts committed according to persuasion; but a treaty may require me to act which have agreed with my conviction when I signed the contract, and have become unconsent when it has to be fulfilled. Honesty requires the execution of the contract; I will fulfill it, but my action becomes corrupt and hypocritical. Sell and hypocritical are the caresses of love, the sacrifices of friendship, the statement of respect for power and to the law, the fulfillment of the religious rite, when there is no lovee, when pity or contempt has changed friendship, when the power became an outrageous yoke, the law is a conscious injustice, when faith in the magical or mystical power of the rite has disappeared. These acts are sold, because I only buy them the right to get rid of someone else's and self-reign of the violation of the obligation; they are hypocritical, because for all such contracts the unspoken condition is assumed that I will fulfill the obligation as \times I have concluded it, that is, voluntarily, and I fulfill it against conscience. They will say that I can avoid this hypocrisy, stating that I am forced to fulfill the contract involuntarily, but I cannot willingly fulfill it, and in this case the responsibility for the immoral effect falls on the one who demands the execution of the contract, and not against me. This should only be recognized as a fiction. Of course, it is possible and should be considered a criminal to someone who demands the fulfillment of a non-economic obligation when it is stated to him of a lack of desire to fulfill this obligation. It demands an immoral and humiliating act, therefore, he himself is immoral and low. But the criminal act committed by others does not diminish my crime at all, when I know I am committing a crime, and still commit it; when I know I am selling a non-sales thing. A person who places moral responsibility for his own actions on another puts himself on the degree of machine: only the machine itself is not responsible for its actions. But to put yourself on the degree of the machine is no less humiliating, as well as to make the sale of my self with the help of the action that I commit against persuasion. Here the crime has already been concluded in the contract itself. Every contract that requires service in the future, in the very essence of which lies a condition of sincerity and indispensability, is morally criminal in itself. Only under the influence of self-deception do people undertake to friendship or love in the somewhat distant future and to deeds, corresponding when the object of their present friendship or love may no longer deserve either one or the other, and they themselves can change; actions caused by friendship and love are deeply immoral, if committed without a sincere feeling, only as a result of a commitment. In the same way, it is criminally committed to obey the orders of unlimited state power, when you do not know what these orders will be, when you do not control them and have no opportunity to influence them.

It goes without saying that the case of a treaty concluded for life or indefinitely distant future represents the same immorality, increased as many times as long as the prolonged repetition of

the bad case is worse than its simultaneous commission. The latter can still serve as an impetus for the development of a person who wishes to make amends with useful activities an immoral act, once committed. But the former converts evil into the habit, dulls the moral sensitivity of a person and not only reduces him to the degree of the machine, but puts before him automatic activity as the ideal of a whole life or part of it. This applies in particular to both areas from which previous examples are taken. Selling the caresses of love for life remains a humiliating sale, at least it was consecrated by the church and the law. Voluntary support for unrestricted and uncontrolled power remains immoral and harmful. The commission of a religious rite to the unbelievers in it remains a symptom of decline. Slavery is real and moral slavery in their various forms are the natural manifestations of such humiliation of human dignity. A society that encompasses a binding contract for most of the life of individuals, the more it brings into itself elements of reaction and its own death, the more thoroughly it is imbued with the regulation.

Thus, a treaty, one of the most important elements of social life, one of the simplest and, apparently, the most favorable of its discovery, becomes a terrible corrosive evil if it is distributed outside its legitimate sphere. There are times in the life of society, when it is the only salvation. There are others when it becomes the most painful yoke.

This can be found an analogy in the activities of an individual. The young man must survive the era when he is accustomed to calculate his present due to the future, is accustomed to weigh his words and his actions. But this acquired habit should not become the basis of the activity of an adult, it enters into this activity only as an element. He who is only careful becomes a coward; from a lack of determination he loses convenient cases; he harms himself cowardices sometimes more than risk; he finally loses the absolutely capable of decisive activity in any case, even the most necessary for him. Caution and reflection become powerful tools of life success only as a resolute act, as one of the elements of a strong and courageous thought.

This is how society reaches the treaty in its youth. Elementary instincts, cultural habits, generic customs, or direct community of interests have temporarily connected people. Their union is convenient, familiar, or beneficial to them by all; they know it; but they have already awakened the consciousness of the variability of their desires, the ability to get carried away; this consciousness makes them fear for the fulfillment in the future of what they are conscious of convenient or beneficial for themselves. They conclude a contract obliging them to do what is actually more useful for them. Then there comes another period. In society there are stronger and weaker people, exploiters and exploited; the latter tolerate the former and do not trust them. But there are moments when the first, with their power, can not achieve their goals without the assistance of the latter. They buy this assistance by providing in the future exploited more or less from their strength. There is a treaty between the strong and the weak at a time when the strong are accidentally weaker and the weak are accidentally stronger; therefore, this treaty gives the social system more justice than it was before.

Little by little, the benefit of such treaties is so obvious that people cannot but notice the improvement of public life, which is a direct consequence of the treaty. The contract is idealized. It is sealed with magical rites, threatening the unavoidable punishment of his violator. In his witnesses and, as it were, the participants call on the host of invisible spirits. The underground gods and heavenly gods are the guardians of the oaths, and these all-powerful and omniscient witnesses who punish on earth and for the grave, give the treaty an

objective holiness. The ideal of a moral person in the most broad and simple meaning of this word includes honesty, and this inner judge demands from the personality the execution of treaties more urgently than all Olympians. This contract receives a subjective sanctity. The ideal of an honest man is generalized in the images of poets, in the worldviews of thinkers. He is in the habit of society. The violator of contracts sees in the smile of a friend, in a cold bow of a friend, in the hint of a secular narrator his condemnation. From the fantastic world of myths and the subjective world of beliefs, honesty turns into the real world of the most sacred social connection.

But the formidable Olympians, the guardians of oaths, are appeased by sacrifices, and the Christian priest allows the oath of the offender from the sin threatening the caro in the future life. The inner world of a person is hidden from the eyes, and he who, apparently, is more honest, can only wait for his hour for a large dishonest act. As for the public court, the decency of the dormitory is so opposed to disgust from dishonest deeds that it is not bad for violators of treaties to live at all; besides, considerable success in the eyes of the majority as if grandiose and dishonest act, and between dupes [prostofilis] and coquins [fraudstors] contempt divisor rather evenly; perhaps, it is even more. Consequently, to protect the treaty, they find it necessary to resort to an additional force independent of the Olympians, from the conscience of the contracting and from the public treatment of the criminals. The treaty is put under the protection of the law, and the law itself becomes a social contract protected by all the forces of the state.

Here, two elements are immediately woven to the treaty, completely alien to its moral beginning. The law itself, as we shall see in the next letter, is a fictitious treaty, because not all subjects of the States obliged to

implement this treaty are called to express voluntary consent to it; and if such a vocation should be assumed, most subjects would not be able to appreciate the benefit or benefit of the adoption of the treaty. Consequently, the term honesty does not apply here at all, and we are in a completely different sphere of action. – On the other hand, the lawful treaty always has a tendency to be made more and more formal. Its obligation is less dependent on the internal conviction of the contracting, and more on different points of the law in respect of, for example, the timing of the submission of papers, the number and properties of witnesses, the word written in one way or another, etc. The most legal contract can be in fact the most dishonest thing, as the most obvious condition can be illegal. The law becomes a progressive element and moral force only when the legislation refers to the two main points mentioned above. The first is that any contract that requires a service that presupposes sincerity, just as any contract that binds a person's will to life or for a considerable period of time is itself a criminal. Secondly, a contract, even concluded with respect to services that allow for evaluation, is valid only when the contracting parties are equally placed with respect to the understanding of the contract and the ability not to conclude it. Consequently, legislation, in order to be moral, must prohibit all unconditional treaties of the first kind, and under conditional treaties shall ensure that the contracting treaty should ensure the opportunity to state its sincerity before the very execution of the contract or evade its execution. Similarly, the legislation must not only protect contracts already concluded, but also when concluding, protect the weak from the strong, less intelligent and knows more intelligent and knows more intelligent and knowledgeable, giving the first the opportunity to understand the conditions that may subsequently harm him. It is the law that the law is the instrument of morality, the instrument of progress when it guards the sanctity of an honest treaty and becomes an obstacle to the dishonest.

If the legislation did not mean this, but, in fact, it is based on the fiction, that most actions may be the subject of a treaty, that the contracting states equally understand the meaning and force of the treaty and had an equal opportunity not to conclude it, then it becomes a trap for the weak in the hands of the strong and develops only one side in society - reflection and caution as the consequences of universal mutual distrust. Then the gods, the guardians of the oath, turn to the metaphysical god, a state whose place of morality is occupied by the volumes of the code. Honesty pales with legality, and there are such moral freaks that they imagine that, having fulfilled the letter of the decree, they are honest. The public court loses all meaning, both because before justification and condemnation by law are insignificant statements of public opinion, and because formal serviceability, entering into the habits of society, gradually replaces the habits of honest comprehension and fair fulfillment of this obligation.

Naturally, in this state of affairs, two social forms are particularly elevated. Since, by the very essence of the contract, there is a transfer to all the relations of commercial relations, the whole benefit of the legality, sanctifying the complete freedom of contract, goes to the element of the industrial. Industrial competition is becoming a type of social relations. Family communication, community, public service receive the color of commercial transactions; literature, science, art - the character of craft production. Personalities, more convenient than others, having the opportunity to better assess the power of the contract and conclude it in time, get a broad ability to develop; wealth and brilliance of the public are increasing; factory technique makes great strides; it seeks to turn science and art into simple tools for its improvement. On the contrary, less conveniently set individuals get less and less able to develop, even resist. They are crushed not only by strong personalities, they are crushed by the still irreposable power of the law. The stock exchange and factory cover more and more social elements.

On the other hand, since the law is held only by the power of the state, the state receives more and more importance in the sphere of life and in the sphere of thought. In other cases, under the guise of better monitoring of the legality of the course of cases, administrative centralization is intensified and the administrative network is unfolding. In other cases, the idol of glory and the honor of the abstract state

requires the constant victims of soulless property and animate personnel. In the sphere of thought, the theory of God-ready state, the deification of all the higher human ideals, develops, and thinkers are looking for the progress of society in strengthening precisely this element, which, with the progressive development of society, must be subjected, as we shall see, a completely different process.

But the strengthening of industrial and state principles in society causes another phenomenon in this state of affairs. Since the strongest personalities, with a somewhat convenient environment, easily break into the ranks of the happiest minority, the strongest minds do not greatly experience the inconveniences of the social system, are critical of it only in the sphere of thought and not only soon reconcile with these inconveniences, but for the most part in the strongest terms, things become among the defenders of the status quo. Nevertheless, the dissatisfied is covered so firmly with the network of the administration and the code that criticism of the existing cannot be expressed or expressed too weakly. As a result, the state is approaching the famous ideal of the most popular social order, which, to put it more correctly and clearly, would be called the ideal of stagnation. A more durable and stronger is

established in society the cultural element of habit and tradition. The idea is working harder under the conditions of commercial gain and legitimate cramping. And it comes more and more in the rut of ordinary views, traditional forms. Life in society begins to decrease; its humanity decreases; the likelihood of progress becomes less.

Of course, and at the same time, there are usually elements in society that the thought can rely on in its critical work. The public principle sometimes enters into a clash with the economic; or among the class dealing with economic issues, more far-sighted people begin to notice the danger that threatens society both from the suppression of the interests of the majority and from the possibility of stagnation; or the science that both industry and the state needs becomes an instrument of social criticism and progress; or, finally, thought works in the suppressed majority and causes an explosion that in turn awakens society to a new life. The last hundred years have presented a number of examples of how, with the strengthening of interaction between industrial and state elements in public life, public discontent led to more or less large reform movements and, in the absence of legal ways for reforms, to revolutionary explosions. At the end of the eighteenth century, the French bourgeoisie had already had sufficient economic and intellectual strength to, relying on the masses of the people who are suppressed and exploited by the state, in the absence of any legal concessions from the old regime, to make a purely political revolution in their favor. In the thirties, again, on the basis of dissatisfied masses, who did not recognize their class opposition to the bourgeoisie, the latter appeared as if the representative of the rule of law against the policeman, but in essence consolidated only legal and economic domination. At present, the consciousness of the class struggle is increasingly penetrated into the theoretical works of sociologists, and into the disturbing masses of the working class; the latter all expand their organization, which is fatally promoted by the very process of capitalist economy, seeking to centralize property and causing an unsatisfactory range of industrial, trade and stockbroideries; the governments and ruling classes of Europe and America use every effort to prevent the approaching catastrophe that must cover all spheres of social life on the basis of the economic revolution. And here there is still the possibility that the concessions made by the time-forming classes by the ruling legal way will facilitate the transition to a new system; but every day this possibility decreases, and with the same time the likelihood of a more acute and bloody catastrophe increases.[6]

But here I had to talk about such ways to solve public issues that lie outside the field of legal. In connection with the previous appeal, special attention is paid to the fact that the transition of the moral beginning of the treaty to the formal beginning of the law is not a progressive phenomenon, just as a substitute for honesty by legality is an apath-generous phenomenon. I have already said in the ninth letter that the law itself, as all the great principles, can be both an instrument of progress and an instrument of reaction. From all the previous one, one can conclude that the true idealization of the law must have its source for it, as well as for a contract that gradually passes into the law, in other principles. Only these auxiliary principles, supplementing and

regulating the principles of the treaty and the law, can eliminate the desire for stagnation in essence of legal formalism.

The contract is consecrated by the conviction of the individual in a minute of its conclusion, just as its sincerity in the moment of its execution. The law is consecrated by the conviction of the individual, that it is good, whether it protects an honest covenant and persecutes a dishonest, or that greater evil will occur from the resistance to the law than from its execution.

In the presence of a treaty requiring the actions of sincere in the distant future, the individual is in the presence of a moral crime. Whoever has made such an obligation can only be regretted, because the dilemma of the breach of an obligation or sale of the unsold for him is almost inevitable. In the presence of a law contrary to personal conviction, the position of the individual is morally lighter. In many states, the law itself indicates the way to criticize the law and to influence the elimination of obsolete legal forms: this outcome is legal. If this does not take place, then the individual has to become in the ranks of the wrestlers against the law that is not against the system that does not allow his criticism; whatever the consequences, the convinced person can always say to himself: I act according to my opinion; let the law punish me: this is an exodus of a moral. There is still an outcome, the so-called utilitarian one, when the individual, in view of the greatest benefit, subordinates his conviction to the law not justified by this conviction; but the question will always remain difficult to resolve here: is there a morally worse thing than an act contrary to persuasion? The progress of society depends more on the strength and clarity of the beliefs of individuals constituting society than on the preservation of any cultural forms.

Letter Thirteen

"The State"

■ The following two letters would require a significant alteration. The reader interested in this question can find a lot here relating in my article "The State Element in the Future Society", which appeared in London in 1875 and component the first (and only) issue of volume IV non-period collection "Forward!". I mean, I mean to say something about this issue and in the last chapter of the ed. II of my 2nd, Experience of the History of the Future of Modern Times, 2727. Here I limited myself to almost exclusively the fact that in different places he expressed with greater clarity of thoughts that, under censorship conditions in Russia, had to be clothed with different veils (1891).

Although none of the great social principles can be said that it was not abused by idealizing it, it is hardly in the last period that has been subjected to such a measure of such an operation as the principle of the state. This, of course, had a logical reason. Against feudal grief, against the theocratic aspirations of Catholicism, against the despotic aspirations of the personalities of the rulers, this principle served as an excellent tool. The progressive party of a new Europe, which fought alternately against these aspirations, did not hesitate to put it on its banner. During the transition from the Middle Ages to the new time, people of the state principle, lawyers, acted in alliance with the sovereigns of Europe, helping them defeat feudal lords and clerics. The struggle was between predatory forces, but, in the name of the principle of the state, idealization was decorated with the activities of Louis XI, Ferdinand of the Catholic, Ivan the Terrible, etc., clothed it with a halo of intelligence and the desire for the common good. By the end of the 17th century, when Louis XIV and Stuarts were already the prevailing force over others, the progressive party contrasted the phrase: "The state is me" is another phrase: "The state is a common good" - and led the struggle against arbitrariness in the name of law. But then there was a phenomenon that I mentioned. The word "state" turned out to be flexible enough to make very different meanings. Some understood it in terms of strengthening the government, others - in the sense of its limitation, perhaps the broad participation of society in political affairs. Some insisted on an increase in the volume of the state, on its external

influence; others put above all the mechanical connection of its parts by a skillful administration, uniform laws, uniform forms of life throughout its territory; others argued that only the organic connection of living and sufficiently independent

centers, united by a common sense of conscious interests, constitutes the state. It turned out to be necessary to conduct polemics not for or against the state, but to understand what exactly the real ideal state is. As to the fact that it was the state that is the main social principle, it seemed, and there was nothing to argue. In addition to the incumbent feudal lords and clerics, everyone agreed on this, and the victories won by the state principle over medieval principles and over the arbitrariness of the personalities were in fresh memory. Thus, conservatives and progressives, monarchists and Republicans, people of order and people of the revolution, practices and philosophers converged in one thing - in recognizing the state as the highest principle, the right of which cannot be placed next to other rights, but is the highest right and allowing some restrictions more out of humanity than from the recognition of other rights. About the thirties of our century, the denunciation of the state reached its climax, and the last great representative of German idealism, Hegel, was at the same time a thinker who most openly expressed this deification.

But history went forward, and the criticism, which understood the true meaning of the state, did its job. Political economy opened the beginnings in public life, alien to politics, but incomparably more deeply its cause of the common good or suffering, and the influence of the exchange on political affairs translated the theoretical considerations of political economists into the field of practice. The principle of nationality, viewed by idealists, stated his rights to control the orders of diplomats regarding the borders of the territories, and his statements were in many cases so effective that the principle of the state had to obey the new (and in fact a very old) beginning. Finally, it turned out that the modern social system is threatened not so much by political upheavals as by social coups; that political parties are mixed and their importance pales pale before the antagonism of economic classes. In addition, among the theorists of the state, one conservative party rendered him a disservice, proving that the state is, in fact, not a product of reason and thoughtfulness, but a natural cultural phenomenon in social life. This thought, of course, to give him additional strength, but in essence they undermined its idealistic meaning: everything necessary and a purely natural person seeks to comprehend and rework. Therefore, the question is, should the natural phenomenon of the state be reworked in such a way that the share of the human mind exceeds the share of natural material in it?

All this makes in our time treated much more critically to the beginning, recently still the idolatant, to reveal his false idealization and replace it with true, i.e., having reached the natural basis of the state in its simplest form, to indicate in which this principle is accessible to the progressive process, how it can satisfy the conditions of the development of the personality and the embodiment of truth and justice into social forms.

As long as people live together, pursuing economic, moral and mental goals, which everyone can change freely or even to retreat from them, without fear of any coercion, until then, people are in a public connection, alien to all legal and political. As soon as they enter into a treaty binding on the contract, their society enters into a new phase of life. It is connected only legally, if the forced force that monitors the execution of the contract belongs to the persons in the contract not involved. It becomes political when power is formed among society itself, obliging the members of society to fulfill the treaty. A political society becomes a State when a

treaty binding on the members who have joined it, it shall, and for persons who have never been asked about their consent or agreeing to it only for fear of personal harm in the event of resistance to it. Academic society, legal-commercial partnership, secret political organization present examples of the first three forms.

From the previous it is clear that the state is as old as the forcible subordination of personalities to the conditions they are not chosen. Since there has always been a huge number of personalities in society who, by lack of mental development, title, energy, need other personalities, smarter, knowledgeable and energetic, choosing the conditions of life for them, the state system was rooted in the first antenatal and clan human groups, in the first stray tribes and still not limited to what is called the political organs of society. Everywhere a person, without reasoning, obeys the conditions of life, not chosen, he obeys the state

principle.

The previous one is clearing the two opposing views of the state, which I spoke about at the beginning of the 12 th letter. The principle of state obligation, of course, is a completely natural product, ascending into ancient times, and even more extensive in its application, the further we go into antiquity. First, it is as the physical domination of some persons over others, then passes into economic dependence, finally, by idealization, becomes moral force.

But at the very first stages of the development of the state, an element of the treaty is also manifested in it, distinguishing it from the simple subordination of the personalities of the individual. The adult and strong head of the family dominates the young and weak women not on the basis of the state principle of coercion, but on the basis of personal predominance. The Prophet commands the believers because of his personal influence. The national element is in the family when there are adult members who might not obey the head, but help him command others; in a religious sect, when the prophet is surrounded not only by the performers, but also by helpers. And in general, the state arises when a group of individuals in the name of their well-understood or misunderstood interests supports the voluntarily binding of certain decisions emanating from a person, from an institution, from an elected council, a compulsoryity extending to other persons who have not voluntarily entered this union. Consequently, the principle of coercion is joined here by the beginning of a contract with the peculiarity that the contract concludes a smaller number of persons, and the coercion extends to a greater number of them.

Of course, this extension of the beginning of the contract changes it significantly. The whole moral and legal meaning of the contract lies, as we have seen, in the obligation of an honest person to fulfill the condition, deliberately accepted. But here the contract is actually concluded by some persons, and its fiction extends to others. The conclusion of a contract by one person on behalf of others who have no idea of the contract concluded, but nevertheless obliged to fulfill it, violates the most elementary requirements of justice, therefore contrary to the concept of progress. How would a lawyer look at a contract that is mandatory for hundreds, thousands and millions, but it is reliably aware that it was compiled, approved and made mandatory several people who are not authorized to sign such a contract? How true is it possible to recognize as a fair contract, concluded by one generation and binding a series of generations until they want to break this contract forcibly or flood it with blood? There is certainly no justice in such treaties, and they presuppose only one thing: the existence of a strong organization or a significant majority of persons for whom the contract is beneficial and who, because of its organization or its majority, force to obey the forcible state contract of all

those who are dissatisfied with them. Withdraw from the state or fulfill the state treaty - this is the dilemma that faces each subject of the state.

If the number of dissatisfied with this treaty is insignificant, this dilemma is sensitive only to them: they have to suffer under the yoke of hated laws or to experience the pleasure of the victims with the most elementary amenities of life, the pleasure of imprisonment, exile, execution for non-compliance with these laws or for the struggle against them. Dissatisfied can finally emigrate. As long as the party of these dissatisfied people consists of disparate individuals, they will always be suppressed. The longer the epoch of this suppression and the more ugly the legal order, the more demoralizing the environment acts on the individual, living in it, atroping in them a clear understanding, energy of character, the ability to have beliefs and finally fight for them, finally, the consciousness of social solidarity.

But, as the dissatisfied gather in a growing social force and organizes, they can no longer be neglected and the state system itself is threatened with danger. These dangers are twofold. If dissatisfied are scattered throughout the territory of the state or are bored in its main centers, the state is threatened with changing the basic laws through reform or through revolution. If the dissatisfied are bored in one part of the state, he faces a disintegration. In both cases, the state connection is unstable, and it is not unrefan, because its laws represent a fictitious treaty, not valid: there is a significant number of personalities who are obliged to obey a

state treaty, but have never been questioned about it, have never agreed to it and are subject to it only by impotence, lack of energy or by inability to be aware of their rights and their forces.

As the participation of individuals in a state treaty increases, it becomes stronger: first, because its inconveniences are rather known, more correctly discussed, can be more easily eliminated through reforms, and not through revolutions; secondly, because more individuals recognize the law as a binding treaty; the opponents feel more powerless and rather obey him. It is obvious that the ideal of the state system is a society in which all members look at the law as a mutual contract, consciously accepted by all, allowing a change by the general consent of the contracting and coercive only for those who have agreed to it, precisely because they have agreed to it and for violation are subject to a penalty.

But the reader will now notice that the ideal thus derived from the very essence of the state principle tends to deny the same principle. The state is the same as different from other social forms, that it adopts a contract by a smaller number of persons and is supported by them as mandatory for more. Two sources of state connection - the natural beginning of coercion and the deliberate beginning of the contract - are in a clash, because the latter, in the name of justice, seeks to reduce coercion. Hence the inevitable consequence that political progress should be to reduce the state principle in public life. It really is so.

Political evolution is expressed in two aspirations. First, the state element is distinguished from all the social forms caused by public needs in order to create special bodies. Secondly, the forcible subordination of the majority of individuals to a state treaty is limited to a smaller number of persons, and a fictitious contract of the state receives more validity, the state connection is sealed, but at the same time it approaches the connection of simply public. Both of these aspirations can be called progressive, because the former is referring to the theoretical truth of the state, the second is the introduction of justice in state forms. Nevertheless, both aspirations, in the process of their implementation, should bring the state

element in the life of mankind to its minimum.

When the power of the husband, father and patriarch in the family lost almost all its coercive force in more civilized societies; when economic obligations in the event of non-fulfillment began to be judged, persons uninterested; when the judicial element separated from the ecclesiastical and administrative, then the coercion of the law fell to the share of human activity, not particularly significant. Very many people could live their whole lives, almost without feeling the pressure of the state element. The roles of different social forms have changed in the theories of thinkers. The ideal of the family turned to the free union of those who love and the reasonable pedagogical action of the older generation to the younger. The ideal of the leading and intolerant church was replaced by the demand for freedom of personal conscience, a free union of believers for the practical tasks of their belief. The ideal of the economic union turned to the idea of a free, solidary society, where there are no social parasites; where competition has disappeared, replaced by universal cooperation; where everyone works for the general well-being and for universal development, and labor, having become diverse and combining elements of muscular and brainwork, is not only not an element painful and resilient, but he himself contains an element of pleasure and development; where everyone receives from the development of the development of the society.

Thus, the element of coercion, which was first extended to the family, to the economic connection of the slave owner with the slave, the landowner with the serf, the owner with the proletarian, the court in its forms - patrimonial, church, bureaucratic, loses little by little its force in all these areas. True, cultural habits still support despotism in the family; capital all reigns over the proletarian; the irremovable, elected judge and an independent juror, are sometimes subject to administrative instructions; these representatives of the "public conscience" are too often only representatives of class and class interests. In other cases, here we have only private abuses, inevitable in society, where the ideological principle guides only the most developed but insignificant minority, while the majority acts under the influence of personal and group interests. In others, we have the result of the class struggle, which is escalated as it is more conscious; here evil can be

eliminated only with the cessation of the struggle itself, and its manifestation no longer depends on the element of coerciveness in particular cases, but only on the forced unfavorable position in the present society of one class relative to another. Against all forms of the element of coercion, the struggle is and will go in the name of ideals, already partly recognized and which naturally seek to come to annih least. One share of these ideals is already carried out in the modern system in the name of free competition of individuals, regardless of other results of this principle. The other must be realized when replacing this competition with universal cooperation, and many thinkers believe it is permissible to hope that then the last traces of the coercive element in society may disappear.

But the less ideal of social forms allows the element of coercion, the more it requires freedom, the more it must be protected from accidental abuses of the individual. Ascending even that a person acting morally and intelligently in all these spheres will not allow himself to be compulsion, it should be remembered in the letter of the tenth, that it is that morally reasonable activity is only one of the types of human activity; that outside his man can act automatically, under the influence of animal attractions, routine or passions. It is hoped that progress in humanity will reduce the proportion of action attributable to these activities; but so far they have been present, as long as the mental and moral development of individuals is not

sufficient, it is necessary to protect the weakest from the actions of the strongest. This protection inevitably assumes the character of coercion, therefore, contains an element of the state. Of course, this element does not seek its minimum, but nevertheless it exists until progress changes significantly inclinations and habits of a person. Removing the arbitrariness of the individual and the administration, society seeks to turn its state bodies only to the perpetrators of the impersonal law and to limit the role of the state to monitor the lack of coercion, the protection of the weakest from the strongest. As a family man, as a believer, as a participant in an economic enterprise, a person tries to limit the state system to which he obeys, only an impersonal form of the law, interpreted and applied by a judge, alien to any state interest.

Here ends the progressive process of political principles in society in its first striving, namely, as the allocation of state administration from others. The false idealization of the subordination of power in all social spheres is being destroyed by the beginning of a free union. The true idealization of the state demands from it justice: the protection of the weak, the protection of an honest treaty, the obstruction of the dishonesty, brings the state function in this respect to a minimum and represents in the future its natural further reduction due to the improvement of the personalities themselves. Obstacles to progress in this respect lie more in the old habits of society than in the very essence of the matter. Mostly they are concluded in the insufficiently rapid reduction of the number of persons forcibly subordinate to the state contract.

This second political aspiration meets incomparably significant obstacles; nevertheless, it is closely related to the first. The entire previous development of social ideals, just as the protective role of the state, is based on the assumption that the law corresponds to the vital needs of society. But this is one of the forms of false idealization of this great principle. The law itself, as we have seen, not only does not entail a reason to develop with the development of society, but rather tends to be chained up in the forms of culture and lead it to stagnation. Only in other, additional principles is the possibility of development for legislation, precisely in altruistic affects, in better understood interests of personalities and groups, in moral beliefs. The law can be developed, and it cannot develop. Justice requires that, in its origin, the existence and repeal, increasingly lose the beginning of coercion. This is due to the increase in the participation of society in the legislation. As the latter proceeds to society and to its freely chosen representatives, the law itself gives a means to correct the laws. A fully demoralizing form of government whose power is limited to custom, transcends a variety of forms of the class and police state, where a certain proportion of the population by right influences the course of affairs; then it is imbued with the tasks of the rule of law, where only the economic conditions of the class struggle limit this influence for the masses. The state union is increasingly approaching the public. The State has increasingly accepted the character of a union of persons who have concluded a free treaty and

freely modify it. The coercion of the state contract is decreasing and seeks to decrease. The ideal of the State, as I have already said, is to refer to such an alliance where only he is subject to the treaty, who had the means and the opportunity to negotiate a treaty, discussed and recognized it freely, can renounce it equally freely, refusing to all its consequences.

Is it possible to implement such an ideal? Is it possible to have a significant progressive movement in society in a similar direction? Are there insurmountable natural or historical obstacles on this path? These questions unwittingly arise when we compare the present

position of civilized peoples with the ideals that have been before, and when we note how far the latter are from the implementation.

Knowledge and energy of character are the necessary conditions for the individual to defend his freedom and use it without violating the alien freedom; but the dissemination of knowledge and the development of character is so insignificant in the environment of mankind that nothing can be expected of the modern system, except for the obligatory subordination of the majority, the conditions established by the minority. Everywhere the State still appears to us as a mass of persons, at the very birth of subordinates to this Code and declared criminals or traitors, if they subsequently declare their disagreement with political forms that have not been questioned. A small minority of this mass achieves such development that it can sensibly state what is in the forms that it is in the forms that are shy about the masses, it is especially difficult and what is desirable to replace it in order to improve the state of society through reform, without weakening the state connection. Of this political intelligentsia, only a small minority achieves a position in which it can draw its views into action through legislation or at least try to do so. Nevertheless, the work of this minority is reflected in history. The number of countries that have entered this history is decreasing, but the continuing to preserve the archaic forms of unrestricted power, as in our homeland. In the most advanced countries, the government prevailing over the state treaty is drawn up by electing trusted representatives from the mass subject to the law, and the number of voters increases as much as possible. The right to participate in the revision of the treaty is all expanded: patricians allow the political equality of the plebeians; the third estate is mixed with the nobility and the clergy; bills of parliamentary reform are lowering the qualifications; in general, the right to choose adult males is made by law; advocates of women's political rights act. But, no matter how broad the right of election is, and no matter how great the difference between the political system of the North American States and the formation of the Asian Khanate or the Russian Empire, nevertheless, in both of these extreme forms, as in all the intermediate ones, there remains a common feature: the subordination of a significant number of personalities to a legal agreement or class domination, which these individuals have not discussed or about which they declare their disagreement. The State remains a enforceable obligation for a more or lesser part of the population of the territory.

In this last word, it is the ossimity of the state contract for the individual. The man was born in the area. This area is part of this territory, as a number of events of more or less distant periods distinguished all inhabited land on political territory. Born here, he is subordinated to the local laws, which he did not discuss, did not accept, but for the most part and will never be able to discuss. Meanwhile, they crush him, interfere with his development, contradict his sincere conviction and throw him at the ranks of the dissatisfied. Leaving the fatherland is a bitter decision, which sometimes even impossible to take, and in any case difficult. Obeying against persuasion is a humiliation of the dignity of the individual. One outcome remains the fight against all its chances and sad consequences for the individual, its entry into the ranks of the parties of reform or revolution. I have already spoken of the path that the parties that are inevitably followed. But now we should pay attention to another circumstance, namely, the danger that threatens the state organism with the presence of struggling political parties in it, and the disorder inflicted by this struggle in social life in general. The presence of dissatisfied in the state territory forces the state to spend a disproportionate amount of effort to protect laws from their violation, to maintain its influence in society. This diverts the forces of society from productive and developing activities in other areas of its life to activities that we have

seen to be minimized

by the demands of progress. This develops in society the irritation, mutual distrust of its members and, therefore, becomes a constant obstacle to healthy social cooperation. Here, the conservative meeting hammers a very good and useful lawyer offered to a judicial office, because he thinks differently about the best form of government; there the liberal editorial board cannot buy a novel of a person who has declared himself a conservative; here the professors of botany are replaced, because his views on the economic issue seem dangerous to the minister, and here friends are ready to shoot because of the death sentence over a faint. The more extensive the state territory, the more likely, in this reason, the displeasure that the more dissatisfied in drink; the more difficult it is to monitor them; the greater the waste of power on the unproductive process for society of the process of protecting the element that itself should confine himself to be limited only to the role of the guard. But the strengthening of such measures still increases the generally discontent, and the strength of the social system becomes more and more doubtful. It is affected by the disease of chronic mistrust and anxiety, the seizures of which are caused by the most empty cases. Even if it does not come to a rebellion, then all the physiological correct actions of the social organism are distorted, society will demoralize and its solidarity disappears.

But incomparably large dangers threaten States with an extensive territory, if the laws cause dissatisfaction not personal but local; if they represent a more or less voluntarily recognized treaty in one part of the territory, but cause enmity of the population in another part of it. The distinction of political territories has been very rare in the course of history under the influence of clearly understood needs of the population. But even those cases where their limits have been established by clearly understood the needs of this epoch do not yet submit a guarantee that the reasonable connection of parts of the territory will remain lasting and reasonable for a long time. The needs of the population in this epoch are not yet their needs in all epochs, and, developing, society can just bind the connection between its members, as well as to give rise to heterogeneous interests, separate areas that previously had no reason to separate. Separatism can have a source of very stupid motives, just as well as very reasonable grounds. But it is always the beginning that weakens society. The weakening here must not be understood in the sense that the state center, which commanded the territory of 100 000 square miles, threatens to reduce it by any 20 000 with a decrease in income by several million francs. The separation of the American colonies did not weaken England, nor would it particularly weaken it, perhaps, the independence of India and Australia. Separatism weakens society by the fact that it is the beginning of discord and mistrust within society; causes cooling one part of the citizens to the common cause; causes the other part to spend - largely unproductive - on the protection of state unity huge capital in money and people, when these capitals are needed on the development of society. If separatist attempts remain unsuccessful, suspicion and enmity live in the memory of the winners and the defeated. Even if the separation has been accomplished, it takes time for the surrender of enmity to cool down and that the recent involuntary allies, yesterday's enemies, come into calm relations between neighbors, comrades in the human being, and the voluntary allies for a certain purpose. Only the upheavals of the first French revolution and the broader political ideals set by it smoothed out the disposition of Brittany and southern France to the prevailing Paris. The memory of the struggle of the 18th century has not yet disappeared between John Boolean and brother Jonathan 28, despite their current mutual courtesies. Many more times green and yellow the leaves of trees on the graves surrounding Richmond 2929 before the descendants of the Yankees and copper-headed ones feel quite like

citizens of one state again.[7]] States are therefore incomparably more dangerous than the emergence of separatist aspirations in their environment than the very division. To prevent these aspirations is the goal of progress in a State where the difference in economic conditions, the difference between the political significance of the centers of power and the rest of the country, the distinction between the range of political activities of individuals and political parties can always incite discontent. Violence conceals and temporarily limits the danger, but it is still increasing for the state as the use of violent measures increases. Firstly, the mutual irritation of citizens is growing, that is, what constitutes the worst evil of separatism; secondly, violent measures reduce human dignity and stop all

development in a society that gets used to them. But the increasing irritation in society and the decrease in the human dignity of citizens are phenomena that very weaken the state and put it in disadvantage of its neighbors, and the struggle of the state with separatism can only mean its strength from the outside.

Indeed, if we trace the phases of history, we will note that the magnitude of states and the strong connection of their parts were especially important only from the point of view of their external relations. Economic prosperity, the scientific and artistic development of society, the expansion of the rights of individuals and more equitable relations between them could have been as well as in small states as in large ones. Even by the world being a meeting of individual autocratic communities, we would have no reason to think that in all the above-mentioned relations there would be a decrease in progress, since extensive economic, scientific and the like enterprises could be carried out through alliances between communities, prisoners exclusively for certain purposes.

But a completely different thing is external relations. The state with a firmly organized power has a huge advantage in war and diplomacy in clashing with the union of states, even superior to the material power of the former, unless the difference between civilizations is too huge (as it was in the struggle of the Persians against the Greeks). The mystery of preparations for the struggle and the energetic pursuit of the diplomatic goal is incomparably more convenient for one state than for the union of independent powers. Not to mention the fact that the union of states can be insensitive and fictitious, and in this case a small state can be easily crushed by great, can become a victim of its predation, or may be put to follow the policy of a greater state, thus remaining an autocratic only by name. In any case, the external relations of states raise the question of small and large states on a completely different basis. The less the state is, the weaker the parts of it are connected with each other and the geographical conditions of its situation make the predatory attitude of its neighbors, the more susceptible to its neighbourhood, thereby its independence is subject to great danger; consequently, the intrinsic development of society in it is less firmly; the more he has to spend unproductively on preparing for possible external danger and the more difficult these disproportionate wastes on its population. In this state of affairs, it is very clear that false idealization sees in any increase in the state its intensification, in any decrease - a decline. Of course, sometimes the separation of part of the state weakens it, but this is when this part is a truly organic element of the state body, but is taken away by the predatoryness of a neighbor, as, for example, this was the case with the predatory seizure of the Alsace and Lorraine from France by the new German Empire. Such seizures act, of course, very painfully on the country, which has been subjected to prey, but again not so much in the sense of its real weakening, but because in it for a long time in the foreground of all state and social concerns remains the thirst for the return of the lost and repression. But even more pathologically, these facts of predation act on the country that

makes them. This was evidenced by the partitions of Poland, the demoralizing effect on all European powers has not stopped until now. This is evidenced now by Alsace and Lorraine with their stubborn separatist attractions. Parts that are infected with deep-rooted separatist aspirations, the fall of their country more often than contribute to its decline. Nevertheless, since it is very difficult to determine with certainty how the separatist aspirations of this part of the territory have become deeply rooted in this area, since it is very natural to make a mistake in this matter and so, since it often happens that the separatist aspirations lie in the interests of one class of the population and are contrary to the interests of another class, it is quite clear that in doubtful cases any state is fighting the separatism of its parts and that society has to spend on this struggle. In the presence of other strong states prone to predation, no society wants to be weak. But the relations of states among themselves have retained to a large extent the primitive character of predation. All this leads to inevitable consequences. Since the existence of large historical states is a historical fact, it must be taken into consideration, and as long as the map of the world represents several large states, until then it is quite natural to the desire of all societies to unite into large and strong state bodies in order to ensure their independent development; when the state has already rallied, it is quite natural in which it is quite natural to defend its integrity.

Thus, we have a dilemma in front of us. The less a state is, therefore weaker to external struggle, the more it is threatened by an external danger of losing independence; it can protect its independence only by becoming stronger in this regard and increasing. But at the same time, there is a growing difference in the interests of its parts, the difference in the political influence of the centers and the rest of the country; discontent is growing, and therefore the state weakened by separatism is exposed to great internal dangers.

Progress in the state system lies, of course, in the desire to resolve this dilemma, that is, to the gradual elimination of both inconveniences, it has shown. This is achievable theoretically only in such a way that the state retains its external importance with the least constraint of individuals within it and, if possible, broad political life in small centres of the population is admitted.

In the United States of North America, an attempt has been made - still the widest in history - to combine a fairly strong state unity that can expand to any extent, with perhaps the full independence of the main centers. But the North American States represents in this respect a federation of too large units that do not allow the universal participation of the population in the most important functions of the political life of the state, and therefore do not represent the punity in the fact that the entire population of the state considers itself really solidary with the state contract, i.e., with the state constitution. Similarly, it is theoretically and practically obvious that the central constitution of the union contains too many elements that can later be transferred to local centers without the loss of the ability of the whole union to act as one state unit in relation to other states. In the movement of the Paris Commune of 1871, a program of politically federal system was put up with a higher proportion of self-government of small centers, but the conditions of struggle did not allow this program to develop at least to the extent that it could be called political experience.

Thus, the previous dilemma has not yet been resolved anywhere, but can be allowed by a stricter separation of the two sides of state life: internal and external. This might have been feasible by creating more perfect forms of a federal system, in whether the establishment of a common territory but the plan of the United States of North America or under free time

federations for a certain purpose, which is more likely in the future system to which the socialists are striving. In the first case, the external side of state life, that is, the state as a single force in the system of the states of the world, remaining belonging to the central authority uniting the territory, may have a natural desire to expand this territory, but this function must become less and less important, as history makes relations between states less predatory and clashes between them less probable. The internal side of state life, i.e., it is that which may be more shadingly more frivolous for individual localities and personalities and can cause the greatest discontent, must pass more and more complete to the smallest centers that allow real participation in the political activity of almost all adult personalities. The difference between the local system should reflect the entire variety of local needs and local culture, and a citizen, constrained by the conditions of the political system of one area, could move to another local center, equally full politically, but more appropriate to his ideal of life. The vastness of the territory in this case, not only cannot be shy, but rather facilitates the citizen, since, as this vastness, the possibility for him to find a local center corresponding to his desires is growing; and at the same time he retains consciousness that, replacing one political conditions of life by others, he remains faithful to his common state fatherland. At the same time, central power can retain the protection of only those laws common to the entire territory that constitute not the historically developed conditions of culture, not the result of local demands or temporary hobbies, but the invariable conclusions of science regarding universal truth and universal justice, namely what constitutes the conditions of progress and their direct general consequences. The scientific and humankind of these laws must be the effect of their approving to all personalities, regardless of the cultural diversity of society. The binding and coercion of these laws can only have the meaning that the conditions for progress for the whole of society must be protected from private hobbies of individuals, but as society develops, this obligation can pass more and more from the state law

into personal conviction, therefore, it will increasingly lose its coercion, that is, the peculiarity of the state system from other political ties will increasingly be smoothed out.

In this state of affairs, the attitude of individuals to the coercion of the law would be quite different from what all epochs of history represent us. Always less developed personalities were more easily adjusted to culture and with less strong work thoughts suffered less from the shortcomings of this system. The most developed and all the most developed and all the most worked with thought felt the coercion of the law. In the newly considered system of society of the individual, the thinkers will meet the least obstacles in the state order, because the possibility of long-distance displacement, without leaving the political fatherland, will allow them to live among their chosen culture, and the scientific nature of the national laws will allow them to direct their forces not to change political conditions, but to more vital interests of personal and social development. By this way, the state element in the life of mankind would seek, as already mentioned, to its minimum as the progressive development of society. Reducing the clashes of states would reduce the importance of the state element in external relations, and the increase in consciousness in the individual and the exercise of truth and justice in social forms would reduce internal coercion as emanating from a common state center. The same part of the state function, which would pass to small private centers, would lose its coercion due to the diversity of the local political system, its correspondence with the local culture and, due to the full opportunity for the individual to choose a convenient political system, without leaving the country. In this way, the local centers would seek to turn into a free social union, but the state would seek to establish its existence and unity on the obligation of

reason, and not on historical coercion. A state treaty would, on the one hand, become a free treaty of personalities, on the other hand, the result of science. The state connection would be almost entirely in the connection of a free society. But this form of state system would have to be looked upon as a transitional to a more perfect and freer federation of small centres and groups that modern socialism has in mind in the future.

“But there is no thing all about all,” the reader will say. – Modern states stand alert against each other, all strengthening their weapons and strictly protecting their integrity with laws and punishments. A State treaty is binding on a subject, never asked whether he or not agrees to this treaty; and then obedience is also provided with fear of punishment. Science remains in the departments and in books without going to codes.

Of course, the present states, as they exist, contain incomparably more traces of past history than notable aspirations for progress. False idealization of the state mechanism has many more adherents. The true idealization of the state as a protective element of society, which contains the desire to constantly fall to a minimum, not only is not realized anywhere, but also conscious very few. Let us not blame the present, because it is the inevitable result of the past. But in the present there is a possibility of progress, and progress for the state is possible only on one way. On this path by the help of reforms or the help of revolutions, all those who understand and wish to serve it should seek to direct existing States. If this path was impossible, then progress for the political system is unthinkable, and political history will remain the chronicle of public pathology.

Will the need for a different reader seem to be a direct contradiction for political progress so that the state element in society decreases? Will it not seem to him that, weakening this element in society in the name of the demands of progress in general, the progressive Party takes itself the best instrument to fight the enemy?

The idea of reducing the state element in society with its progress is not at all a new idea. It was expressed, by the way, already by the way, Fichte Sr. in the work that appeared in 1813 on 30, and it has since been expressed more than once. Anarchist theorists have put the elimination of the state element in the basis of their teaching, denying the need for its existence even in an era of stubborn struggle with strong opponents of progress, but it is already difficult to agree with this. The weakening of the state element, of course, depends on the reduction of the need to protect the weak, to protect freedom of thought, etc. by state forces. As long

as there are monopolizers of capital enclosed by the laws, and until the majority has even elementary means of development, until then, the state forces represent the necessary tool that the party struggling for progress or recourse seeks to possess. Under these conditions, critical-minded individuals should look at him only as an instrument in this struggle, they can make every effort to master the necessary tool and direct it to the development of progress, to suppress regressive parties; but by using this tool, the fighters for progress must remember that it has its own characteristics, which force the progressive man to treat him very carefully. In the struggle, it is quite natural to take care of the strengthening of the tool that you act, but the strengthening of state power, in its very essence, can be harmful to social progress, as soon as this strengthening goes a little further further than the extreme necessity in this particular case. It always corresponds to the increase in the obligatory, violent element of social life, always suppresses the moral development of the individual and freedom of criticism. This is the main difficulty in progressive activities by public means. This caused the failure or harm

brought by the famous reformers who decreed progress in an unprepared society. It is difficult to determine the measure of the use of state forces in the struggle for progress in each particular case, but it seems rather that these forces can be used with benefit only negatively, i.e., to suppress the obstacles contravened by the free development of society by the existing cultural forms. However, this is an extremely controversial issue. As long as the state union is a powerful function in the struggle for progress and recourse, until then, a critical-minded person has the right to use it as an instrument for the protection of the weak; to expand the truth and justice, to give the personalities the means to develop physically, mentally and morally, to give the majority the amenities necessary to enter the path of progress; to give the thinker the means to express his thoughts, and the opportunity for society to evaluate it; to communicate the public form. This is true not only for the state as it is in this epoch, but also for all the social forms encountered by the individual in the cultural environment, as mentioned above in the letter eighth. But, working in the allfact of the state element for the scientific realization of human needs in other social forms, the progressive figure must remember that the very form of statehood does not correspond to any particular real need; that it, therefore, cannot be, the goal of progressive activity, remains for it in all cases only a means and therefore should be changed in accordance with other guiding goals. With extreme misconduct, there may be a need for treatment of very energetic. With the improvement of the position of the patient, the drug should be weaker. The doctor-man knows that only then the patient is his health, when proper hygiene is sufficient for him, and the therapeutic agents are completely eliminated.

Can human societies aim for eternal political treatment, not a healthy life according to the rules of sociological hygiene?

Letter Fourteen

Natural Boundaries of the State

In the last letter, I spoke of the political progress of society and came to the result that this progress is to reduce the state element in public life. I had to point out that the modern system of society is still very close on the path of this progress and that the state beginning of the forcible subordination of one part of the population to the conditions of life not discussed by this part of the population is a general rule for modern societies. This situation gravitates on personalities, especially since the State units seek to increase for greater contentment for success in the event of a struggle between States, and as the State units expand, they capture the area increasingly different in the economic and moral needs of the population. Of course, individuals are not able to fight against a state that captures their homes in its territory and imposes the duty of citizenship on them. But to provide individuals from constant accidents of this kind, thinkers put various principles that would indicate the natural limits of the spread of states. If such principles were established, it would be scientifically determined for each state the legality or illegality of its existence, the justice or injustice of its wars, in short, the ideal system of separation of the surface of the globe into the territory. Then every state would have a very definite goal for its territorial development, and in any deviation from this

purpose, it would know that it would bequeath to the next generations a difficult struggle which will end up with the state ever brought to its natural borders. Perhaps such a consideration would eliminate many bloody clashes from the history of mankind, a lot of

suffering and grief for personalities, since it must be assumed that although some leaders of the destinies of the peoples would realize how ridiculous it is to shed blood and spend capital on enterprises, in its very essence contradicting the natural course of events.

But until now, no one rational principle has been set forth in this respect; the natural limits of the state have found themselves in most cases no more as a mask for predatory encroachments for the captures of one piece of land. If we carefully consider the activities of different acquirers, exalted by history, then the limits to which they aspired for their states will be really natural, but in a completely different sense. They were guided by a very simple principle, bringing a person closer to his smaller zoological brothers: take what you can; and at the same time the natural limits of power determined the natural limits of the state. The ideal for such purchasers has always been a world state. Neither the form of government, nor the race of the conquerors, nor the degree of their civilization in this case do not represent the slightest difference. Tamerlane, Louis XIV, Alexander of Macedon, Napoleon I, Roman Republic, Venetian aristocracy, North American democracy meant the same thing.

If our comel-style friends are limited in their political program to the mainland of the New World, it is nothing more than temporary shyness: first, and the mastery of the American mainland is already quite extensive in order to deliver a lot of work to several successive generations; secondly, the state covering the entire continent of America will inevitably dominate all the states of the world; therefore, their independence will only seem; and finally, in the third place.

Of the different principles set up so far to determine the natural limits of states, only two deserve special attention: these are strategic boundaries and borders of nationalities.

If there is a struggle between States, it is quite clear to take as far as each State such lines, for which it is most secure from attacks, that is, it may, at the lowest cost to protect its territory from seizures. But such lines are expedient only in cases where the state is ready for defense and is imbued with enough energy for defense, and even if the forces of the defender are not through a measure inferior to the forces of the coming; in other words, strategic lines are good only when without them the defense of the country can be very significant. If these conditions do not exist for it, then strategic boundaries have never helped. Wide rivers and seas stopped as little skillful and energetic generals as the ridges of the mountains, the Chinese walls and the notorious quadrangles of fortresses. For a state that is strong materially and morally, there is a sufficient strategic boundary everywhere; in the moments of political weakening, such borders exist only on maps.

Recently, the principle of nationalities has become more and more influenced by the course of historical events. I spoke in the eleventh letter about the attitude of the individual to this principle and of the conditions under what conditions nationality can be the beginning of progressive. But there it was inconvenient to understand the circumstance that complicates the issue, it was the case of a clash of nationalities. This case could not be considered without considering the principle of the state, since the clash of nationalities occurs either in the form of a clash of states, or in the form of a struggle within the state for its integrity and separatism. Although history has repeatedly proved that wars occur as often between different nations as between societies belonging to the same nationality, but in recent years, many consider the most likely precautionary means of future wars and incisability of nationality in its annex to the definition of the natural borders of the state. In this regard, he expresses a dual aspiration: the first is a positive one, the association of individuals of the same nationality into one state, the

second is the negative liberation of individuals from the nationally formed by nationality, alien to them. Let us see how progressive these two elements of the national principle can be considered.

The first of them can be reduced to the following provision: it is natural and fair that the same state treaty

should be binding on all personalities whose culture has bound in tongue, legends, way of life. – It is very clear that cultural connection can exist for individuals whose economic, political and mental demands are very different. Two groups of people who speak the same language can have a completely different environment. Industrial and shopping centers can be common to people who have different lifestyles and are different for people similar in lifestyle. For one part of nationality, the interest of the defense of its existence from the predation of neighbors may require greater centralization of governance and superior prerogatives to power, while another part of the same nationality, secured from external attacks by the property of the area on which it lives, has no need for such centralization and may seek to reduce the coercion of the state treaty to a minimum. What can be recognized as a progressive in uniting these diverse groups as one state treaty?

Can it be seen to see progress that the political conditions developed by the population of one part of the territory, as a result of the special interests and needs of this part, will be mandatory for the population of another part of the same territory, associated only with the unity of language and some other peculiarities of culture? Neither the understanding of the true needs of individuals, nor the understanding of the fair relations between them can benefit from this artificial connection by one forced treaty of people who have very little in common; in such a combination it is less possible to see the introduction of justice in social forms. This connection brings to the population of the state territory only mutual irritation, i.e. a source of separatist aspirations, which, as has already been said, is more dangerous than the collapse of the state itself. It turns the state more and more into an abstract whole, rather than a living unit, puts forward more and more in appearance, in its unification, not a common sense of interest, cultural habits and questions in the field of thought, but the coercion of a treaty supported by an administrative organization and the force of arms. Therefore, the fusion of societies of one nationality into one State does not represent any guarantee in promoting the progress of societies, and, the greater than the spread of this nationality, therefore, the more significant the territory of the state formed by it, it is more likely that the displeasure of the population by a state treaty will increase and be more obscuring of public progress. But there is still a reason to assume that a state association of nationality can rather counteract the progress of society than to contribute to it. I have said in previous letters that, on the basis of the idealization of one or another principle in the given society, a minority is developed in it, which benefits the benefits of this idealization, and that, in view of the strength of society, this minority is obliged to extend these benefits to the majority. Although this was also a moral duty and contained the demand for the benefit of the minority itself, such a task, as is known in history, was fulfilled in the most limited size. On the contrary, the minority, which enjoyed the benefits of this civilization, wanted for the most part - due to the evil-thought-out selfishness - to appropriate the monopoly of the benefits of civilization, leaving the majority only its burdens. The best tool for such aspirations was usually served and could serve as a state organization. By helping her, the minority of the monopolists of civilization tried to consolidate the benefits of the latter and suppress any attempt to change the order of things in society, a change that would be aimed at bringing into society a more just relationship between individuals. Such

attempts, caused by social suffering, were nevertheless made by personalities. Opponents of outdated laws and forms of government were opposed. There was propaganda of the reformists. More or less energetic opposition parties were formed to the existing system. It was, as we have already seen, the only way of progressive development for society. Consequently, the progress of society required that for individual personalities to be criticized to treat the existing social system, to spread their ideas, to gather like-minded people near themselves and to form a party that would enter into a struggle for a more true understanding and a more just implementation of social tasks. Otherwise, the demand for legal reforms turned into a preparation of the revolution. The opposition was developed in the rebels; under favorable conditions - in the revolutionaries. Of course, such a struggle of individuals for social progress had the main instrument of his preaching or agitation, verbal or written, in the language of the society whose system was in mind the criticism of individuals and to which they had to act for their reform or revolutionary goals. But it was just as inevitable that it was at these personalities that the blows of a state organization were directed

in particular, which had to protect the monopoly of the minority in the use of the benefits of civilization. Therefore, if all the individuals who spoke this language lived within the same state territory, then the action of individuals on the population of the territory was very difficult; the critical thought weakened; the formation of reformist and revolutionary parties encountered significant obstacles; the individuals who tried to bring society to a more progressive road, for the most part, perished in the struggle and the progress of society slowed down. On the contrary, when several independent states used the same language, there was a very soon rivalry between them not only in the sphere of political influence, but also in the field of thought in general. Persons whose critical aspirations were subjected and may have been persecuted in one State have been held asylum in another. Their thought was free. The commonality of cultural conditions in both States allowed to spread word and thought easily from one State to another, despite any obstacles. The party of progress was strengthened, and the likelihood of progressive reforms in society has become more significant.

History provides many examples to support this provision. The division of the Greek world into independent centers contributed to the development of Greek thought not only in the era of free republics, but even in the era of the despotic diadocs. The unity of the Roman state crushed the development of critical thought. The feudal world of Europe, despite the savagery of its civilization, to the extreme poverty of its culture, gave rise to satirical and polemical literature, the courage of which is barely imaginable during the horrors of the Inquisition and the most complete arbitrariness of the rulers who did not put life and freedom of the individual at all. Criticism of old France during the Bourbon period was possible and influential only because neither Louis XIV nor Louis XV could interfere with the existence of French literature outside their state, among the population who spoke French. It is unlikely that German philosophical thought could have such brilliant development and such an independent attitude to its subject, if the German universities were not scattered in independent states, competing in the field of thought as the ancient diadochi, in spite of their tendency to absolutism. Even for ancient Russia, it can be seen that the predominance of Northern Russia over Moscow and then Moscow over Russia, with the fall of independent national governments, went forward next to the weakening of the work of thought. In Moscow Rus, criticism could already manifest itself only in the form of Stenka Razin and a schism.

All this leads to the conclusion that the fragmentation of nationalities into independent states is much more conducive to the progress of societies that are part of a given nationality than the

union of the whole nation, speaking in any language, to the laws of one state. With this in mind, progressive parties must take more care of the independence of the territories beyond their political fatherland, but having a common language with it than their inclusion in one state. Of course, sensible French progressives in the era of the Second Empire had to see what was more profitable for them, so that Belgium and Geneva remained independent than they were part of the Napoleonic power. Where there are no such independent territories, the progressive Party must take care of their education with all its strength, since they represent an important benefit free criticism of individuals, the spread of independent thought and the strengthening of the progressive party. In general, it can be said that the positive side of the national principle in the division of territories should not be considered progressive and a nation seeking to achieve natural state borders in this sense, in order to include all the individuals who speak it with the language is very mistaken if it sees this desire for progress.

The negative side of the principle of nationalities is of greater importance. The difference between language and cultural habits largely causes a sufficient difference in economic, political and mental needs so that state unity under these conditions becomes extremely difficult. For a large part, when the various nationalities is united into one state, the treaty that binds them, is beneficial to one nationality, is shy to another and excites them with mutual enmity. The outcome of the clashes may either consist in the fact that the strongest nationality eats the weakest, suppressing little by little from the peculiarity, or that state unity is increasingly striving to go into a federal union of individual states. At the same time, it is quite natural that the weakest

nationality, by all means defending its existence, seeks to form a special state, since otherwise it is threatened with death. The struggle for their existence is a very legitimate struggle, and the desire for state isolation in this case is quite natural. Equally natural, in view of the struggle between great states, as I said in the last letter, the desire of the state power to preserve the unity of the state whole. At the same time, two natural aspirations collide, but the question of justice and progress is not in any way related to one or the other. Like any other banner of social parties, and separatism in the name of the principle of nationality, and the desire to maintain state unity can be progressive in one case, retrograde in another. The solution of the question depends on the combination of circumstances, and not on which one is taken separately.

Every nationality in this epoch of its history only has the right to the sympathy of the thinker as it has in the forms of its civilization to exercise for truth and justice. In the clash of nationalities on the issue of state unity or separatism, victory for progress is desirable for the nationality that has brought up a more critical attitude towards issues in the field of thought, a more vivid desire for the practical implementation of what is fairer. Nationality, based in its demands on the gross force of numerical predominance, on traditions, alien to scientific criticism, on the long-experienced periods of history, on treatises that once fenced the rights of predators with the form of a contract, signs a sentence for itself in the process of historical clashes of peoples. The history differs from the rest of the processes of nature, that in it phenomena do not repeat and the past remains for it only a memory. If in the name of the past it was possible to redo the present, then such a alteration would have no end, since for half a century past would have risen last, for him two centuries, etc., each with its legendary clashes and desires, with its own heroes and villains. The past is a passing and cannot be a judge of the present. The judge of the present is the unrealized future in its ideals of truth and justice, as they live in the minds of the thinkers of the present.

The thinker is at the heart of everything the unchanging law of nature, which cannot be disturbed for any aspirations for the better, the true and the most just one. Before the thinker, the actual distribution of material, mental and moral forces in the present, the distribution caused by the past history, which can not be recognized also because of new ideals, because it has happened. Before the thinker, the ideals of truth and justice developed around him and in him by history itself. They consist of the driving forces of the future, the action of which is limited by the invariable laws of nature and the soil of historical facts. In the name of these ideals, and only in their name, it is possible to declare the real distribution of forces correct. No other right may be recognized before the court ' s history. Nationality, which wants to defend itself in the struggle for existence under unfavorable conditions, should declare itself a representative of the best demands of the future, without referring to the irrevocable past. Nationality, which desires to prevail over others, should renounce everything that constrained the life of peoples with obsolete principles; it is possible that it is possible to carry out criticism in the field of thought and perhaps better to realize justice in the field of life. Outside of these ways, there are no solid foundations for the state development of nationalities. If they write on their banner the ghosts of the past, then their existence will always be unstable and ghostly, despite the heroism of personalities, despite the sympathy that always inspires the braveness of the courage of the fierce struggle of the weak against the strong. If a nation escapades itself with the mummy of lifeless beginnings, then neither the vastness of the territory nor the significance of material means will allow it to have a strong domination among the peoples: its thought will remain fruitless, its best aspirations will be amazed by impotence and it will have to submit to mentally and moral peoples, incomparably weak ones. Only in truth and justice is the power of nations.

Therefore, in the struggle for state unity or for separatism, this of these elements is a representative of the law, which is written on the banner of nationality, which has completely renounced the ghosts of the past, bringing criticism in the field of thought, justice in the field of life. The state is an abstract concept, and if this concept does not conclude real content, it becomes an idol before which to make bloody sacrifices meaninglessly and immoral. The real content of the concept gives only the personality in its development.

By introducing the precept to the state the demand for truth and justice, the individual draws a prejudiced idol into an inseparable element of the highest social ideal, and for this ideal, all sacrifices are reasonable and fair. Isolation of nationality is eliminated as an unfeasible question where the state, although far away, approaches ideal requirements, and this is proved by the example of the North American States, where emigrants of the whole world are already in the second generation, and sometimes in the first to become simply Americans. The separatism of the southern states had no right to declare itself before a constitution, better than which history had not yet presented anything, and before establishing the equality of races, which had to be contrasted only with the apology of non-solution. On the other hand, the numerous separatist aspirations in Europe and South America had very often the right to themselves, because the states against the integrity of which the separatists were armed were very far from admitting free criticism of thought and from the embodiment of justice in social forms. Here, the law was inclined even more to the side of the separatists, the more progressively the state ideal that they sought in isolation. Where both the defenders of the unity of the state and the separatists argue because of the opinions and because of the ghosts of the past, to a very small extent, introducing the ideals of our presentness into their demands, there is a struggle not for progress, not for human aspirations; there the thinker

turns away, deploring the spending of forces and blood. There is only a lover of historical melodramas with greed to watch the bloody struggle of gladiators, the fanatical self-denial of the knights of the past with their various mottos. Homeric 3l will always glorify the Achilles and Hectors, but what is the point for Aristotle does the struggle for the beautiful Helen?

When nationality was imbued with the demands of truth and justice, when it decided to break with the past and serve progress, it has the right to defend its isolation from the state unity, constraining its aspiration; or, if it has already reached a state predominance, it has the right to use the most energetic measures to defend its strength and material power of its political organization, next to the neighbors standing at the lowest level of civilization. Progressive nationality has the right to isolate from a less progressive state. Progressive nationality has the right to suppress the separatist aspirations of nationalities of less progressive and historically related to the state treaty. But this is the last abstract right never has to be applied, since there is no need to deal with the separatism of the entire population of the entire population of the territory, but with one class of the inhabitants of the latter. Thus, the northern states did not fight against the entire population of the southern population, but against a minority of the population who sought to retain power over the majority. Under such circumstances, the struggle is legitimate only when the nationality defending the integrity of the state does mean to improve the state of the repressed majority and can bring it truly the highest social principles than the nationality that aspires to separatism. That was the case in America.

Here we are presented in a new form, the question already taken above: if the state principle in its progressive development should come to a minimum, should not progressive parties eliminate at all from international political issues and turn exclusively to other parties of social activity? Since it has already been said that the historical conditions constitute the basis of the possible for all activities, then the solution of the issue must also be sought in them. Since the most progressive parties are still a minority of mankind and the most progressive nationalities are at risk of predatory violence by neighbors, they must prepare for the struggle, must defend progress and in delivering it to material power. Hence the temporary duty for progressive parties not only to defend their ideas by criticism and to translate them through persuasion, but also to use existing state organizations in order to fight the hostile parties at the head of other states.

Of course, this is a duty only temporary, caused by predation, which prevails in relations between states, and the danger of political wars. We have seen that political progress is to bring the state element in society to a minimum, i.e., to eliminate all coercion of a political treaty for individuals, those who agree with it. Since this progress destroys the separatist aspirations in their very germ, the reasons for the struggle between nationalities, the reasons for the discrimination of some nationalities by others will disappear. At the same time, the question of the natural borders of states will also lose its importance. Temporary economic, cultural

or scientific interests shall bring together societies and determine the temporary territory of a federation having a certain goal. This goal changes, expands and narrows the boundaries of the federation, which always remain natural. As for the higher unity, as we have seen in the past letter, it must be confined to universal science, for which natural boundaries cannot be drawn on any map.

Whether the reader will agree or not agree with me, that such is the possible future to which one should strive, but he, of course, knows very well that it was wrong. The forced principle within the state and the predatory relations between the states prevailed. It is quite natural that this state of affairs was all heavier than the minority, which was separated from the masses by the power of the mind and in terms of character energy. Therefore, it is clear that the mind and character of the advanced personalities in the past were most often and most noticeably addressed to political questions. When forced force was in the hands of persons interested in the very issues that caused coercion, it was more natural to expect abuse of power. These abuses, in turn, were most likely aroused by opposition, the formation of parties, the struggle of forces, and therefore it was the most notable side of history that was the history of the state struggle. Who will own the right to establish a state contract? To what extent can individuals and society influence its compilation, protest against its inconveniences and demand its change? Who will have to obey the state contract without condemning it? The dispute over these issues is the entire immediate lining of the struggle of the personalities for the crowns, for the rank of viziers or for the portfolios of responsible ministers; the struggle of political parties in the press, in parliaments, on the squares and on the battlefields; the struggle of peoples for independence or for the subordination of others; the struggle of states for predominance; the struggle of the best people for political progress.

But this is the most visible side of history, its dramatic appearance, her motley clothes. The interest of the thinking historian seeks under this appearance more significant beginnings. The most dramatic epochs sometimes testify only to the waste of effort on issues of unimportant. The most gifted individuals sometimes used their minds and their energy for the purpose very insignificant. The success and brilliance of activity do not prove the still high human significance of the individual. The prospect of facts in history must be consistent with the meaning of these facts for the progress of mankind. The element, the expansion of which is most important for progress, can be important in its barely noticeable manifestations. The same one that must lose importance as society progresses has the least right to the attention of the historian.

As the progressive development of society, the state element reaches a minimum; therefore, political history is of the least interest to someone who wants to find any meaning in the history of mankind. With every external clash of states, as in every internal shock, the historian should ask himself first of all: what non-state elements played a role in this clash, in this shock? Every influential figure should be asked to report: what did he do to reduce the action of a coercive, state element on society? To what extent has it contributed or opposed the progress of extra-State elements? The expansions and disintegration of states, extensive conquests, bloody battles, diplomatic tricks, administrative orders receive new interest from this point of view, but quite different from this point of view than the one they had in the eyes of former historians. By themselves, these phenomena have no importance: these are the meteorological processes of history. Strong hurricanes, earthquakes, epidemics, especially beautiful northern lights, the unusual birth of twins or freaks are facts of exactly the same value as the processes mentioned above. In both cases, the fact for the scientist is important not by himself, but for its consequences or for his reasons. It opens attention and is carefully studied either to find a new general law of basic phenomena, physical and mental, or to cause in the future to create beneficial distributions of facts and eliminate harmful ones. What needs and thoughts have caused this or that political phenomenon? How much has it contributed to the emergence of new needs and changes to the previous ones? How much did it shake or strengthen the former

culture? How much did it give impetus to the new development of thought? Here are the important questions of history regarding each political phenomenon. Others are behind them: how much in this phenomenon can you study the mental processes of

personality, the flexibility of her thought, its desire for personal development and for justice? How can it be to study the influence of social culture on the mental life of the individual? The solution of the first issues indicates the historical significance of political events; the decision of the latter understands the importance of these events as a material for personal psychology and sociology. In both cases, political history attaches importance to the tasks of the higher parts of natural science or the task of the history of civilization.

Letter Fifteen

Criticism and Faith

In a number of previous letters, I have disassembled the most important mottos that usually stand on the banners of social parties, and for all of them the situation had been rightly expressed before: none of them in itself is an expression of progress; depending on the circumstances, he represents a reaction or movement forward, becomes vital or made an empty word. Constantly on these mottos, false idealization works, covering them with completely outsiders for them, not at all ideally desires, forgetting those natural needs that allow idealization of the true, humane. Thus, the great ideas, the engines of history, only in their specific sense, as the banner of certain personalities under certain circumstances, are really great ideas. Only a constant criticism of their historical specific content can give the individual confidence that, standing under a banner on which a loud word is written, a person does not pursue a ghost or is not made an instrument in the hands of prudent and self-interest intrigues.

But the reader has the right to ask me, when a constantly returning word criticism on these pages: if the person always bears in mind criticism, and only criticism, will it not take away the energy of action from itself? Criticism presupposes uncertainty, oscillation, enough time to weigh arguments for and against. But is life always given leisure time? When a person dies before our eyes, is there time to reason how useful or harmful is it to save him? When a political storm, on some accidental occasion, the society and the mass, deprived of the leaders, may rush to a false road, to accept friends for enemies and enemies for friends or lose all the benefits of one's strength and their animation due to indecision, is it really a true citizen who understands the state of affairs has the right to oscillate, to miss a minute? What is beautiful in the office may not be suitable for the square; what a scientist needs can be harmful to the public figure.

This is true; but the fact is that criticism is the work of all life, a habit that a person must acquire and learn in order to have the right to the name of the developed personality. The one who until the moment when he sees a dying person, did not think and did not understand the conviction: should the person who dies under these conditions be saved? He has no right to consider himself a public figure that a citizen who remained so alien to the historical movement that the popular explosion takes him by surprise and he still has to hesitate and think about it: what to say? What to do? Where to go? Where is the truth? What is the banner of this moment? Epochs that cause a person to work are rare, and all life serves as a preparation for them. No one can say when personal or social circumstances will become before him with formidable words: go and do your own thing. Therefore, everyone must constantly prepare. Developing a

person, a person solves all sorts of questions of life. Looking at the motley wave of history, a person is brought up to fight at the moment when he needs. He does not need criticism in the case, but for this case.

A minute has come. His brother's voice calls him to help. Society is indignant with a long hibernation. The banners of hostile parties unfolded there and here. Criticism has done its job. Summing up the capital of his physical, mental and moral forces, a person throws this capital into enterprises. The stricter, more careful, colder, more extensive was his criticism, the more powerful and deep is now his faith.

Yes, faith moves the mountains, and only she does. In a moment of action, it must master a person, or he will be powerless at the moment when it is necessary to develop all his strength. It is not the enemy that are dangerous to the struggling parties: they are more dangerous than the unbelievers, the indifferentists who are in their ranks, become under the banner of the parties and proclaim their mottos sometimes louder than the

most loyal leaders; they are dangerous people who reject criticism of these mottos while there is still time for criticism, but when the moment has come, when the moment has come, when it is necessary to act, taking for criticism, which are hesitant, which are hesitant.

The most weighty words usually presented the opportunity to give them the most diverse meaning, but hardly the word faith belongs to those that caused the greatest disputes, precisely because of misunderstandings, since the disputing, using the same word, they spoke of completely different objects.

There is no need to associate with the word faith the idea of various religious cults, myths, dogmas or philosophical world contemplating. People, as a result of their faith, defended and preached myths and dogmas, performed rituals of different cults, but this was only one of the applications of faith. Similarly, there is no need to associate the term belief only with the representation of the supernatural. The everyday life, nature and history in their diversity represent a very extensive material for the process of faith; and one who has acquired the habit of being skeptical of anything that has no analogies in the world of observation can be very prone to faith.

Faith is psychic or external activity, where consciousness is present, but there is no criticism. When I have mastered the representation that I no longer understand, but which forms the basis for the analysis of other ideas and concepts, I believe in this representation. When, according to another person, I act, thinking about how to carry out this word, and not pondering already whether it is necessary to implement it, I believe this man. When I set myself an end and criticize only the ways of achieving it, not the goal itself, I believe in my goal.

Therefore, it is possible to say that faith is the opposite of criticism, but in a limited sense. What a person believes in, he no longer criticizes. But this does not exclude the case that the subject of today's faith was criticized yesterday. On the contrary, this is the hardest faith and the only rational, the only solid. The test of faith is an action at the moment when there is reason to act in one way or another; but if my faith is not a consequence of criticism, that is, I have had no opportunity to object, who will vouch for me to vouch that, in a moment of action, the reasons that prompt me to act disagree with this faith will not be shaken by it?

Only criticism creates lasting beliefs. Only a person who has developed strong convictions in himself finds in these beliefs a sufficient power of faith for an energetic action. In this respect, faith is opposed not by criticism in essence, but in time: these are two different moments of

development of thought. Criticism prepares activities, faith causes action.

In the imagination of the artist, the image was united. The artist subjected him to strict scientific and aesthetic criticism in his particulars. This criticism found him more and more artistic forms in their decoration. And here is a whole, living image stood before the artist's thought. He takes a brush or incisor and embodies his ideal because he believes in his vitality, in his beauty. Otherwise, his activities are indecisive and insentiable. When the picture or statue became objective, a new process of criticism and an artist may begin, dissatisfied with his work, perhaps, will destroy it. But in the process of artistic creativity, criticism is not involved, but faith in the vitality of the image participates.

The scientist carefully determined and weighed the facts. Involuntarily, they are grouped into his thoughts into a law more or less hypothetical. Other facts, known to him, arise by themselves in his memory as confirming, complementary, expanding the found scientific analogy. He's checking himself again and again. Criticism has done its job. He is convinced of the truth. And here he enters the department to announce to the students a new acquisition of science. It summarizes experience, warns objections, shapes analogies, and points new likely discoveries. At this time, he no longer criticizes, does not hesitate: he believes in the strength and fullness of his criticism, he preaches a new truth. Until he believes it, he will not announce it precisely because he appreciates the criticism above all.

A person approaches another person, sees his merits and shortcomings; he knows how much his friend can be carried away and can treat various objects rationally. At the moment, on the basis of the words of a friend, it is necessary to act one way or another. The process of criticism that has been done in advance gives the result. A person believes or does not believe his friend. He decides and acts on the basis of his faith.

Life and public history raise a similar question to a person. Man developed the ideals of truth and justice, developed under the influence of these ideals and developed them under the influence of the accumulated experience of life and the critical process of thought. A person studied the culture of society, his surroundings, the work of thought, in it is happening, and the specific meaning of the various mottos of modern parties. He admitted not perfect, but historically the best here, but the worst here. He knows that there is no complete truth and justice, and there is no unconditional evil and falsehood. But he realized that under these historical conditions, the struggle was possible with the hope of success only in alliance with these parties, and that only these parties could one challenge the victory of the other. One of them is better than the others, and progress at the moment is possible only by its victory. It is the truth, the most justice. Of course, understanding its shortcomings, the thinking and sincere person should try to weaken with his influence, eliminate these shortcomings, increase the percentage of truth and justice, which consists in the aspirations of the best of modern parties to him. If it is strong, he can declare his disagreement, contradict its leaders, put his banner specially. But there was a historic moment of collision. All social forces are called upon to fight for progress or for reaction. Staying aside is to weaken the best. He believes that this is the best, and adjoins them in the name of this faith. The time of criticism, the division has passed. All the best people must join forces to fight for possible progress. Everyone should join the party that promises a better future. The more strictly a person has studied the shortcomings and merits of different parties and, more precisely, on the basis of his criticism, I am convinced that the best here, with a more unconditional faith, he devotes his activities to the elected party, fights its enemies, rejoices in its victories, suffers from its defeats. Criticism of thought

has not weakened, but it is time to come again, as soon as there is a convenient minute for it.

Even stronger and more complete, the process of faith that animates the personality to activity is made when it is not necessary to make concessions, when it is necessary to turn a new banner and throw a new word into humanity. Social suffering and critical thought have developed persuasion in the individual. It is lonely or has very few sympathizers. Perhaps, until recently, the wave of history swept away and carried away people who fought for the fact that the person recognizes truth and justice. Centuries of cultural habits and legends are crushing from all sides. The thought of hostile parties has powerful, skillful and advantageously set representatives. How does it happen that a person does not lose heart? Why, conscious of its low strength, it does not leave her crazy enterprise? What motivates her to rush into the struggle, despite the obstacles, to the indifference of the majority, to the cowardice of some, to the meanness of others, despite the ridicule of the enemies? It's a matter of faith. Criticism has led man to believe that truth and justice are here. He believes that the truth and justice, which is clear to him, will be obvious to others, he believes that the thought animating him to activity will overcome indifference and hostility to him. Failure doesn't bore him because he believes in tomorrow. He contrasts his personal thought with centuries of habit because history has taught him the fall of the most persistent social habits before the truth that the units believed in. It contrasts his personal conviction with a law armed with all the powers of the state, because neither the codes nor the state forces can make it false and unjust that he believes in truth and justice. Dying under the blows of enemies or under oppression of circumstances, he still bequeaths like fellow-minded people to fight and die like him, if he only believes in what he dies.

A supernatural element is not needed for this. Motley myths, incomprehensible dogmas, solemn rites of worship do not give more strength and intransigence of such determination to live and die for what you believe in. It is true that the past history of mankind has preserved much more legends about people who

fought and died for ghosts of religion and metaphysics than for beliefs that had nothing fantastic. Belief in ghosts is as possible as much as belief in progressive ideas. People who are weak in thought and give little criticism in their lives can reach heroism only in the process of religious beliefs, and this process, which makes up the only characteristic side in them, of course, will transfer them to history as heroes of religious belief. People of thought and criticism represent the bibiöx so many different aspects in their mental and civic activities that he sometimes misses without sufficient attention the heroism of the faith that they have developed through criticism and delivered to them in life a lot of hard, relentless struggle, forced to give up many blessings, and sometimes from life. Coster Giordano Bruno was not inferior to the bonfire of St. Laurentia 32 and Jan Hus. Spinoza, Feuerbach, Strauss were able to tolerate poverty and rejection no worse than the ancient and new religious visionaries. Republicans died under bullets and barbecues of royalists with the same determination as the royalists on the Assembly of the Convention. A belief that causes a willingness to sacrifice without hesitation, the comforts of life, the affection of people, even with life for what we recognize as truth and justice, was in all parties in a moment of struggle. She also annoyed those who, besides her, had no dignity. She was animating the reaction figures who shed blood flows and strained all their strength to stop a story they could not stop. She also penetrated the martyrs of thought, the heroes of progress.

Therefore, faith is indifferently the engine of truth and lies, progress and reaction. Without it, progress is impossible because no energetic selfless activity is possible. But it is not a sufficient condition for progressive movement. Where we see heroism and selflessness, there we have no right to conclude about the existence of progressive aspirations. Only faith based on strict criticism can lead to progress; only criticism can determine the purpose of which the developed person has the right to believe.

Thinking people developed a representation of the useful, true, just. Believers fought for what they believed in as useful and appropriate to them; the best of them fought for what was true and just for them. The hotter was the faith of both, the more fierce the struggle was. The weaker the thought was, the more insufficient the criticism, the more diverse the ideas of the useful and the proper, true and just, the more significant the division of the parties was, and the more much the forces in humanity were lost to a useless struggle. The variety of ghosts can be infinite, and the more diverse they can be the more they can be than they are further from reality. The terrible chain of progress, which I spoke about in the fourth letter, mainly grew from ghostly ideas that are not sufficiently subject to criticism. The more people believed that the benefits of each of them were hostile to the benefit of others, the more enormous was the waste of power in the obvious struggle of the exploiters, in the secret struggle he was humane mutually unfriendly and incredulous. The more people believed that the duty is in the magical rites of religion, in its fantastic dogmas and myths, in decency, separating castes and estates, the more they shortened their already short life, giving themselves less time for real development and pleasure. The more lies were in their truth, the more immoral their justice was, the thought worked worse and life was more painful. Deep faith, the heroism of self-sacrifice disappeared for the most part, because they relied on insufficient criticism.

Only as ghosts dissipated under the influence of the work of thought and approached reality, it may have been reduced by the struggle and waste of power, because the new faith, based on better criticism, led to reconciliation, and not to enmity. Faith in a single scientific truth, highlighting fantastic creatures from it, eliminated enmity in the field of thought. The belief in the equal independence of the dignity of individuals as a single justice eliminated the clash of thousands of different national, legal, class, economic justice and the whole struggle for these idols. Belief in personal development and justice as the only duty reconciled all personal aspirations in the general effort of the spread of truth and justice, eliminated the spending of forces due to fantastic duties. The belief in the same nature of the greatest benefit of every developed person with the benefit of the greatest number of people is exactly the beginning that should minimize the waste of humankind on the path of progress. And the benevolent influence of these beliefs expires from the fact that

they are not developed by religious thought, that they do not conclude anything supernatural, do not need either myths or sacraments. They rely on strict criticism, on the study of a real person in nature and in history, and become beliefs only at the moment when the person is called to action. Their main dogma is man. Their cult is life. But no less religious beliefs they are able to animate the individual to selfless activity, to the donation of various vital goods and life itself on the altar of their shrine.

I am objected that these beliefs are far from common, the pageer belong to a barely visible minority. Truth. But progress in humanity is very small, and its price is great. However, history will not end today or tomorrow, and the progressive future belongs to the faith, based on criticism.

But is a progressive future possible? Is it possible to make real historical progress in the sense that this word is given here?

It is still absolutely impossible to predict in history. With much less complexity and in the absence of an element of developing personal beliefs, meteorology cannot predict weather phases for Europe in November 1872, and even attempts to predict common meteorological changes for the continents under the influence of their settlement, changes in the number of vegetation, etc. belong to the most part of the region of fantasy. However, it is possible to say the possibility of a certain course of progress in history, where the distribution of personal beliefs between individuals - the most important element - is still available to statistics and the lesser prediction can allow prediction. Perhaps, in the very distant future, science may ever make such successes that it will be permissible to predict changes in the distribution of stellar groups for billions of centuries or the form of a system of organisms that will be observed in hundreds of thousands of years; then, or a little earlier, it will, perhaps, be predicted with sufficient probability and reality of history, therefore, to test the theory of progress with the condition of the possibility of its implementation. Now such a task is fantasy. Speaking of progress, no one should think that he decides the question: how does the flow of events really happen? What is the natural law of history? The theory of progress is the application of the natural laws of moral development to the tasks of sociology, as they appear in their historical development. The theory of progress gives a moral assessment of the events of history and indicates the moral goal to which the critical-minded person should go if it wants to be a progressive figure. Moral development of the individual is possible only in one way. Moral progressive activity of the individual is possible only in a certain direction. Whether progress will not be made in his final tasks will be done in his final tasks - it is unknown to Be Bockle, whether he will end his "History", 33 and Conto, whether he will end his "Course of Positive Philosophy." One died at the beginning of labor, the other not only finished his work, but survived the phase of a positive religion. These are opportunities, randomness, which have no meaning to the thinker, who is taken for his work. He proceeds to him, as it should have been completed, and as if the author should never have renounced him. Exactly the same is the attitude of critical personalities to the theory of progress. The individual has developed morally; it has applied its moral requirements to existing cultural forms, to the distribution of goods in humanity; she has said to herself: these demands are feasible only in this way; these are ideas that can be preached today; these are the enemies to fight today; this is the struggle to be prepared for tomorrow; this is the ultimate goal that will not be achieved today, but still is and should be a goal. As soon as the path is appointed, the personality must follow it. I tried to point out some points of the way, that's all. Whether there is a law of nature or not, leading to moral progress, it does not apply to a person who at the present moment can not know it anyway. Everything that is done independently of its will is only an instrument, an environment, an object of objective knowledge, but should not affect its moral aspirations. She has nothing to hope that the Olympians help her aspirations, or to fear that they look envious at her independent activity; [she has nothing to look around] in the direction of the conscious Olympians of Providentialism or the unconscious Olympians of Fatalism when it comes to the embodiment of persuasion. Develop a persuasion and embody it - that's all you need to know. Progress is not necessary and continuous movement. Only an assessment of the historical movement in terms of progress as the ultimate goal is

necessary. From this point of view, the real story represents progressive and regressive phases. A person who is critically thinking must be clearly aware of this and direct its activities

in such a way as to promote a progressive phase, reduce regressive, and in the depths of his conviction, his faith must seek the means to do so.

Letter Sixteen

Theory and Practice of Progress

■ This letter was not part of the "Historical Letters" either in Nedelya or in the first edition of this book. It was placed in 1881 in one of the large legal Russian journals 34 with minor exceptions and changes caused by censorship conditions. I now attach him to the letters of the late 60's, as it means the same questions from a slightly different point of view and can point out a slightly reader in which direction I would have rebuilt the whole "Historical Letters" if I took them in the early 80's, and not in the late 60's. Little repetitions were inevitable, but there were few of them, and I did not consider it necessary to eliminate them. Contradictions with the previous reader, I believe, will not meet, but some points of my view of things may not be clear enough in the previous work, here can be made more certain for him. No significant changes against 1881 have been made here, all that, according to the inevitable conditions of the Russian legal press, was previously said not intentionally clearly (1891).

1. The Duality of Progress

Let us examine the results of the previous one regarding the real idea of the progress that the evolution of thought in humanity has developed and which has to be distinguished from the ghosts surrounding it.

Since the time historical tasks stood before the minds of thinkers as one of the most complex and most important subjects of human study, thinkers did not cease to work theoretically to understand the concept of progress and over the dismembering of the process covered by this concept. Since the time when people ceased to believe in the inviolability of the social order bequeathed by their fathers, from the moment when their environments were developed individuals, whose thought ceased to be limited to the desire for personal interest in the alleu that existing social forms and conditions, but set himself the task of finding and implementing forms of dormitory in which it would have been better, since then, fighters for progress have not been translated in the world.

Most thinkers and practical wrestlers were wrong. In the explanation of the theoretical concept, the unspoken, and sometimes completely unconscious desire to support their personal interests and the interests of people close to the thinker, traditional idolatry was stolen before the routine representation. Even in the case of complete sincerity and full desire on the part of the thinker, to be critical of the question too often, his notion of progress suffered from a lack of observation and experience in the field of sociological facts. Even more often and even sadder were the mistakes of practical fighters for progress. Some, fascinated by their indignation against the shortcomings of the existing social system near them, did not give themselves time to think and understand the conditions for the possible improvement of this system, rushed into battle, without calculating their strengths or the forces of the opponents, died themselves, destroyed what affected their fanatical impulse to progress, and left behind in history only a halo of heroic activity, which most often blinded some. Others, trying to catch the thought all the conditions of the complex process, fearing to cause more suffering by his activity than necessary, indecisively referring to outdated tradition, oscillizing doubts about the

unfaithful future, prevented themselves from fighting for the proper means, themselves cooled the ardor of their supporters, gave themselves to the people less sincere and less understanding, gave themselves to circumambing the prudent opponents.

The consequences of these theoretical and practical errors were sad. It turned out that the fighters for

progress were too often sources of public disasters, even directly reaction actors, hindrances on the paths that could lead human societies to a better future. It turned out that extensive literature about the best and most convenient social system left the new generation in the same bewilderment regarding the true meaning of this "best and most convenient", in which the fathers and grandfathers of this generation were. It turned out that the struggle for progress led to results that were very different from what could have been called progress. It was finally proved that the "better and most convenient" for descendants was sometimes manifested in the path that most of the "progressive" minds in the generation of ancestors, on the way that instilled disgust and caused energetic opposition from the most sincere fighters of this generation for the best social system. The primitive sages argued that the only salvation of society was to protect the shrine of ancient custom; but their descendants recognized this protection as the greatest social evil and in the restructuring of social forms, under the influence of reasonable and expanding human needs, discovered the only healthy process of history. The isolation and opposition of the ideologically connected within the nationalities was the ideal of the ancient world, the ideal for which the remarkable representatives of this period of human life died and destroyed others; but centuries have passed, and among these very nationalities there has been a development that, in this ideal of isolated nationalities, is the most harmful beginning for the progress of mankind and that the economic, political, mental and moral solidarity of all developed and developing mankind is the greatest. Religious beliefs were for the best minds in the long period of history the basis of social life, the spiritual connection of society, the nervous system for literature, for art, for philosophy, which served only as an ornament or a support for this higher manifestation of human thought in this period. But it has come a different time, a time of secular civilization, when people of theory and people of practical matter have eliminated, as far as they could, from all spheres of thought and life, the element of religion and recognize that the only truth that a person can win lies outside the realm of religion; the only morality that can be agreed with its dignity is that which relies only on natural needs, on logical criticism and on rational beliefs of man. The political goals that pursued the great state minds of the XVII and 18th centuries were for the nineteenth generation only the ghosts of economic realities. Even later, the economic goal of the rich state is in our time the goal of a vague and unilateral, until the question of the rational distribution of the wealth of the country is resolved, and so far, the ulcer of the degenerating or disturbing proletariat is spreading, and so far with this wealth is spreading. Finally, even the one-Mutual, the empirical science of the last centuries, the science that has shied away from life, from burning questions and in calm indifferenceism, made its enormous conquests of the world of inorganic and organic, turns out to be for the advanced minds of our time only an elementary exercise of scientific thought, a lesson of a mental period, which will soon survive and should survive a more developed humanity; this humanity sets itself the task, as the crown of modern knowledge. do things about my demands or - you don't understand me!

If the history of unraveling the concept of progress and the history of the struggle for progress is the history of human delusions and self-deliverations and bloody mistakes, then it is more urgent to help to eliminate these errors and self-deliverations, the prevention of these

mistakes. If the goals that set social life and social development our ancestors were constantly insufficient for their descendants, the nevertheless, the living generation can calm down on the established formulas, on the inherited tasks of this life and this development. It must ask ourselves again and again: how can we, on the basis of all the preceding conquests and errors of thought, understand the theoretical task of progress? How can we, on the basis of all the victories and their defeats, more appropriately fight for progress in the form we understand it? And we will make mistakes in our understanding of progress; it is quite likely; but we will try to bring our mistakes to the lowest possible minimum by studying the mistakes of our predecessors. And we may be defeated; yes, it is possible; but even in this case, we will try to do everything in our power to win or, in the defeat itself, to indicate to our successors the conditions of possible victory.

It is most important to remember that the task of progress is inevitably double - theoretical and practical; that one cannot fight for progress without trying to understand its task as clearly as possible, how impossible to

understand its understanding, avoiding the struggle for it behind it by the forces that exist in us, and by the means that we find near ourselves. Throwing ourselves into the struggle for the best instinctively, without an attempt to critically understand this best, we constantly risk repeating the numerous mistakes of previous periods and, perhaps, fighting for the triumph of reaction or stagnation, when it seemed to us that we are fighting for progress: history presents too many examples of this kind. By limiting ourselves to theoretical understanding and abandoning the real struggle for progress, we either did not understand the essence of this process, or consciously act against what we ourselves have recognized as the best. In the understanding of progress, it is included as an essential element of consciousness, that it has never been done and could not be accomplished by itself, unconsciously; that, outside the efforts of personalities, only the repetition of the former could be realized, only a routine and habit could prevail, only a stagnation could establish; only the energy work of personal thought could again and again carry out criticism in social world outlook, which naturally turn to the state of the same way. If it is so, if any one who understands the essence of the process, which is gaining progress in history, must understand this, then it must be aware that, remaining indifferent in the month-long struggle that goes between people because of a different understanding of real progress, and even more often because of any understanding of progress against stagnation and routine, we will not only weaken our supporters, but directly become in the ranks of the supporters of the ruth. In social life, these forces that create a social movement where it is not, which accelerate it where it has slowed down, and giving it a different civilized character, when the era of renewal of mankind is that they are nothing and can not be anything else than a personal thought, personal energy that embodies the result of the needs of a given era and the work of the thought of all the preceding time. Anyone who does not aspire to progress in the sense that he understands it fights against him.

Thus, the need to participate in the struggle for progress is the moral duty of the individual, who was aware of the meaning of this concept. But how to participate in the fight? How is it expedient to strive for the realization of progress according to our understanding of it? - The moral duty of the progressive figure is explained by himself on his own on his close consideration. First of all, in the name of his conviction, if it is sincere, it should strive to understand to others the understanding of the progress which he has learned; he must seek to acquire supporters of this understanding. But if he is "one in the field is not a warrior", then all the separated persons are as powerless, no matter how much and sincerely their conviction is;

only the collective power can have historical significance. Therefore, for a fighter for progress, it is a duty to seal his connection with his like-minded people, to enter into an organized collectiveness of people acting in a certain direction by word and deed. Next to this, there is another morally binding branch of activity: the fighter for progress has developed in himself the consciousness of the need for progress in a certain direction, therefore, the need for a certain change in the social system or in social thought; he has developed this consciousness only thanks to any favorable circumstances that allowed him to critically and sensibly treat the disadvantages of the environment in which he has developed and in which he lives; but he does not have to deceive himself. Thus, in himself he finds the very elements against which he struggles in general as a progressive figure. To defeat them in their various social manifestations, he has to fight them and in himself, to re-educate and rework themselves in his own habits of thought and life. The spreader of understanding of progress in the field of thought, a member of the collective organism and the organizer of the social force for the struggle for progress in the environment of society, the fighter for progress must be still, although to a certain extent, in his own personal thought and in his own personal life, a practical example of how progress in a certain direction should affect the thought and life of individuals in general.

So, it is necessary to establish a well-established plan of personal life, consistent with the progressive ideal, which has become an inexorable element of the conviction of the individual, and the determination to practically implement this plan as the circumstances allow; as long as the environment allows, pressing from all sides on the personality in the direction of the old routine, old habits; how far their own weaknesses and their own hobbies allow, which all grow up on the same ground that must plough and rework the progress

that a person has taken to serve.

Thus, a clearly learned plan of the activity of an organized social force is necessary, without which future progress cannot be realized. A clear understanding of the obstacles to encounter and the conditions conducive to this exercise is needed; an understanding of the forces and means of the adversaries to be combated and the means to be used; understanding of the distribution of real and possible friends and supporters in the future struggle for progress is needed; understanding of the distribution of real and possible friends and supporters in the future struggle for progress. And next to this, it is necessary to firmly resolve to use the most expediently organized collective force for the realization of the assimilated plan, to remove the obstacle to progress, to suppress its enemies, to use in the cause of all necessary means, whatever they may be, until they contradict the ideal of progress to which we seek, to organize the final victory of progress, after organized public force was made for this.

So, a rationally thoughtful system of argumentation is necessary for my belief about the meaning of progress to be the conviction of the person I turn to. I must have a logical argument for a minority that succumbs to anything but a critical mind. I must have visual, imaginary facts for those who find it difficult to generalize, but which need specific, empirical arguments. I have to have an argument of the affective area for people of affect. I must finally have the most extensive utilitarian ground in the field of urgent, tangible, accessible interests for the vast majority, which moves only in the name of a positive interest close to it. Only that progress can have reliable and numerous supporters, which relies with the same force on the method of science, on the affect of imagination and on the calculation of personal interest.

These are the conditions of the practice of progress that alone can implement it.

But all these conditions require a theoretical lining. Both for the dissemination of an idea in various social spheres, and for the organization of social power in view of the activity of progress, and subsequently in view of its victory, and for the expedient processing of one's own personality in the direction corresponding to the ideal of progress, the person learned requires an understanding of many theoretical data. It is necessary to understand both the environment in which the circumstances of birth and upbringing the figure for the progress, and the historical process that, on the one hand, has developed this environment, and on the other hand, prepared the opportunity of thought critically related to it and revealing itself in the very task of progress, which should recycle it. And both should serve as a basis for understanding progress as a natural process in the social system, but the process that occurs under certain conditions, according to certain laws, under certain laws, under the influence of certain forces, no matter how motley and chaotic, the picture of the historical movement in its complexity and variability.

Thus, the presentation of the practice of progress is its theory as a natural process, as a real historical phenomenon and the application of this theory to the social system, to the social environment that evokes the device of progress on his practical activity.

2. Disputes of Teachings

What are the results of understanding of progress in the present era? What is the relationship of the facts of modern social life to the task of progress?

Before us are a series of completely contradictory, apparently unconsent views on this task, and, looking at them carefully, we will find agreement in them only in one thing: that the period we experience is the most saddest picture of the disintegration of all strong social ties, a picture of the enmity of classes, the struggle between individuals, which is becoming more fierce. Regarding the outcome of this struggle, almost all against all and regarding the means of treatment for all recognized social diseases, views diverge diametrically.

Let us leave aside the Providentialists and in general all those who openly resort to the religious element to explain too real social ulcers of the present and equally real martyrology of the majority of mankind, a martyrology called the chronicle of historical events. Their teaching belongs to the structure of thought, alien to modern science.

It is too enough for us and those interpreters of the social process who remain, or think that they remain, on the basis of real.

Before us, first of all, pessimists who tell us: what is called progress in history is a fatal desire to increase the disasters of mankind. All paths lead to this result. If we can better understand all things, we can understand it only as a source of disasters and with the understanding of our understanding to become more and more convinced of their fatal growth.

Next to them we hear a calm, comforting speech of optimists: fatal progress, fatally improvement, the rise of human existence in all respects, the human hostel in all its forms. All disasters, all the strife are illusory and temporary. The delusion and suffering of personalities, what seems to be a reaction) and an evasion of progress is only ripple on the surface of the ancient "river of time"; this ripple is raised by the wind, the direction of which changes every minute; but the total flow of this vast river cannot be stopped by any wind. The power of human thought grows, revealing the truth behind the truth, illuminating the previously unknown paths to progress. The well-being of even those classes that are usually exhibited as stepsons of modern civilization is also growing. At the same time, various instruments of the human

concert are configured in order to merge into one slender harmony over time.

Both of these directly opposite world-views are left quite aloof those that can be called naturalists in history. Progress, they say, is one of the many illusions that one by one another amuse humanity in the fatal change of events that make up the process of his life. All "best", all "higher", all ideal, personal or social, is an illusion and again an illusion. Only the process of mechanic-chemical phenomena is real, which in its diverse and ever-repeating phases causes there or here in the universe the process of organic life, the process of consciousness. Where organic life comes, there begins the struggle for existence, which ends only with the end of life itself. Where consciousness is developed, there are growing various ghosts of truth, beauty, moral duty, social connection, ghosts, through the exhilarating fog of which only occasionally looks sober, albeit sad, truth, through the exhilarating fog of which is only occasionally seen. The happiness of some individuals and the sufferings of others are accidents, having as little meaning in the general process as this or that bubble that jumps on the surface of the boiling liquid. There is no deterioration in nature, no improvement, no decrease, no elevation; there is only a change of phenomena which all have the same meaning and to which any moral assessment is quite inapplicable. The struggle for existence, the struggle between cash, is the only reality in the process of history, and all the ideas and ideals that appear on the surface of this process are only self-delivering, which is caused by the processes of consciousness in order to hide from itself the monotony of the real process that is being committed and continue it.

These metaphysicians of various kinds of realists object to history, changing the exact very statement of the question. It is impossible to know the essence of things, they say, and it is useless to take care of it. Assuring that the entire intellectual world of our aspirations for the truth of theoretical and practical is nothing but a world of illusions in which the monotonous process of struggle for existence is wrapped, we still cannot thwart this veil with the essence of things and yet in real life we will set goals and we will seek the means to achieve them. We will suffer and enjoy, no matter how insignificant, maybe our pain and joys for the "whole." We will seek the truth or what we think is true. We will be indignant in injustice or that there is injustice to us. Therefore, for us, the question of "bet" and about progress will always have a vital meaning, whatever the essence of things. We put it for the intellectual world that constitutes our science, our morality, our philosophy. From this point of view, the views of pessimists or optimists are quite indifferent to us. What is done in history by itself, fatally, lies outside our strength and our activities. Perhaps, in the

"whole" the number of evil and misfortunes in the world is growing irresistibly. Maybe it is unstoppably decreasing. But before us is the painful humanity of our period, whose suffering is the result of the process of the preceding historical time, and people like us have participated in the development of the process. We have before us the possible future of this suffering humanity, the future, in the construction of which we have to participate. We stand between this past and this future with our opinions and beliefs, with our criticism of science and with our determination to act, whatever our mental and moral data. In the name of these data, we inevitably say to ourselves: evil and lies here; here the truth and the good. This was a phenomenon of progress, and this is the fact of regression in the past, because the first for is to approach the good and the truth, the second is the deviation from them. And in the near future, in the construction of which we have to participate, this is where the phenomena that promise the greatest amount of truth and blessings; that is why we have to fight so that more affected humanity feels relief. There will inevitably be new pains for him, they say. It may be; but our work is to fight against the pains of it which we know, which we understand, leaving future

generations to come up with funds against evil, of which we have no clear idea. And this is possible; but the real pains of him are felt to him, and we must seek their explanation in the past, in the future their cure. For us, progress is a possible direction of the historical course of events for the "best" as we understand it, during the period of time that we can grasp with a mental view. For us, the struggle for progress is the obligatory promotion of this possible direction, which, as a matter of the only extent, could, as far as we understand, be replaced by a completely opposite direction, therefore, needs the assistance of all those who understand it in this way, and not otherwise. Pessimism and optimism with their common considerations remain completely beyond the theory of progress that we need for our practice.

On this real basis, we have different opinions that can and should be negotiable from the point of view of establishing the true theory of progress.

And here we will eliminate the few in our time representatives of the mystical direction who are looking for the progress of mankind in the change of religions, see the main evil of modernity in the absence of religious beliefs and are looking for the salvation of mankind in the creation of new dogmas, a new cult. If the religious element has to be left aside during the metaphysics of history, then it is almost better not to resort to its allusion and with an understanding of its real process, and even more so in the treatment of social ulcers.

But the realistic explanations of the present social situation and the possible exodus from its difficulties are very diverse, and I will have to limit myself to only a few main teachings here.

Very few thinkers now see the source of evil exclusively in the world of ideas and count on the establishment of a more correct world-middle among the developed minds and the expansion of rational education in all classes of society to cure social evil. For them, it is still enough to formulate progress in words ideas move the world. For them, the growth of science and the understanding of worldviews make up all progress, as this element, in their opinion, determines everything else. For them, the struggle for progress lies in the promotion of science and rational philosophy, since evil in all other spheres of human existence will be, as they think, eliminated by the clearing of this dominant sphere.

Most go on to the area of vital interests.

Some say: progress was and consists in introducing the beginning of the right into the public system, in establishing the rule of law, which will exclude violence and inequality in all its forms, protects the weak, restrain the strong, will bring freedom and equality into life, will eliminate the extremes of the struggle for existence, the extremes of rivalry because of the young lady, because of the power; this ruler will itself submit to the beginning of freedom and equality. The progress in the right that had passed for these admirers was to approach the rule of law, and this progress, gradually being carried out through peaceful reforms and bloody revolutions, must go further in the same way in the future. All other phenomena can be brought under the phase of this development, and outside it there is only a world of harmful social illusions. Near the

banner of the rule of law, near the principle of political freedom and political equality, fighters for progress should be grouped. To fight for these higher social principles should devote all their strength. Everything else will appear as a consequence of the establishment of a rule of law, covering its idea the whole ideal of historical progress.

No, other, legal relations and all political life are objected only by the appearance of a more significant social process - the process of economic development. The country's progress is to

enrich it, which determines its external importance and the internal development of its culture. The difference between political forms of monarchies and republics, more or less liberal constitutions disappears in the vast process of world production, cosmopolitan turnover of the exchange, in the indestructible connection of economic interests between all countries, all peoples, all public classes. Civilization is the product of wealth, and in the gradual growth of human industry, in the expansion of economic ties between people, in a closer interweaving of all groups of mankind among themselves, the progress of mankind is the progress of mankind. Wealth gives independence and strength, develops human dignity, constitutes a condition under which freedom and equality can be established. To achieve the goal of economic, the only real, country can make all kinds of sacrifices, calmly treat all sufferings, because both the sacrifices and sufferings are temporary and will pay off a hundredfold, when the close connection of all economic interests will bring to the social system the consciousness of their solidarity and their harmony. The struggle for progress in humanity lies in the natural desire for enrichment, in competition, the help of which the most intelligent and agile, enriched by himself, thereby indicates to mankind the best process of enrichment, therefore, the surest way to progress. Devoting all its strength to this struggle, eliminating all the effective and moral illusions that distract a person from the rational path, assessing everything from the point of view of economic interests, establishing for the entire market price, the individual best develops his individuality, develops his abilities and is the most rational fighter for progress, for the rapid establishment of harmony and solidarity of the interests of all individuals in the process of enrichment of mankind. Recently, there are writers and more frank, which, however, in this case represent in a new form the doctrine of a very old one. They consider illusions about the idea of freedom and equality, just as the dreams of harmony of economic interests. They find an internal contradiction in the very concept of a state of law. Progress, they say, has been acquired and can only be acquired through minority domination over the majority and the leadership of the latter first. The state is domination, not the right. It can establish a legal relationship, a certain share of freedom and equality between its subjects, but it remains pure domination and relative to them. But political domination is impossible without economic domination, and therefore the politically ruling class, which constitutes power in the state, must also be an economically dominant class, concentrating in its hands ownership of others. The economic monopoly of property is an inevitable condition for the existence of state power, without which civilization is impossible, and progress is impossible. It may only consist in the fact that state domination will become stronger and the condition of its existence, the economic and political inequality of groups, more generally recognized; and even because, due to the greater strength of its dominion, the ruling classes will be more humane to the classes of subordinates and to give them more humane existence. The struggle for progress under these conditions is reduced to the promotion of the fatal process of concentrating property and political power in one class against others and on the moral preaching of the rulers of the world to leave some share of human dignity and prosperity to the subordinate masses.

In contrast to the previous sociological teachings, a group of socialist thinkers and figures accepts a share of the principles belonging to each of the schools listed, but accepts them in a completely different combination and comes to a completely different conclusion. Yes, the proponents of this doctrine say, the progress of mankind is to introduce freedom and equality into the social system, in the introduction of the right to the public life as a truth, but not to bring these principles into society, because it is in its essence domination; it is inequality; it is a constraint of freedom. With the strengthening and consolidation of the domination of one class over another, not only cannot be counted on a more human existence for subordinate classes,

but their

material, mental and moral humiliation must grow. The rule of law is an impossible dream. Therefore, the state, as the domination of one class over another, is an element which, but its strength and historical significance must strive for a minimum in the name of progress. It could be, as an external force, a historical necessity for a long period due to a lack of social development; but as this development grows, it is inferior to one of its functions for another other social elements and its role in history is fatally diminished. At present, it is already conscious of itself quite dependent on the economic forces that dominate the forms of social development. Therefore, the public truth, the social embodiment of freedom and equality must first of all be sought not in the establishment of the best legal relations between individuals and groups, but in establishing a more correct economic system. If the latter is valid, then the wrong political forms cannot be established for a long time.

But the real economic system is wrong. It inevitably causes inequality and restriction of freedom for the majority. It inevitably creates the domination of some classes over others. He, in economic competition, evokes, strengthens and legitimizes in humanity the elements of enmity between individuals, the struggle between groups and within groups. It suppresses individual development among millions of people, allowing only a few to develop, but even here distorting their development by one immersing them in the war of all against all. Progress in the present is possible only by radically changing this wrong economic system and replacing its foundations by others, allowing the full development of each person, allowing the greatest possible generation of freedom and equality, which allows for the truth in public life. And in past progress was and could consist only in the development of those aspects of thought that understood people the real relationship of things among themselves and the real needs of personal human development and the correct social system; in strengthening those elements of social relations that strengthened the connection between individuals and between groups and expanded this connection to the introduction of all thinking mankind into it. In other words, progress was and could consist only in the growing consciousness of truth through an increasingly developing critical thought and in the growing realization in the social life of solidarity between people, which finally extends to all thinking humanity in its cooperation to universal development. This solidarity can, of course, not be established on the basis of competition for enrichment and struggle for existence, but on the basis of the common interests of all working with muscles and brain; on the basis of the availability of all and each of them means of personal development to the means of productive labor; on the basis of all monopoly, material or intellectual, on the basis of collective labor, in view of the common benefit. In this case, elements hostile to progress are both the routine of existing social relations and the interests of those individuals and groups of the ruling minority that would lose its dominance with the cessation of competition for some because of the right to barely exist in starvation and competition for others because of the greatest profits and the greatest appropriation of luxury badties. Many distances of thought are also hostile to it: those who do not recognize the domination of economic interests over other societies and the need to arrange solidarity in them as the only reason for lasting solidarity among people in general; those who see the main instrument of progress in the competition of personal interests, not their cooperation; those who consider the domination of one class over another inevitable condition of progress are hostile to progress, are hostile to the progress, and that are the ones who are considered the domination of one class. In the teaching of socialism, the fighters for progress are called upon to develop from these real relations between people new relations,

allowing solidarity between all thinking and working human groups; to understand themselves and other those elements that already exist that contribute to this restructuring, and those that prevent it; to the development of a collective force capable of taking advantage of what is conducive to change, and to remove or break the obstacles that are on this path.

Limit the previous one. Next to the mentioned teachings, expressing different directions of thought about progress in their greatest sharpness and certainty, there are several others, parts of less importance, especially those of transitional and mediation stages between those I have pointed out. But for the purpose of this letter, there is no need to list these conciliation teachings. It is enough to point out views on progress in their

extreme difference. Each of these views has its own supporters, its own history, had its own reasons to happen and exist. For each of them expressed and expressed strong arguments. Therefore, questions arise: when distinguishing the above-mentioned exercises on progress, how do we proceed with the weighing arguments for and against each of the controversial teachings? How to dwell consciously on a particular practice of progress, which is the inevitable consequence of this or that of his theory? - I will limit myself here only to the fact that I will draw on the questions that have to be solved at the same time, and the order in which, it seems to me, it is more convenient to put them for an expedient solution. L to put them for themselves is inevitable, since they are not put by the arbitrariness of the individual, but by the fatal development of history. And to solve them in one way or another - necessarily, because, as mentioned above, one who does not want to look for ways to progress and act as his forces a fighter on this path is thereby a fighter against progress.

3. The order of questioning

What was and what could be the progress in the history of mankind?

To answer this question, we have triple material. First, we have a society accessible to our observation in the form as it exists, with its benefits and shortcomings, with its elements of solidarity and enmity, with its healthy and pathological processes. Secondly, we have a process of history that has prepared the present of the past, and can more or less accurately restore the actual course of this process on the basis of historical criticism. Finally, thirdly, we have far from perfect, but in some cases very remarkable private scientific works on sociology and areas of psychology and biology close to it, works in which various elements of the social system are considered in its various historical phases are considered and their dependence is indicated, with the help of the material already mentioned above and with the help of the material already mentioned above and with the help of methods of guidance and inference.

Therefore, the question, we have just put, allows a triple attack to its solution.

All closest to us and everything is more famous is the society that is near us. Apparently, it is easier to start directly with him: it is not for nothing that we were taught that in the study it is always necessary to move from a certain to the unknown. So, let's arm ourselves with descriptive material, statistical data, comparative tables and try to decide: what in our society can deliver the source of progress and what is the element of regression or stagnation? What should be promoted and what should be counteracted in the name of the task of human development? What is a fatal necessity, against which to argue is as stupid as against the law of gravitation, and that is the result created with the participation of personal persuasion and personal energy, and therefore can be changed by the understanding of beliefs and other direction of energy?

But can one observation of modern society allow us to solve these issues? We see only the rough results of the long process, but we have to solve this process in other ways.

Here is a number of sufferings; this is the list of criminals and suicides by category; here is the budget of bloody warriors, bloody revolutions; that's the calculation of the income of the worker, the income that has no opportunity to reach the figures of his necessary expenses. This is all an indisputable evil, and all this in the name of involuntary affect, we want to eliminate simple sympathy. That's great. But what?

Here, next to the previous picture is quite different: the increasingly powerful technique breaks through the continents and allows you to communicate between themselves the antipodes, surrounds the everyday life with unprecedented amenities; science tires the observer of his conquests and makes in popular explanations available to the weakest mind that the rather deeply understood the minds of the exceptionally developed ones are barely understood until recently; feats of philanthropy are performed. We are unwittingly proud of these conquests of our time; we would like to expand them, to generalize them. Here are the elements of

progress, we say, and we need to develop them on the account of others. Let's say that too. But again, how do you do it?

And what if the lists of criminals and suicides are as little to be influenced by sociological changes as the average number of annual rainy days and gradits? And what as the evil we mean to fight against can only be replaced by another, even worse evil? And what as the brilliant pictures in which we thought to see the elements of human well-being and development are so connected with the outrageous pictures of social disasters that with the increase in the kindness of the beauties to us, and even, perhaps, in the highest degree, these most outrageous disasters will inevitably increase? In addition, bloody wars and bloody revolutions, just as the conquests of science and technology, the budget of chronically starving workers, as the feats of solidarity among these very workers, appeared not at the pike order, but as a result of the historical process and can be eliminated alone, others are expanded only in the further course of the same process, the very forces that operate in it, they are made by and some can act in it.

The observation of modern society to us only in this case can point us to the proper practice of progress, when we have understood phenomena around us, as natural or historical categories; when we know, which of these phenomena depend on natural causes, on other phenomena, constantly repetitive (as the need for food, for example), from the processes acting on all historical generations of man (such as the climatic and topographical conditions of the country); which of these phenomena are inextricably linked with the conditions of the conditions. The theory of progress cannot be extracted even from the most careful observation of the modern social system, until we understood this system as a result of all the preceding history, in which certain historical forces acted: some are constants, determined by the processes of nature, others developed by the very history itself, but, once developed, capable of entering into a struggle, sometimes victorious, with elementary historical motives, delivered by nature.

To understand our time as a result of history, you have to turn to the second type of data mentioned above, to historical material. We have to consider in it: what is the phenomenon that is recurring under all conditions of culture, and what is associated only with certain forms of

civilization? What group of social phenomena is always observed as a whole, with the indispensable coexistence of its elements, and what elements can be represented in various combinations? What historical forces arose independently of the personal beliefs and personal energy of individuals and in what historical force is this belief and this energy constituted inexhaustible elements? What motives represent the present ground of history, with which every fighter for progress has to be considered, as [and] to any opponent of progress? At what combinations did these motives serve as the real soil of progress and when did they give rise to a reaction? And what forces, although significant, represent only a temporary allowance for a progressive figure, since neither the duration nor their permanence can be expected?

Undoubtedly, history can give answers to these questions, but under two conditions: with a fairly large amount of its material and with a fairly wide formulation of its task.

Accurate historical criticism has a material that does not cover a particularly long period of time. Behind him are social paintings, somewhat vague, looking into which the historian is too inclined to restore ancient periods by analogy with newer epochs, analogies, always somewhat dangerous. Even further lies the semi-historical and prehistoric period, which has to be recreated in the imagination, at least in some respects, a number of combinations, and again it is very easy to bring into these combinations the personal habits of the thought and life of the researcher. In such techniques, any historical form, which had its basis arose in this era and therefore to fade and blossom himself in another era, is sometimes drawn to the historian as an invariable, permanent, natural element of the social system. The ancient Greek looked at slavery as an institution without which no society is inconceivable. The modern lawyer mostly sees in the current forms of the family, property, police, court something that does not allow change. The modern politician can hardly but seek in any epoch the state element as something separate and dominant, cannot allow economic forces

to determine domestic and foreign policy in the present system and that in the future any social elements bring the role of state life to a rather small minimum.

The task of history is gradually expanding, but not all researchers put it with the same latitude. If the time of biographical history has passed, then there is not a single integral work in which the role of economic forces in all periods of human life would be developed with sufficient detail and thoroughness. The development of philosophical worldviews, and especially of scientific works, with the course of political events, is far from satisfactory in the existing historical works. Even less, perhaps, the coexistence in this epoch in the same society of several minority groups standing at different levels of mental and moral development, participating in various ways in the work of thought, the existence of a majority next to them, standing again at a very different level of development, the interaction of these groups, connected by life, and a completely different course of history for each of them, which constitutes an element of the general picture of the historical life of this period. Of course, these tasks cannot yet be properly solved at the present time for all periods of history; of course, it cannot be demanded from modern writers in this industry, so that they quite satisfactorily dismantled these difficulties, which can be overcome only with the strictest study of historical material, part quite neglected so far, part of the developed very insufficient or even unknown; but it is necessary for all historical work, standing at the level of modern tasks of thought. But how many historians in our time are so familiar with the field of economic phenomena to properly assess the economic meaning of this fact? How many can - I will not tell you how to trace the connection between these scientific works and the general state of

culture, but even - to independently understand the role of this scientific work? How many are able to get so used to the simultaneous historical development of different social groups to restore the imagination the diverse action of this event on each of these groups? Unfortunately, all these questions have to be answered negatively. But without a clear understanding of the economic process of production, the exchange and distribution of wealth, the historian can never become the historian of the masses, who are predominantly subject to the conditions of economic security. But without a definite view of the scientific significance of this thought, is it possible for a historian to understand the true nature of the development of the thought of a given period? But, limited in its study to only some social groups or without raising the question of the possible and actual interaction of these groups, is there any possibility to make any idea of the progress of society in this period?

Thus, the answer to those questions that are shown above arise from the consideration of the historical material for the theory of progress, requires that the researcher of this material be armed with an understanding of the sociological problems in their mutual dependence; that he should illuminate the material of the facts presented to him by a certain view of their relative importance, on their essential connection, rooted in part in the constant laws of natural human needs, partly in the temporal laws of the needs of historical, developed by the very course of events, caused not only by the dorm. Historical material is understood only in the light of the laws of biology, psychology and sociology, which themselves contain, next to the elements, repeated for a period of indefinitely, the still considerable long elements of historical, produced by history and destroyed by history. The habit of food susceptible to cooking could not but change to some extent the physiological and pathological conditions of human nutrition, just as the processes of nervous activity in the central organ of consciousness had to change under the influence of various forms of hostel. The share of psychological processes, directly dependent on biological conditions, is completely insignificant before the share of them, which has developed under the direct action of social connection and social needs. Regarding sociology, it is hardly at present that the truth is that all the functions of social life are changing quantitatively and qualitatively with the course of history and that all organs for these functions are created by history as the various social needs of man change, the birth and disappearance. Historical material thus serves to bring the laws of psychology and sociology at a time when these laws, once established, serve to group and clarify further historical material. We cannot even begin to analyze the relations of this historical material to the theory of progress, if we have not taken for the point of exodus

some already established theory of human needs, some definite view of the role of dormitory in human life, and the attitude of the individual to society in the process of social changes, to the main social forces, which either fatally (for some teachings) create human progress, or can (acutely in other teachings) in other cases to interfere with it; finally, on the main processes. A more extensive and more careful study of historical facts can lead to the modification of the points of outcome, and this is the success of psychology and sociology, which in turn causes a new success in understanding history; but at every moment it is necessary to evaluate and group historical material only on the basis of those data from sociology and close to it the fields of psychology and biology, which in the present position of knowledge are considered the most likely.

The above question of the theory of progress disintegrates, therefore, into three questions that have to be put in the following order:

on the basis of modern data of biology, psychology and sociology, what could be the progress in human society;

based on the disassembled and studied historical material, what were the various phases of historical progress;

on the basis of the system of society that we observe near ourselves and the work of the work in this society in its various groups, accepting in the consideration the historical process of the origin of the modern system and the main phenomena of progress in history, what is the possible social progress for our time?

The practice of progress, which is mandatory for a developed personality, depends on the answers that this theory of progress gives to the questions posed.

4. Context of the theory of progress

What private research is the three new general questions that have just been raised are divided into? We will try to consider this in the most general terms.

To answer the question of what progress could consist in, it is necessary first of all to determine its elements and find in the various processes covered by the word developmente, what is for the desire for the better.

Here we will face two processes in which we cannot but recognize at the very very first glance progressive processes, but which, as it were, differ so that they may turn themselves in contradictory and really entered into a clash in real history.

Before us is the growth of personal thought with its technical inventions, with its scientific conquests, with its philosophical constructions, artistic creations and moral heroism. Before us is the solidarity of society with its main motives: "everyone for everyone, all for everyone", "everything is necessary for life and development; from everyone all its strength to work for public benefit, for the public good, for social development."

The growth of conscious processes in the personality, the development of personality in the field of thought is the indisputable phenomenon of progress for us. The conditions that provide the greatest and greatest growth of personal thought in humanity are therefore the conditions of progress.

On the other hand, the strength of public communication is a necessary condition for the healthy existence of society and the well-being of individuals included in it. Therefore, all the binding of this connection is an element of a beneficent, progressive; all the weakening of this connection, all the enmity in society, creating inequalities in its environment, is a pathological, regressive phenomenon for us. The ideal of society in this respect is for us in this respect a society of equals, in solidarity with each other in their interests and in their

convictions, living under the same conditions of culture and eliminating, as far as possible, all the passions hostile to each other, every form of struggle for existence between members of society.

But these two ideas about progress can come and clashed during history.

The ideal of a solid society of equals is satisfied largely by the primitive realm of custom, in which every work of thought, any personal development is suppressed by the dominant routine of life, where social equality denotes only the least in the absence of more developed needs, the same for all the inability to conquer a more human existence. Is it a primitive, semi-mythical

state of the human herd is anything desirable, something better?

The ideal of the highest development of individual thought can satisfy the system, where the mental gains of a small minority are more significant, that this minority absorbs the vital juices of a vast majority, subordinate to his domination, deprived of any opportunity to participate in the mental life of a minority; strong personal thought shoots can be bought at the cost of enslavement of the masses, at the cost of innumerable suffering. Is the social environment that causes the mighty development of consciousness processes in a few under such conditions can be called a progressive environment without reservations?

No, we, the primitive human herd, are as subordinate to the custom as an anthill or bee ibinga is subordinate to the instinct, is not the ideal of progress. If there is a lasting strength, society is progressive only when consciousness grows in it, new, higher needs grow; when there is only a possible equality between individuals as possible as possible serves as the ground for the greatest personal development of each of them; when the ordinary system, ordinary life is constantly processed under the influence of expanding thought; when the bond of society, its strength is not the same inherited custom, according to the same animating all.

No, we continue, the development of personal thought, bought at the cost of enslavement and the suffering of the majority, is not a process that satisfies the demand for progress. This is a one-sided phenomenon, and the indisputable sign of this is already that, with all the mental successes of a minority, thus developed on the account of other people's suffering, this minority is very little developed morally when it allows itself to develop under existing conditions, when it does not resent the conditions that produce it. The truly progressive development of personal thought is carried out only when this development is aimed at the consciousness of solidarity between a more developed person and less developed groups, at the processing of social relations in the sense of this direction, at reducing inequality in the development of members of a solidary society. The true development of the personality can take place only in a developed group of people, with the interaction of social elements, in which the difference in the degrees of development of personalities is brought to the lowest possible minimum, and with a general desire to lower this minimum. In a healthy dormitory, the personality develops not on the account of other personalities, but with the most active cooperation of all on the path of development.

Isn't that an impossible ideal? Is it not necessary to choose between a strong and solidary society, but who renounced the conditions for the development of personal thought and society with a strongly working conceit, but subject to constant discord, endless struggle between individuals and groups, repetitive internal and external disasters? Is it not necessary to choose between a minority developing its thought, subject to the enslavement and suffering of the majority, and the lack of development of thought? Can a social system be established that is connected with the beliefs of members of society, in solidarity in the name of these beliefs, a system where individuals would cooperate for general development? Do personal interests resist one person for all? Do they not oppose forever the individual of the social system, making it from it either the exploiter of society, or his martyr? Can personal needs be reassured with social tasks? Can a personal interest become the holding force of the dormitory as much as it is an impulse to the personal work of thought?

At this phase of developing an understanding of progress, it is necessary to compare the interests of the

individual and society and see how they agree.

The facts of history show that there is no irreconcilable contradiction between a strong social connection and a strong work of thought in the community and that personal thought can work productively not only in the direction of opposing the interests of the individual to the interests of society, in the direction of the exploitation of society by the individual, but also in the direction of solidarity between the developed personality and the society to which it belongs, causing a love for the tribesmen, for compatriots, to people in general. Next to the struggle of thought against social habits is the work of the thought on the development of a social progressive civilization in history. Next to the struggle of interests for existence, for enrichment, for the monopoly of pleasures, we see opposing this struggle the feats of conscious service to public affairs, whole existences devoted to the effort of solidarity among people.

A person can be sympathetic to the social connection in which she lives, not only in the name of subordinating custom, just as her personal interest may not only be to use the social environment for such purposes as are opposed to the goals of the majority of other members of society. A person may at a certain stage of development recognize that its interests are the same with the interests of this majority; it can recognize that it is beneficial for her that the social connection is stronger; thus, the work of her thought can be aimed at fastening social communication, at strengthening social solidarity. The power of developing personal thought then coincides with the power of a more and more rallying society. According to the progressive development of both considered elements, it will then become possible, and in this case the phenomena of both processes, helping each other, will become really progressive.

It remains only to understand the motives that move the personality in its activities. This is the usual power, the power of interests, the fascination of affects, the moral power of beliefs. The supremacy of custom and rutin as unquestioningly contrary to a healthy work of thought must be absolutely recognized as a regressive phenomenon. Progressive thought must continually rework the inherited habits in accordance with developing ideals. It must be made by the thought of becoming more critical in the development and grouping of existing material. It, in the volume of its field, must be made to think of an ever-increasing, more coherent and harmonious world-sorting, and the thought of becoming more slender and all-embracing philosophy.

Affect as an independent urge to activity is as small as the domination of custom can be recognized as a progressive figure of social life due to the extreme irregularity and impermanence of affective manifestations. It is progressive only when he gives more energy to interest and belief, which are already progressive in itself] and in all other cases can be as easy a tool of stagnation and regress as an instrument of progress.

There are interests and beliefs. When they contradict each other in the chest of the same person, we can have fanatics, heroes, solitary sages, but we have in each case exceptional facts that are unable to become the basis of social strength, historical influence. When the beliefs or interests of a minority are contrary to the beliefs or interests of the majority, there is no solidarity in society, there is no strong connection. It is on the eve of disaster, and no brilliance of civilization, no enormous conquests of external culture or personal thought can close the gaping wound on a public body. The social system is doomed to death or radical restructuring.

Only then is progress possible when consciousness has entered the belief of a developed minority that interests are also of the majority in the name of the strength of the social system;

when the desire to unite society into a more solidary whole in the name of its own interests has developed in developed personalities in the moral conviction; when a person can enter the organized social force in the name of the unity of interests of all the elements that make up this force; when, entering into this force, the individual brings into it. Then the task of progress is established in a certain way. Progress is the growth of social consciousness, as

far as it leads to the strengthening and expansion of social solidarity; it is the strengthening and expansion of social solidarity, as far as it relies on the growing consciousness in society. The organ of progress is a developing person, outside the activity of which progress is impossible, which in the process of development of its thought opens the laws of social solidarity, the laws of sociology, attaches these laws to modernity, its surroundings, and in the process of developing its energy finds ways of practical activity, namely the restructuring of its modernity, according to the ideals of its conviction and data of its knowledge.

If the interests of the thoughts and interests of the dormitory solidarity, the interests of the individual and the interests of the society to which it belongs can be agreed and if there is a true understanding and true practice of progress, then it is necessary to consider more attentively and divide into the categories of needs of the individual whose satisfaction it seeks in the dormitory, for the satisfaction of which society creates various organs corresponding to different functions, and which make up the basic scheme of historical development. These needs are either basic, or permanent, or developed by the process of development of thought and life and leading to this development, or caused by the transient phases of history and temporary, or even pathological. The presence of pathological needs gives the course of history a pathological course; their elimination is one of the forms of struggle for progress. The establishment of a correct hierarchy of needs, basic and temporary, understanding of their mutual dependence and rational relations between them is one of the main branches of work of critical thought that prepares the correct practice of progress. The goal of correct historical development can only be possible to fully satisfy the healthy needs of a person in the hierarchy as they confess to them, as the lower and higher ones, as he personally develops.

In the interaction of the basic and developed healthy needs of a person, the main processes of history are manifested.

All basic needs are the needs of a purely material property and are related to the most elementary processes of life. Temporary needs generated by history are much more complicated. A person puts them usually higher, but under them hides, in fact, the desire to best satisfy the same elementary needs; everything else that stuck to this over time is for the most part pathological growth. Elementary needs are first in the form of the unconscious and create a world of customs, and, with a unilateral desire to satisfy one need, the hostel is cluttered with many growths of purely pathological, preventing other parties from manifesting the development of the individual and society and with whom thoughts must be fought in its pursuit of progress. In the later phase of development, the same needs are embodied in religious beliefs, philosophical world-foreignnesses, in artistic images and, as a mystical or metaphysical idea, as an ideal of art or morality, in the form of asceticism or higher wisdom, enter into a struggle with their own elementary forms. But this struggle is again a pathological phenomenon. The basic needs should be met, and the correct work of a person's thought is directed to the question of their satisfaction in the most complete and best way.

At the same time, the work of thought itself creates new needs that are inseparable with the development of thought and therefore healthy, but developed by a person in his development as

the needs of creating historical progress. They are both accelerating the forces of progress and the most powerful tools for the right satisfaction of the basic human needs. The need for critical thinking reveals the pathological element of custom and temporal needs, releases the real content of basic needs from the ecological customs and religious, metaphysical, artistic constructions and images that have increased on them. Science sets a certain task about the hierarchy of healthy human needs. The need for philosophical thinking brings unity to various private attempts to solve this problem and until then consistently rebuke the system of thought, as long as this system embraces all the gains of science and brings the hypothetical element of its content to a small minimum possible. The need for artistic creativity embodies in integral, pathetic images all the clear understanding of the basic and historical needs of man. The need for moral activity creates heroes and martyrs who implement and act this understanding, put a stone behind the stone in the construction of a society in which the satisfaction of the basic and elimination of pathological needs will be possible, and

often fasten these stones with victims of their personal happiness.

But under this diverse struggle for progress, the main process of history is still being made, the desire to best satisfy the basic very elementary needs of a person.

With a more careful consideration, these basic needs are reduced to very few: the need for food, clothing, housing, tools, etc., i.e. the group of so-called economic needs, and the need for security. The first creates an economic system, its various functions and bodies; the second - political relations, external and internal. All basic human needs that are not in these two categories are not a need that is directly related to the bonding or weakening of social solidarity, therefore, there is nothing to consider. All others here are developed during history, under the influence of its processes, and therefore belong to either temporary or pathological, or to those that are, as mentioned above, the products of the healthy development of society and the main instrument of acceleration of social progress.

Thus, in the motley and diverse picture of historical and modern social phenomena, it is first necessary to discern with modest forms of habits and under the luxurious charred of religious, scientific, philosophical, artistic, moral products of human activity, the economic interests of the individual and society and the interests of personal and public security, since these interests should be satisfied first of all, since without their satisfaction, society can not have any strength, nor solidarity, and the individual cannot develop morally.

But even between these basic needs, it is necessary to establish a mental dependence, since it depends on a true understanding of the conditions of progress. What does 35 in social tasks and social development, political or economic interests? - - Should the help of the right state reorganization achieve economic progress or under political clashes and struggle for power only have to be seen only by economic tasks? - Should we call on the ancient wise Solon or a new, fabulous Utopian 36Utopia 36, which should the proper economic order be established by law? Is it necessary to campaign for a general supply of votes and fight at the barricades, as it was done in Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Rome, in order to win back political progress, and with it together and economic? - Or, perhaps, on this path, mankind followed illusions; the wise Souls gave only the legal form of real economic domination in advance. The utopians never existed, and if they existed, they would be weak before economic forces, near them prevailing until they had found the means to undermine these forces. Have all the constitutions, statutes, charters always and everywhere written those social groups in the hands of which were actually economic domination? Did not the miserable fiasco, with all the heroism and self-ordon of the

personalities involved, all political revolutions, if they did not change the distribution of wealth in society, and did not only have enough of them what meant the economic reorganization? Were not only the plans for the redistribution of wealth that relied on the already existing changes in the form of production and exchange? Were not the real, truly radical demands of the fighting parties that belonged to the satisfaction of economic needs and that corresponded to the actual conditions of economic life of society in this era?

When considering the interaction of economic and political needs in history, the scientific solution of the question is inclined to the domination of the former above the latter, and everywhere, where with the help of historical material you can see with more the true course of facts, it is necessary to say that the political struggle and its faces had the basis of economic struggle; that the solution of the political question in one direction or the other was determined by economic forces; that these economic forces created political forms that were convenient for themselves every time, then they were looking for a theoretical idealization.

However, more than once these political forms, distracted ideas and concrete ideals created by economic forces, established, becoming an element of the cultural system, turned into independent social forces and, forgetting or rejecting their origin, entered into a struggle for domination with the very economic forces that created them, causing new forms of economic needs, to the historical arena. The feudal system of property

was undermined to a large extent by the administrative and state system that it itself created for its security, and the idea of a treaty, which it itself put forward as a fence from the abuse of a central state body. The modern state militarism, which protects the shrine of the property of the stock and factory kings from the famine proletariat, is repeatedly in the hands of Napoleons III, Bismarts and their imitators an instrument of plans, far from the same with the economic interests of these kings. The ideal of equality, in the name of which the bourgeoisie has consolidated its domination over the feudal owners in the preceding period, becomes a double-edged sword for it in the real social struggle, when the proliferating proletariat emphasizes in this ideal an element of equality of economic.

Thus, the struggle of economic forces is complicated by the participation of those products of this struggle in the field of political forms and ideal tasks that require self-domination in the name of their own right to historical existence. But, no matter how diverse the forms of this struggle, its process is not inherently complex.

The conditions of production and exchange in this era, in combination with existing political forms and with an inherited share of the habits of culture, establish a fatal distribution of wealth, and therefore, the distribution of labor and leisure, the distribution of the possibility of work in a given society. A dominant minority is formed, concentrating in its hands the main share of wealth, therefore monopolizing the main share of social influence and political power, inevitably monopolizing almost exclusively and leisure for the work of thought, and this work itself. It seeks to strengthen its rule by custom, laws, beliefs, philosophical and scientific considerations, artistic creation. The position of the subordinate of the majority is getting worse. The habits of thought and life are increasingly separate by the ruling minority from the subordinate majority. The story of the former, with its more or less brilliant appearance of cultural forms and more or less powerful conquests of idle thought, is becoming increasingly alien to the social life of the majority working to create this minority civilization. But one coexistence of them next to some pathological phenomena. The need to keep the exploited majority distorts the work of the minority's thought. The presence of pleasures, inaccessible to

him, in the field of material and intellectual, increasingly irritates the majority, makes him an enemy of the ruling classes and the entire available social order. The class struggle is growing and exacerbated. Public solidarity is becoming fictitious, and the existence of society is in danger.

With the sharp formulation of this public disorder, which existed all the time and nearby in the ancient world, with the isolation of nationalities, the catastrophe came quickly and decisively. A poorer predatory neighbour came with the intent to take advantage of the simplest image of the wealth accumulated by the minority of society in question. Most were quite indifferent to the imminent danger. The minority was ruined or perished. Civilization disappeared with all its brilliance, and after thousands of years archaeologists read with amazement on papyri and clay bricks the evidence of unheard-of conquests of thought; they mourned the catastrophe that destroyed this "forgotten civilization", and usually forgot to mourn the fate of the majority of the majority, who lived with her side, who created it later and blood.

There was another outcome. The creation of political forms caused to social life, in the interests of the ruling minority, new social groups, which, taking advantage of the case or fatal development of the technique of production and exchange, the technique of political life, with their own gaining economic independence, therefore, and social influence. Several intermediate strata arose between the undoubted minority and certainly subordinated masses, which had a share in the domination of subordination and, of course, sought to increase the first and reduce the second. Sometimes the work of thought passed almost entirely to these intermediate layers. Progress in technology and exchange reinforced some. Literary, scientific, philosophical, artistic creativity became the lot of others. Various ideals, various worldviews were created and faced in the arena of thought. They were arguing for social domination of various forces. The one that was able to link its interests, really or fictitiously, with the interests of the unconditionally subordinate and suffering masses, became the prevailing force, because it managed to direct the real or ghostly "growth of public

consciousness" to "strengthen social solidarity" in its favor. This predominant force or decomposed the social organs of its opponents and grew on their ruins, which disintegrated as they could, as they could, (as the organization of the church grew on the decaying Roman Empire), or caused a more or less bloody revolution and on the shoulders of subordinate classes rose to unconditional economic and legal domination, creating new social forms in which its aides in the struggle usually took the same subordinate place as well. A new period of history began, due in essence to the economic domination of the new social stratum, which creates in accordance with new political forms, new products of thought for the idealization of the existing one and thereby giving rise to new intermediate strata that could grow into new social forces.

But at the same time, the recurring basic process of the soil on which it occurred was constantly changing, and therefore the phenomena never repeated and could not be repeated. The new economically dominant class was not at all in the position of his predecessors, since it relied on other forms of production and exchange; having a different combination of social forces, he had to take into account other ideal products of thought and other social habits, and therefore he was threatened with other catastrophes.

And, accordingly, the fighters for progress in each epoch had other tasks both in terms of the opportunity to spread their understanding of progress, and in relation to the means to organize

a public force to fight for it, as well as in terms of the development of themselves and around themselves new habits of thought and life, in harmony with a new understanding of progress. But always and everywhere these tasks, correctly understood, had the same essence. This essence was as follows: to change the forms of distribution of social forces, mainly the form of distribution of wealth, according to the existing conditions of production and exchange, using the existing usual ordinary and legal forms of social organization, taking into account various existing conquests of scientific thought, building philosophical thought, types of artistic, ideals of thought moral; to make these changes in the direction of the greatest increase and expansion of social solidarity and the greatest growth of social consciousness; finally, to consolidate the change that has become more harmonious.

Only such could be progress in human society, and only by recognizing it as the point of exodus, we can correctly raise the following question: what were actually the real phases of historical progress?

Here, first of all, it is necessary to keep in mind the tasks of the history of civilization and on the basis of these tasks to understand the phases of the historical process as a whole. I pointed out these tasks already in the first letter, but now they are kept to formulate somewhat differently.

The history of civilization must show how the first culture has developed from the natural needs; how it has immediately added to the natural needs of habits and legends; as thought has worked on this ground, increasing knowledge, clarifying justice, rounding up philosophy, embodying its gains into life; as a number of cultures which replaced one another; as their forms gave more or less scope to the work of thought; as the deeds of the same veins, the same.

Even in short, the task of the history of civilization can be expressed as follows: to show how the critical idea of personalities processed the culture of societies, seeking to bring to civilization more truth and justice.

On the basis of the previous decision on the actual course of historical progress, the following form is presented. The researcher will first have to consider the transition from the anthropological realm of custom to the period of separate nationalities. The observer then arises, as a result of the increased exchange of material and ideal and increased economic and mental dependence between nations, the idea of universal human wisdom, the universal legal state, the universal fraternal religion. But precisely because these universal principles were not firmly connected with the basic needs of man, they failed to establish the solidarity of mankind, and the new European civilization, characterized by the fact that it became csecular civilization, returned to the contradictory ideas of separate state organisms in the existence of universal scientific truth preached in all languages, in all schools; with the preserved - albeit weakening -

experience of a universal, one for all people. It goes without saying that the contradictory social ideals, while created, could not be lasting. For two centuries, the ideal of social solidarity in the form of state absolutism did not exist. As soon as he changed the ideal of state democracy, as the thought of political economy, which raised the rationale for political economy, demanding primacy for economic principles. But the political economy, which acted as an ally and the ideal justification for the economic and political domination of the bourgeoisie, as a scientific element of the rule of law, very soon met with new tasks for which the bourgeoisie was powerless. Fatically evocariatically evocaria, the existence of all the

growing, or excitatory proletariat, with political forms caused by them, with ideal products that have grown under the influence of its struggle against medieval feudalism and with the new absolutism, did not allow the bourgeoisie to eliminate the existence of the proletariat or prevent it from growing into social power. In the name of the previously developed democratic ideals, the demands of the economic restructuring of society arose again and again under different forms. First, utopians began to draw their pictures of a new organic period in the life of mankind, the kingdom of harmony between capital, talent and labor, the slender world of universal cooperation in work and development. But the struggle of social forces could never end so peacefully. The camp of the working people to support modern civilization was separated by an increasingly deep abyss from the camp of those who use this civilization, and with the modern growth of thought, there could no longer be the numerous intermediate classes between the indisputable kings of the exchange and the proletariat, which brought its hands and their brains to the market. In the ranks of the rebels against the capitalist system, the fighters who relied on all conquests of the thought of previous periods did not hesitate to appear, and fatally this idea in its development set tasks more acute and categorical. She set the task of sociology as a single science, as a crown of spiders. It put forward the law of universal evolution and proclaimed that all social phenomena and forms are phenomena and forms of temporary, "historical categories". It made it felt both the irreconcilable antithesis of capital and labor, and the fatal generation of the proletariat by the very development of capitalism, and the imminent catastrophe that threatens capitalism. The bourgeois ideals of progress through universal competition, the space speculations of the exchange for the accumulation of untold riches in the hands of its tsars was opposed to the ideal of the solidarity of the working people, and only the working people. The ideal of the all-powerful state, which protects the sacred property of the speculators, was opposed to the ideal of political anarchy, based on the mutual exchange of services. The idea of creating a new social power to defeat the old was embodied in the call "Join!", addressed to the chronically starving classes of all countries and tribes, and for eight years the first attempt to organize this force, terrible all the dominant elements of the old world 37, existed. It fell not under their blows, but because of the shortcomings of her own organization, inevitable in any first attempt of this kind. The noise and thunder of political rivalry between states, the intricacies of diplomats, the temporary fireworks of the "cultural struggle" of secular thought against the exhausted clericalism could not and cannot and cannot close from the attentive observer the economic foundations of modern discord that cause most of the pains of our period, and those economic problems that urgently require themselves to be solved, since the solution of all other problems depends on their solution. xx.

And on the basis of this understanding of the general content of progress and its phases, the third and most burning of the questions posed above arises, because it is closest to practice, namely: what is the possible social progress for

If the present system is wrong, if there is irreconcilable discord in it, if the previous history has destroyed the solidarity of religious, national, family, state ties, if all the old ideals have faded and lost fertility and if the general laws of sociological dependence of phenomena convince us that the dissatisfaction of economic needs lies at the heart of any social disease, that the economic reorganization is the first and necessary step in any social treatment, then what should be? Is there no direct indication under the existing conditions of production and exchange of direct indications of how distribution should change? Have science and literature, philosophy and life, put rather clearly before all sincere minds of the truths which should be

translated into practice, those ideals that should be realized in larger dimensions? Is it possible to determine in what direction competition does not availate to think about the harmony of interests, the establishment of solidarity between individuals and groups and in what kind of solidarity is not only possible, but already carried out under the most unfavorable conditions, with the most sad situation? Is it possible, on the basis of the previous growth of thought, with sufficient fidelity to determine the nearest phase of the progressive development of social consciousness?

If the question of the necessary economic reorganization for us is resolved, if we have learned a certain plan for the restoration and strengthening of the solidarity that has now been destroyed in society, a certain plan for the growth of social consciousness, what political forms will best correspond to the new economic forms of production, exchange and distribution, the needs of the comprehensive development of the individual and universal cooperation for collective social development and will make it better offset this progressive process? What is the system of knowledge, what philosophical world outlook, which artistic types will strengthen the new order in the field of ideas? How should a progress fighter live in our time, so that his life is in line with his determination to fight for progress?

We put only questions, but the reader to whom we turn, the reader, who has not thrown the previous pages as disturbing his thoughts, the routine of his life, the reader, who thought about the tasks set on these pages, will find certain answers to these particular questions. These answers should not be subtracted from the book, accepted on faith: they should be drawn from life; they should form the basis of life's persuasion.

When these private answers are received, it is in their combination that will put an answer to the question posed above: what is the social progress for What is it for a society that wants to be a representative of the best aspirations of modern mankind? What is it for a person who thirsts not the tranquility of a routine life, not the pleasures of an intelligent sensible animal, but a enjoyment of the life of the ideological in his consciousness, the life of solidarity with all that in humanity strives for development, life of historical, unfolding for mankind, a wider future that is unfolding for mankind?

At this stage, the theory of progress merges with its practice. It is impossible to understand him without participating in the case, and this very thing understands his understanding. It is not easy to understand both internal breakdown and numerous victims of life. It is not easy when it very often breaks the connections of a person with loved ones, when it destroys the fantastic beliefs of the individual, sometimes forced to tear it away from the family, from the homeland, from everything that caress and lulls a person, but at the same time can narrow his desire for progress; from what can draw him into the tyre of social stagnation. History requires sacrifice. They are brought in themselves and near themselves by the one who takes on the great but formidable task of being a fighter for his own and for someone else's development. Developmental objectives should be allowed. A better historical future must be conquered. Before each person who has reached the consciousness of the need for development, the terrible question has become a terrible question: will you be one of those who are ready for all kinds of sacrifices and all suffering, if only he managed to be a conscious and understanding figure of progress, or will you stand a side by an inactive spectator of the terrible mass of evil, near you, conscious of his apostasy from the path to development, the need for which you once felt? Choose. [[8]

Letter Seventeen

The Author's Aim

Looking through these letters, the reader, perhaps, it may have been possible to ask himself, why these letters are “historical”, what are historical in them? I did not consider individuals, not epochs, not events, but some general principles that could easily seem somewhat distracted by the reader, even sometimes alien to the interest that the reader finds in the historical story. Let’s look at the question more carefully. I will try to bring together the thoughts expressed here in different places of these letters, and those that I may have not

clearly expressed enough, but which I wanted to arouse in the reader. Is there a reason to justify me?

What are we looking for in history? Is it a colorful story about events? Few will dare to answer in the affirmative, and those who are looking for only this will be absolutely right if they complain about the distraction of the letters offered by him. By embarking on more serious demands in history, it is possible to seek either the struggle of individuals and societies for human interests, clashes for opinions, the weakening and development of different particular ideals of man; or a common natural law covering the entire course of historical events, the past, present and future. The first point of view separates the interests of history from the interests of natural science; the second brings down the history of the general beginnings of the study of nature. But in fact, for strict research, these two points of view do not differ very much between themselves, because knowledge of an object is determined not only by the fact that it is desirable to know about it, but by the fact that it is possible to know about it. So the question is: what can be found in history? – turns into another: how, according to the unchanging laws of his mental decrees, can a person treat history? What inevitably eludes its scientific assessment and can be only a ghostly phenomenon of historical construction? Only by establishing this more or less basis of scientific research can a person associate with some certainty questions about what he wants to know from having to bear.

But I tried to develop at the very beginning the position that for a person it is inevitable to make his personal moral development, his moral ideal, to assess the historical events. In the struggle of personalities, the most important is the properties of personalities that he recognizes as elements of moral dignity: intelligence, agility, resourcefulness, strength of persuasion, faith in those ideas that are important for the researcher, conscious or unconscious assistance to their strengthening or weakening in society.

In the struggle of societies and parties, the researcher is more important again than the intensification or weakening of those directions of thought which for him as a person represent the best or worst, the most true or the most false. Covering in general worldview the whole process of history in the past and the future, a person cannot, according to the laws of his thought, to seek in history nothing but the phases of the progressive process of his moral ideal. Therefore, trying to understand history, to bring to it serious interest in thought, a person inevitably attributes personality, events, ideas, social upheavals to the measure of his development. If it is narrow and shallow, then history presents it with a lifeless series of facts and these facts will be uninterested and inhuman to him. If its development is unilateral, then the most careful study of history will not protect it from unilateralism in the representation of historical events. If he is imbued with ugly, fantastic belief, then he will inevitably mutilate

history, no matter how he tries to understand its objective understanding. In any case, with sufficient fact knowledge, the degree of development of the personality, its moral height determines the understanding of history. The private historical interest, aroused by certain personalities, certain events, is arguing on the common interest, initiated by their participation in the progressive development of mankind. The general natural-confuious interest, initiated by the search for the law of history as a whole, is nothing but the interest of the realization of our moral ideal in the progressive course of history.

If this is the case, then we seek and can only look for different phases of progress in history, and to understand history, is to understand clearly the ways of exercising our moral ideal in a historical setting. Our ideal is subjective, but the better we test it with criticism, the greater the belief that it is the highest moral ideal possible in the present epoch. We attach this ideal to the objective facts of history, and this does not prevent them from being objectively faithful, since here their fidelity depends on our knowledge and on our criticism; the subjective ideal gives them perspective, and there is no other way to build this perspective, as in the concept of a moral ideal. It is objected to me that there is another way and a more correct one: it is to build the perspective of the events of the epoch on their internal connection and by the moral ideal of the era itself. But what does an internal connection mean? What does the moral ideal of this era mean?

Of the thousand motley facts known to us about this epoch, we build a connection, for most likely, on the

basis of what we have realized as the most true psychical executing personality, the most general sociological phenomena in the collection of personalities. This is the "intradition" for us. A historian who has developed an understanding of economic issues for society will find a different internal connection of events than one that has dwelt on the understanding of the influence of political intrigues. A writer who is aware of the power of beliefs, hobbies and unconscious self-deceptions in the personality, otherwise will bind events to what a writer is accustomed to attribute everything to calculation and cunning.

The "moral ideal of the age"! Why do we collect his traits from these events, and not from others, with them next to them? Why do we draw evidence mainly from this author, and not from his contemporary? Because these events represent more wholeness, consistency; because this author is smarter, more consistent, more honest, more frank than his contemporary. But do we not express our moral ideal about the most significant events of the most significant personalities? It is absolutely true that historical events should be described in their "internal connection", evaluated by the "moral ideal of the epoch", but this most internal connection and this most moral ideal and can be discovered by the development of in us the ideal of impartial truth, historical justice, and the very connection of epochs and successive ideals is still subject to the judgment of another criticism, namely, criticism of historical progress, that is, our moral ideal in its whole. Therefore, we will give one era more importance than the other; one events in their inner connection will be considered in more detail than others. I repeat: the moral ideal of history is the only cankeness that can give the perspective of history in its whole and in its particulars.

Therefore, to understand history in our time means to clearly understand the moral ideal developed by the best thinkers in our time, and the historical conditions of its implementation, because the process of history is not a abstract, but a specific process. It can only use tools of a certain kind. It is done under this situation, which determines the possible and impossible. It

obeys the inevitable laws of nature, as well as all other processes. To understand history, you should constantly pay attention to these external conditions, in which human ideals are placed. The necessary processes of physics, physiology and psychology do not represent the possibility of neither deception nor a jump. Historically, this environment is as little eliminated in this era with all its influences as the previous need is never eliminated. The brightest truth, the highest justice is subject to its manifestation and dissemination to these limiting conditions. The most talented and energetic person can only of the necessary conditions of nature and, from historically given environmental conditions, draw material for their thought and for their activities. Historical interest, clearly understood, poses first of all the question to each epoch: what was possible in this era for the progressive movement? How did the people understand the conditions in which they were? Have they taken advantage of all the conditions of time for their own purposes?

But to clearly understand the modern ideal is to eliminate from it all the ghosts that wove to it the legends, the erroneous traditions of thought, the evil habits of previous eras. Truth and justice are more or less unquestioningly written on all banners of our time, but the parties differ in where the truth is, what justice is. If the reader did not try to understand this, then history will remain for him an obscure process of grappling events, the struggle of good people because of trifles, the struggle of madmen because of ghosts, the struggle of blind guns in favor of several calculating intrigues. Many loud words are heard from all sides. Many beautiful banners fly in all ranks. A lot of selfless energy is spent by representatives of all parties. What are the people who are probably so close to the mottos, which are so close to? Why is the banner that the best of them yesterday was in dirty hands today? Why does a beautiful thought, in his statement, meet such a formidable resistance? And why do not only the exploiters of this social system, but sincere personalities resist it? All these tasks can be solved only when we look more closely at the process by which truth develops and strengthens, to the formation and clash of parties, to the change in the inner meaning and historical significance of the great words that move humanity, to the process of thought, processing culture; when we study the position of individuals due to the necessary and historically given the cultural habits and

the collapsing parties of thought; in view of the great words on the banners of the parties and the eternal requirements of truth. In previous letters it was meant to dwell on these subjects in order to eliminate, if possible, those misunderstandings that are involuntarily transferred to the study of past and modern history, with insufficiently understanding of the various elements that are part of historical progress and its conditioning. Besides, the story is not over. It is done near us and will be performed by generations growing and not yet born. The present one cannot be detached from the past, but the past would have lost all living and real meaning, if it were not inextricably linked to the present, if one great process did not cover history as a whole. The past died. The culture of society has changed. New specific issues have taken place in the same place. The mottos of the past changed the meaning and meaning. But the universal role of individuals in the present remained the same as it was in thousands of years. Under the motley forms of culture, in the complex issues of modern times, under the various mottos of the defeated and the winners, all the same tasks are hidden. Outside the truth and justice, there has never been any progress. No truth is obtained without personal criticism. There is nothing fair. Without faith in their banner and without the ability to fight opponents, no progressive party triumphed. The forms of culture require the development of the work of thought, as in the past millennia. The great mottos are just as little insured against the danger of losing or changing their meaning. The social conditions for possible progress

have not changed. The requirements for payment for progress cannot be ignored by a developed person. All this existed for our ancestors, will exist for our descendants and exists for us. The only difference is that we can better understand it than the ancestors understood, and that our descendants will probably understand us even better.

Therefore, previous historical letters, concluding attempts to solve problems that existed and must exist in any historical epoch, conclude an attempt to understand the problems of modernity. They turn to the reader not only with the word about the past, but also about the present. The author is very aware that they are both insufficient and imperfect. In addition, our era is not very convenient for reasoning of this kind. These letters may seem heavy, and distracted, and uninteresting, and alien to the questions of the day. Another author, under other circumstances, could write both better and more entertaining. But I hope that in our society, at least between reading young people, there are still a few people who will not be afraid of the need to seriously think about the issues of the past, the remaining issues and for the present. For these readers, the shortcomings of the fulfillment of my work, perhaps, will recede into the background before the content. These readers may also realize that the questions of the day receive their real, significant interest from the eternal historical questions that the author touched upon in these letters. These readers will understand that they, as individuals, must perform a critical work of thought on modern culture; that they must pay their fate, their work, to pay their share of the enormous price of progress that has so far accumulated; that they must contrast their conviction of the lie and injustice in society; that they must create a growing force for an intensified course of progress. If there are at least several such readers of these letters, then the author is done.

Notes

Originally printed in the weekly "Week" (1868, No. 1-47 with breaks and 1869, No. 6, 11, 14) under the pseudonym P. Mirtov, first used by Lavrov, as he was in exile and could not be printed under his surname. In a revised form, "Letters" was published in a separate book in September 1870. In this book, Lavrov answered many questions that worried the advanced Russian people of those years.

Even when the "Letters" were published in the "Week", they were noticed by censorship, and "Week" received the first warning. The censor found that in the "Letters" "the doctrine of the organization of the struggle against the existing social system" and that they are "against our state principles" developed. When the "Letters" came out a separate book, the censor summed up their contents: "There is no spiritual nature in

man, there is no higher spiritual being outside matter; religion is the fruit of ignorance of the masses and the instrument of discipline in the hands of the authorities; religious morality is a cunning fabrication of priests; private property is no more than a fruit of predation; the laws are the precepts of the master classes, aimed at keeping them in obedient. The author preaches, among other things, that the purpose of any progressive person should be the desire to divide the state into independent territories, for in such a division it seems more space for free criticism and for the strengthening of the progressive Party. S. A. Relocated. Official comments on "Historical Letters" P. L. Lavrova. "Old", 1925, No. 2 (30), p. 37-40).

Herzen, in a letter to Ogarev of October 10, 1868, he praised Mirtov's articles, the minds of "Historical Letters" in the Week. A. I. Herzen. A complete collection of works and letters, v. 21, 1923, p. 109). Sympathetic articles about the separate edition of the "Pistulas" were published: "Domestic Notes" (1870, No. 8, pp. 215-221, anonymously), N. V. Shelgunov in "Detail" (1870, No. 11, pp. 1-30), weekly "Activities" (1871, No. 37) and others.

For the revolutionary-popular youth, but the testimony of many of its representatives, "Historical Letters" were a "revolutionary evangelist, a philosophy of revolution."

Only relatively recently it became known that the point of view of the author of "Writings" on social phenomena was criticized by P. N. Tkachev in the article "What is the party of progress" (the manuscript of it is dated 16 IX 1870). The article was detained by the III Department and printed for the first time B. P. Kazmin in the "Selected works P. N. Tkachev" (1932, t. 2).

In 1884. "Historical Letters" were issued illegally, in a lit-record form, without the author's instructions.

In connection with the criticisms made by N. V. Shelgunov and A. A. Kozlov, Lavrov prepared an "Super to 'Stronic Letters'" and sent it to the editors "Knowledge", which published it as an article "But about criticism of "Historical Letters"" (see present volume). From Lavrov's letter to Shtakenschnider dated April 14 (26), 1872, it can be seen that these additions Lavrov decided to use these additions of the book and sent them to St. Petersburg to the Tchaekovites, but the publication was destroyed immediately after its printing. Secondly, Lavrov supplemented and sent "Letters" for the second edition to the Socialist Literary Fund in Zurich. It was published in the Geneva "Free Russian Printing House" in 1891. In the foreword and notes, Lavrov explained all the changes, corrections and additions made in the original text.

In St. Petersburg, the second edition was published for the first time in 1905 simultaneously in two editions: under the name C. A. Arnoldi (Publishing by P. I. Artyushina) and without specifying the author (the publication of the editorial office of the magazine "Russian Wealth"). In 1906, the daughter of Lavrov M. P. Negrskul released 3-rd edition unchanged. In the 4th edition of 1906, which was also unchanged, "the editorial board of the Russian Wealth magazine and M. P. Negrskul" is indicated by the author: "P. L. Lavrov (p. Mirtov." The letter of the 11th "Nationalities in History" was reprinted separately with the author's indication in Warsaw in 1906 and in Kiev in 1917.

In 1885, the Polish translation of the 1st edition of Historical Letters was published in Lviv. The second edition was published in German translation. Davydova and with the introduction of X. Rappoport in 1901. (Berlin, Bern, Edelheim). In 1903, the French translation of Maria Goldsmith was published in Paris with her own biobiblical article about Lavrov.

Reviews of the second edition "Historical letters are available in the works: N. I. Kareev. Theory of Personality P. L. Lavrova. "Historical Review", 1901, v. 12; // Berdyaev. Subjectivism and individualism in social philosophy. Critical sketch of N. K. Mikhailovsky. With the foreword of Peter Struve, St. Petersburg, 1901, pp. 12, 16, 57, 99, 112, 135 and 242; P. Yuzhakov. "Journal for All", St. Petersburg, 1905, No. 9, p. 570; A. Leonid Kornilov. Public Movement under Alexander II, Moscow, 1909. 196-198; Yu. Martov. Social and mental currents in Russia of the 1870's. "History of Russian Literature in the XIX

Century", ed. "Peace", t. 4, 1910. Reprinted: M., 1923, pp. 21-26 and in the book of Yu. Martov "Public and Mental Currents in Russia 1870-1905", ed. "Book", L. - M., 1924, p. 27-32; 77. Vityazev. What the Russian public owes to Lavrov. "Monthly magazine", 1915, No. 2 and 3; O. V. Pharmacist. Society "Land and Volya" of the 70s, 1924, p. 74-76.

The last time "Historical Letters" was published in 1934 in the first volume of "Selected Works on Socio- Political Themes" Leonid Lavrova.

For the present publication, the work is checked with the layout, sent and supplemented by Lavrov (Ts GAOR, p. 9, 10).

In 1873, the Narodniks did not appear "under the banner of Marx and Lassalle"; they saw the starting point of socialism in the Russian peasant community.

Only here Lavrov puts Lassalle next to Marx. In 1874, typing Chernyshevsky's Letters without Address in the second volume of the magazine "Forward", in the preface to them, Lavrov already spoke about the activities of Lassalle as "a much more remarkable in agitation than theoretically".

2 Lavrov means their recent death: M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin and N. Mr. Chernyshevsky died in 1889, and G. Z. Eliseev and N. V. Shelgunov - in 1891.

I mean Evgenia Conoradi (1838-1898) - the founder of "Week".

4 See in this volume article "On the criticism of "Historical Letters".

6 Article of Lavrov "The formula for the progress of g. Mikhailovsky" was published in the "Domestic Notes", 1870, No. 2 (see also P. L. Lavrov. Op. on social-polital. topics. I, M., 1934).

6 Hymnotates is an electric eel that lives in South America.

7 Heterogenesis (Greek) is the theory of the origin of species, according to which the sudden appearance of individuals that are sharply different from the parental forms, occurs allegedly regardless of changes in the conditions of life.

8 Rochefort, Henri (1830-1913), a publicist and politician, opposed the orders of the empire of Napoleon III, sympathized with the Paris Commune.

Gustave Maroteau (1848-1875) was a journalist and publisher of newspapers against the Second Empire. During the Paris Commune, he published the newspaper "Mountain", and then "Public Salvation".

Louis Amelet (1814-1876) was a statesman who refused to swear to Napoleon III.

9 Bradlot, Charles (1833-1891), a member of the English parliament, refused to take the oath, and therefore was temporarily expelled from it.

10 Palenka is a village in Mexico, where in 1750 the ruins of an ancient city with traces of the civilization of the Mayan people were opened.

11 Diadocha - the successors of Alexander the Great (IV century BC), his commanders, who separated the world monarchy created by him after a long struggle.

12 We are talking about consuls - the title of two senior officials of republican Rome. In ancient Rome, the word consularius had two meanings: a) former consul, b) governor of the province.

13 Thevaida is a desert area in Upper Egypt, where the first Christians indulged in austerity.

Joseph Louis (1754-1826) was a chemist, a member of the French Academy. He has a decisive role in the discovery of one of the basic laws of chemistry - the law of constancy of the composition of chemical

compounds.

15 Trazibul, an Athenian general, freed in 411 BC. Athens of 30 tyrants from domination.

16 Little Corporal is Napoleon, who was of a small stature and began his political career as a corporal.

17, 1854 - the beginning of the defeat of Russia in the Crimean War, which revealed all its backwardness; 1861 - "liberation of peasants", 1863 - Polish uprising; 1889 - the publication "Reports" about Zemstvo chiefs in order to strengthen the role of the nobility in the post-reform village.

18 Katkov Mikhail Nikiforovich (1818-1887) - publicist, ardent defender of the autocracy.

19 These peoples, according to the Bible, God himself commanded to destroy the ancient Jews.

On September 4, 1870, a revolution occurred in Paris, as a result of which the Bonapartist regime of Napoleon III was overthrown.

21 Hesler is a cruel governor who was killed, according to legend, by the Rigist Wilhelm Thelem.

22 Cassianites - on behalf of the head of the Roman law school of Guy Longinus Cassia (1 century AD).

Benedict of Nursia (480-543) was the founder of a monastery near Naples, the charter of which marked the beginning of the Catholic monastic order, named after Benedictine.

23 The Shakers (shaking) is a religious sect in North America preaching celibacy, community of property and relentless work.

24 Those deum laudamus - "You, God, Praise", Catholic Church anthem.

25 Wilhelm Henry Wilhelm (1823-1897) was a German writer and publicist. In the book "Country and Men" proved the multi-wheeledness of the Germans.

The Doctrinals are the French moderately conservative party of the big bourgeoisie in the Renaissance (from April 1814 after the abdication of Napoleon I before the July Revolution of 1830), headed by the Roye- Collar and Guizot.

The Experience of the History of New Times began to be published in Geneva in early 1889.

28 John-Bul (John-Byk) is a mocking nickname of the English, a hint of stubbornness.

Brother Jonathan is a joking nickname for Americans.

29 Richmond is the main city of Virginia, the center of the southerners during the Civil War in the United States.

30 Johann Gotlib, Fichte (1762-1814) was a German idealist philosopher. In 1813, his "Excursions to the Teachings of the State" ("Aus dem Entwürfe zu ienter Politischen Schrift im Frünling 1813) were published. Excuse zur Staatslehre, 1813) and the Doctrine of the State, or the relation of the primitive state to the realm of reason. Lectures taught at the University of Berlin in the summer of 1813. "Die Staatslehre der über das Verhältniss des Urslaates zum Vernunftreiche, in Vorlesungen gehalten im Sommer 1813 an Universität zu Berlin").

31 Homerids - descendants of Homer on O. Chios, who had the art of reclamating his poems, as well as poets who own separate parts of the Iliad and Odyssey, attributed to Homer.

32 Lavrentius was the archdiagonum of Pope Sixtus II, burned in 258 during the persecution of Christians and canonized by the church.

Henry of Thomas Bockle, Hisist of Civilisation in England, in two volumes.

34 I mean the magazine "Word", 1881, No. 4. The article "Theory and Practice of Progress" published by Lavrov signed by Lavrov: P. Shchukin.

35 To accept (fr. - primer) - to prevail, to prevail.

36 Utop (Greek: Outside) is the Conqueror in the Utopia of Thomas More.

37 The first attempt of the organization of this force, which terrified all the dominant elements of the old world, i.e. The First International, which existed not 8, but 12 years, from 1864 to 1876. Lavrov, apparently, considered the last year of the existence of the International in 1872, when at the Hague Congress the General Council was moved from Europe to the United States.

38 It is meant Bismarck's "culturing" in Germany in the early 1870s, when the Jesuits were expelled, the school was subordinated to the state, a civil marriage was introduced, etc. However, in the late 1870's, to fight the socialists, Bismarck overturned a number of laws against the church and became close to Catholics.

1. However, as far as I know, not at all for my article. 2. One friend made me a remark that hardly anyone in our time, especially of Russian readers,

remembers Caspar Gauser and knows what kind of person. This is quite fair, and it would be better to take another example, but I prefer to correct the case with a note. In 1828, a young man in peasant clothes was met on Nuremberg Street, in which there was a note explaining that he was found to be found, was born on October 7, 1812 and learned to read and write. The strangeness of his conversion led to the study. It turned out that he had all his life saw only one man who was raised, ate only bread and water, lived in a dungeon and even recognized his teacher shortly before his release. Previously,

this stranger, if Gauser's words are taken for the truth, changed their food and clothing during sleep (probably giving him euthanizing substances for food, which led to a nervous disorder, to convulsive movements of the face and body seen in Gauser). At first, the unfortunate young man became the subject of idle urban curiosity, rude experiments and suffered a lot. Then it was attended by many wonderful people, especially Anselm Feuerbach (a famous lawyer, the father of the philosopher). As a rare specimen of an adult child living outside society, Caspar presented the subject of interesting mental studies. But even more interest was raised about his origin. All the searches were in vain. A. Feuerbach, who published a special work about Caspar, submitted in 1832 to the Queen of Bavaria (from the Bade House) a secret note (now printed), where he argued that Caspar was probably the last representative of the men's line of the Baden House of Tseringen, eliminated by the magorganic spouse in the city. Karl-Friedrich, who originated from the Heye v von-Geyer-Geyerb family, to deliver the throne to his son, Leopold. The release of Caspar explained Feuerbach by the death of his ambitious pursuer [in] 1824. In 1829 an attempt was made by an unknown person to kill Caspar. On May 29, 1833, A. Feuerbach: On December 17, 1833, Caspar Gauser was stabbed to death. The killer is not found. The origin of Kasparus is unknown (1889. The latest research makes it possible that the case of Caspar Gauser had no political significance. But I thought it was the best not to change what was in the text.) 3. is difficult to say about modern Russia, with the general discontent caused by the government

of Alexander III, it is difficult to say how long the latter can still exist in its outrageous forms, if all the classes suffering from it do not organize an equally energetic, but more extensive opposition than the socialists (1890) could do so far.

4. leave the text printed in 20 years in Russia, unchanged. The reader will make the appendix to modern Russia (1890). 5. It would require extensive development, which was impossible in the publication made in

Russia. I leave the text almost unchanged, as it was in 1870. (1890). 6. our country, with its archaic political forms, the struggle for the elementary demands of the rule

of law is still taking place next to the new world struggle for the best economic order; the reduction of social disasters from the current demoralizing influence of uncontrollable power and from the threatening social catastrophe in the future can be facilitated only by a strong and wide organization of socialist elements in society and their support by persecuting supporters of the rule of law, which should understand that the current state is in the struggle. But will it be possible to organize again those forces who have been fighting for a better future for Russia for the better future of Russia for 18 years, with terrible losses? Will the Russian liberals finally understand the role that they are solely allowed to take on and their principles, properly understood, and their vital interests? The form in which Russia will take part in the world economic and political upheaval, which is inevitably approaching for all peoples involved in modern civilization (1891) depended on this. 7. Only the commonality of socialist beliefs and their international task could smooth out in the

ranks of the socialists the traditional distrust that the predatory sections of Poland of the late 18th century bequeathed to the Poles, Russians and the Germans. Unjust laws regarding Jews have created hostility about the political system of the Russian Empire among entire groups of individuals, who, in fact, by tradition, nor in their economic interests, do not represent data for political opposition; and in countries where such laws have already been abolished, the memory of one's own injustice in the past, causing distrust, led to that outrageous spill of "anti-Semitism", which we see near ourselves as one of the symptoms of the modern era of the social reaction. 8. Censorship conditions forced the journal that printed this article to throw out its end. The

manuscript is apparently lost. After 10 years, it is difficult to remember with any accuracy the course of thought, which then dictated this end. Therefore, if the manuscript of 1881 has been preserved somewhere, it can in this case represent significant differences from the printed here (1891).

Petr Lavrov This work has moved to Public Domain in Russia according to St. 1281 Civil Code of the Russian Federation and in countries where the term of copyright protection is valid for the author's

life plus 70 years or less, or it has been made public anonymously or under a pseudonym and the identity of the author has not been disclosed within that period. If the work is a translation, or a different derivative, or is created in co-authorship, then the expiration date of exclusive copyright has expired for all authors of the original and translation.

Source - Russian Wikisource page, old revision 5594688.