Slavophilism and Westernism in 19th Century Russia

Sasha Westgate

Hist 470

Dr. Pantsov

"If you ask yourself how Dostoevsky's characters should be governed, you will understand."[1]

Introduction

The early 19th century was a period of great change in Russia. With Renaissance-like shifts in literature and philosophy, the Russian elitists began to separate into two distinct schools of thought. The Slavophiles were a group that fashioned an ideology out of a desire for love, harmony, and religion. These romantic thinkers were the ultimate defenders of all things uniquely Russian, especially the Orthodox church. In contrast, the Westernizers formed as a broad alliance of intellectuals against the Slavophile ideology. Instead of seeing Russia's future lying in traditions, the Westernizers sought to challenge religion, society, and the entire political system of Russia and adopt those of Western Europe.

While the division widened between the two groups, the debate began to appear in journals and intellectual salons. The prominent literati started to incorporate their respective ideologies into novels, pushing the philosophical debate even farther. The ongoing question of Russia's uncertain future and the ideologies that sought to answer it was pressed into books, spreading the gospels of Slavophilism and Westernism.

In particular, two members of the Russian literary intelligentsia, Ivan Turgenev and Fyodor Dostoyevsky, incorporated these ideas into their novels. Similar in method, albeit extremely opposite in theory, these authors opened the world of philosophy into literature. The amount of inspiration that was garnered from these debates proved to be a significant factor when analyzing books such as Dostoyevsky's *The Idiot* (1869) and *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (1863)

and Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons* (1862) and *Virgin Soil* (1877). Each author put his respective philosophies into life examples in order to prove the validity and superiority of either Slavophilism or Westernism. Due to this literary and philosophical union, the movement proved to be revolutionary influencing the new methods in which the public received the varying schools of thought, as well as introducing a new form of fictional literature.

Western Influences on Russian Life in the 18th Century

Over a century before the emergence of these philosophical circles, the foundation had already been laid, leading up to the ongoing debate. During the reign of Peter the Great at the turn of the 18th century, Russia began her immersion into Western culture. A small group of young men were sent into Western Europe in order to learn languages, cultures, and new arts and skills, beginning a period of Westernization.[2] With newly acquired Western knowledge, Peter began implementing new changes economically and socially. Feudal Russia was now forced to accept new taxes and tariffs, strict military service laws, the creation of mining in the Ural Mountains, a new canal to facilitate trade, and the overall increase of imported and exported goods. Specifically in regards to culture and education, Peter the Great began to introduce Western dress, manners, and usage, despite an emergence of strong opposition.[3]

These new changes began a shift into Westernization that could not be reversed. Russia had taken her first step into a future that revolved around a centuries-long debate regarding the positive or negative effects of Westernization. As Riasanovsky explains, "Quite possibly Russia was destined to be Westernized, but Peter the Great cannot be denied the role of the chief executor of this fate."[4]

Throughout the 18th century, Isaiah Berlin describes the Russian government as an alternating force of oppression and liberalism.[5] Westernization continued to spread, especially with the increase of foreign relations with other European powers. Several emperors and empresses saw

short ruling terms of power following Peter the Great, adding to the feeling of an unstable Russian government. Six different people held the throne during a period that spanned less than 40 years (1725-1762).[6] During these short terms, there was a growing German orientation in the Russian government, particularly with Anne's reign from 1730 to1740.[7] After Anne, a series of German relatives took to the throne. They were, however, removed from the throne in 1741 by a coup led by Peter the Great's daughter Elizabeth.[8]

With Elizabeth's rule, Russia again felt the comfort of a Russian empress in rule. "The new monarch symbolized … the end of a scandalous 'foreign' domination in Russia and even, to an extent, a return to the glorious days of Peter the Great."[9] In 1742, Peter III obtained the throne, however his wife Catherine, a German princess, replaced him in 1762 during a palace coup.[10]

Catherine the Great's reign furthered the Westernization of Russia. Reigning until 1796, Catherine followed the footsteps of Peter the Great in encouraging Westernism to flourish in Russian government, foreign policy, and culture. She adopted French intellectualism (especially that of Montesquieu's *The Spirit of Laws*) and was a model thinker in the Age of Enlightenment.[11] Culturally, Catherine the Great sought to "civilize" Russia by reforming the education system, encouraging the Edict of 1783, giving license to private publishing houses, resulting in a surge of journalism and literature.[12]

The inconsistencies of the Russian government and the increasing Western presence on the throne only added to the feeling of a foreign rule over traditional Russia. This Westernization of Russian government mimicked the Westernization that was rising in Russian culture and life. By the end of the 18th century, Russia's experience with this new form of Westernization (resulting from Catherine's encouragement of literature), gave way to the following new schools of thought that would be used to criticize and analyze Russia's past and future.

A Call for New Russian Philosophy

In 1829, Peter Chaadayev's "Philosophical Letters" began circulating amongst Russian intellectuals and was published in the journal *Teleskop* in 1836.[13] The publication was quite unpopular with the Russian government, claiming that Chaadayev was insane. Nicholas I relieved all duties of every individual involved with the publishing. Despite the strict government reaction, the writings offered the first glimpse into the future debates between Slavophiles and Westernizers. Chaadayev's "Letters" offers a harsh criticism of everything Russian: the government, the society, and the culture. Chaadayev argued that Russia had intentionally severed itself from the rest of Europe by not embracing Western European Christianity; that it had been completely useless in offering any contributions to world history; and that Russia had neither a past, nor a future.

> Historical experience does not exist for us... Isolated in the world, we have given nothing to the world, we have taught nothing to the world; we have not added a single idea to the mass of human ideas; we have contributed nothing to the progress of the human spirit... From the very first moment of our social existence, nothing has emanated from us for the common good of men; not a single useful thought has sprouted in the sterile soil of our country; not a single great truth has sprung from our midst... [14]

Chaadayev, whether right or wrong in his allegations, spurred many to respond. His significant questions, "Where are our wise men, where are our thinkers? … Who thinks for us now?" began a new calling for Russian intellectuals and members of the Intelligentsia to answer.[15] As a response, several new groups began to form, each seeking the answers to Russia's future. From these new circles arouse the two most important schools of thought: Slavophilism and Westernism.

The Emergence of Slavophilism and Westernism

As a response to Chaadayev's "Letters," a group emerged to defend Russia and her traditions. The early Slavophiles were based upon a desire to save Russia from the West by emphasizing strong spirituality within the traditional Orthodox church and discouraging attachments to

materialism and Western culture. The father of this ecclesiastical perspective was Alexei Khomiakov (1804-60), a nobleman with extensive knowledge of Orthodox theology and an affinity for German Romanticism.[16] Ivan Kireevsky (1806-1856) formulated the rest of the Slavophile philosophy.[17] Other significant contributors to early Slavophilism include Konstantin Aksakov (1817-1860) and Yury Samarin (1819-1876).[18]

After nearly 150 years of growing Westernization in Russia, the Slavophiles were attempting to embrace a new Russian identity. As opposed to Chaadayev's call for a coming to Christianity, Khomiakov called for a return to traditional Orthodoxy. As Robert Bird mentions in the Introduction to *On Spiritual Unity*, "The question of Russia and Europe became a transcription of the question of Orthodoxy and Western Christianity."[19] Khomiakov compares Western European Christianity as "the grain of sand [that] draws no new life from the heap into which it is cast by chance," stating that "the brick laids in the wall in no way changes or improves as a result of the place allotted it by the bricklayer's bevel."[20] Khomiakov insists on the doctrine of *sobornost*, or "organic togetherness."[21] *Sobornost*, as explained by Riasanovsky, is an integration of love, freedom, and truth which was the very fundamental nature of Orthodoxy.[22] Furthering the separation between Slavophiles and Westernizers, Khomiakov states that "the Slav cannot be fully a Slav without Orthodoxy."[23]

Satisfying a need for a more complete ideology beyond religion, Kireevsky expounded on this religious foundation by embracing Russian culture and general society. He states that "literature, music or foreign affairs … as it were, [are] a fundamental part of our very being, insofar as it affects every circumstance and every moment of our lives."[24] Kireevsky focuses on the cultural aspect of Slavophilism. In a letter to Count Komarovsky entitled "On the Nature of European Culture and on Its Relationship to Russian Culture," he identifies a general sentiment that Russia is the living embodiment of the universal ideal of unity. This is due to the purity of its Orthodox culture, blaming the West's deteriorating culture on the character of Western civilization, values,

and society. Symmetrically, Russia's cultural superiority is directly attributed to the character of the Russian people.

> In the West, theology became a matter of rationalistic abstraction, whereas in the Orthodox world, it retained its inner wholeness of spirit. In the West, the forces of reason were split asunder, while here there was a striving to maintain a living totality. … In the West, pagan and Christian civilization grew into one another, while here there was a constant effort to keep the truth pure. … In the West, laws issue artificially from the prevailing opinion, while in Russia they were born naturally out of the way of life. … In the West we find the whim of fashion, here the stability of life. … In other words, in the West we find a dichotomy of the spirit, a dichotomy of thought, a dichotomy of learning, a dichotomy of the state, a dichotomy of estates, a dichotomy of society, a dichotomy of familial rights and duties, a dichotomy of morals and emotions… We find in Russia, in contrast, a predominant striving for wholeness of being, both external and inner, social and individual, intellectual and workaday, artificial and moral.[25]

The major ideas of Slavophilism, as penned by Khomiakov and Kireevsky, conclude that due to Russia's pure Orthodox values and traditions, Russian life is superior to that of the West. The very character of the Western Europeans is despicable and contains a vile artificiality. Western Christianity does not incorporate the loving and inclusive traditions as the Orthodox Church and the true nation-loving Slav cannot adopt Catholicism and Western European Christianity without betraying his own culture and people.

These beliefs were universal amongst Slavophiles. The Russian Westernizers were seen as isolating themselves from everything that was distinctively Russian. As Slavophilism evolved, the answer to Russia's future depended in a return to the "native principles, in overcoming the Western disease."[26] Once cured, the mission of the Slavophiles would transcend into a purely evangelical goal of delivering Russian culture to the deteriorating West.

Though many intellectuals supported the Westernization of Russia since the reign of Peter the Great, the term "Westernizer" had not been coined until the Slavophiles wanted to shed a poor light on the individuals, portraying them as being anti-Russian.[27] In the 1840s, the cohesive

group of Westernizers appeared as a loose union of varying Western ideals that banded together in their opposition to Slavophilism.[28]

Among the Westernizers were individuals such as Vissarion Belinsky (1811-1848) and Alexander Herzen (1812-1870). Due to such varying ideologies that fell within the Westernism group, there was not a specific identifiable theme or mission. Instead, each individual had his own beliefs and theories and just happened to be lumped together since each did not adopt the Slavophile ideology. In addition, Riasanovsky indicates that the Westernizers changed positions quickly.[29]

Some trends in the Westernizers' philosophies did appear. Among these, was a general disregard for religious overtones and most were agnostic and even atheistic.[30] Most importantly, the Westernizers believed that Russia was not unique to the world and that, in order to prosper, the nation must embrace the historically Western path, which served as the role model to modernization. However, Belinsky warns that Russia should not merely imitate what the European countries have done. "Likewise, we shall not forget our own worth. We shall know how to take pride in our nationality… but we shall know how to be proud without vainglory which blinds one to one's own defects…"[31] Herzen echoes this need for Western influence in a successful and flourishing Russia.

> …Before 1848, Russia neither should nor could have entered the revolutionary field. She had to learn her lesson, and now she has learned it. The Tsar himself has realized this and is raging against the universities, ideas and learning; he is trying to cut Russia off from Europe and destroy enlightenment. He is doing his job. … There is no point in blindly believe in the future; every embryo has the right to develop, but not every one succeeds. The future of Russia does not depend on Russia alone. It is bound up with the future of Europe. [32]

Fyodor Dostoyevsky and Slavophilism

Fyodor Dostoyevsky (1821-1881) never completely committed himself to a specific ideological set. Instead, he has been seen as a type of wanderer amongst intellectual circles, mixing and matching certain ideas to best fit his own. In fact, from the beginning of his *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*, Dostoyevsky defends Belinsky as a "a man more passionately Russian."[33] However, he begins to explain that he is unsympathetic towards those who are "so blindly indignant … toward much of what is native to us," specifically identifying Chaadaev as one who "apparently disdained everything Russian."[34]

Sarah Hudspith chronicles Dostoyevsky's incorporation of *sobornost*, the philosophy of essential organic unity adopted by Slavophiles.[35] Throughout his fiction and his non-fiction, Dostoyevsky draws conclusions about Russia's past and future through his characters and his own musings. In particular, the legendary *The Idiot* and the lesser-known *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*, both look at the *sobornost* and solidify the connection between Dostoyevsky and Slavophilism.

Born in Moscow in 1821, Fyodor Dostoyevsky lived a life of tragedy and hardship. His first novel, *Poor Folk*, was published at the mere age of 24.[36] Though it gained wide success and quickly threw the young author into the spotlight, the difficulties of life soon caught up with him. In 1846, Fyodor began to experience symptoms of his oncoming epilepsy and in 1850, he suffered his first epileptic seizure.[37] Shortly after publishing *Poor Folk*, Dostoyevsky was arrested for participating in an intellectual circle that discussed a letter from Belinsky to Gogol criticizing the Russian Church and State.[38] In 1849, he was condemned to death and while on the scaffolding, waiting to be executed, received a last moment pardon from Nicholas I. Instead of death, Dostoyevsky received four years at a labor prison in Sibera, then proceeded to have been made a soldier in the army.[39] It was not until 1859 that Dostoyevsky was invited back to Russia, following a pardon by Alexander II.[40]

In *The Idiot*, the main character Prince Myshkin is arriving to St. Petersburg from a Swiss sanitarium where he has been seeking treatment for an illness similar to epilepsy. The title is derived from the portrayal of Myshkin as an awkward idiot. He is unable to articulate himself, somewhat uneducated, and appears simple and innocent. Despite his idiotic tendancies, Myshkin is an honest, albeit overly generous, young man whose goodness consistently brings him trouble. Through a series of troubling events, it is concluded that the only place fit for Myshkin is the sanitarium from which he recently left.

Dostoyevsky paints a portrait of a world filled with materialism, power hungry individuals, and overall corruption. His main character Myshkin represents all that is good and innocent and proceeds to prove that such righteousness cannot survive in this seemingly apocalyptic world. This portrayal of a society obsessed with money, power, and material is an accurate painting of what many Slavophiles considered to be Western Europe. This is what Kireevsky was referring to in "On the Nature of European Culture." "There (in the West) one finds the precariousness of individual autonomy, here the strength of family and social ties. There we see ostentatious luxury and artificial life, here the simplicity of vital needs and the courage of moral fortitude."[41] The argument could be held that Myshkin himself is Russia, as the symbol of goodness cannot fit in the Western world of "ostentatious luxury and artificial life."

Myshkin repeatedly exhibits the *sobornost* philosophy. "Myshkin is the first of Dostoyevsky's characters fully to understand the notion that each is responsible for all; for this reason he is so ready to say he is to blame, and to forgive all who wrong him…"[42] This idea of a innate unity of intuitiveness for one's fellow brother is the driving force behind *sobornost* and Slavophilism. Myshkin continues to show love and compassion to fellow characters, seeking for a harmonious understanding and a resolution to the chaos that is consistently created.

In Dostoyevsky's *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*, he gives a non-fictional account of his first travels outside of Russia. His writings are overtly anti-Western, harshly critical of the

European cities that he had visited, and unsympathetically judgmental of the people he meets along the way. Dostoyevsky even comments "even now, wherever they are encountered, all sentences like this, cutting foreigners down to size, contain something irresistibly pleasant for us Russians."[43] His writings relive his visits to countless cities, including Berlin, Dresden, Paris, London, Geneva, Florence, and Vienna. The piece, though published in a book format, is more of a collection of essays that contain idle thoughts and musings. However, these idle thoughts are rife with insight and exhibit philosophical ideas in a true life environment.

Dostoyevsky, like all Slavophiles, questions the validity of this alluring Westernization movement that has driven Russia since Peter the Great. "You see, our whole life, from earliest childhood, has been geared to the European mentality. Is it possible that any of us could have prevailed against this influence, this appeal, this pressure? How is it that we have not been regenerated once and for all into Europeans?"[44] There is a distinct feeling of Dostoyevsky himself searching to understand the meaning of being Russian. He continually asks rhetorical questions and seemingly wrestles with trying to find truth amongst the Slavophile-Westernizer debate.

> Can it be that there is in fact some kind of chemical bond between the human spirit and its native soil, so that you cannot tear yourself away from it, and even if you do tear yourself away, you nonetheless return? After all, Slavophilism did not just drop down to us from the sky, and, although it later developed into a Moscow fancy, the basis for this fancy is broader than the Moscow formula and is perhaps rooted much deeper in some hearts than it seems at first glance. Indeed, perhaps even among the Muscovites it is rooted deeper than their formula. Oh, how difficult to express it clearly from the start, even to oneself![45]

While noting Paris and the French, Dostoyevsky is determined to reveal the hypocrisy that he observes. In the chapter entitled "Baal," he begins a sarcastic tirade regarding how orderly and morally sound Paris is. "…How secure and sharply delineated everything is; how content everyone is…," yet continues to identify the reality, "how they struggle to convince themselves that they are content and completely happy…"[46] He observes that in reality, Parisians

desperately cling to uphold the status quo, simply out of despair and stubbornness; that the bourgeois truly believe that everything is absolutely in order and the way it should be, regardless of the blatant disorder that surrounds them. Dostoyevsky also paints a similarly grim image of London, dripping with poverty and inhumane conditions where the upper class walks past starving children while wearing expensive clothes.

Beyond this physical paradox of the rich and poor, Dostoyevsky makes note of the hypocrisy of European Christianity. He experiences a woman who pushes a Christian tract in his hand, then begins a long-winded diatribe comparing Catholics to Anglicans. Dostoyevsky contrasts that the Catholic priest will at least help the poor then try to convert them, unlike the Anglican priests. These Anglicans are proud and wealthy, live in rich parishes, and grow fat with their consciences completely at peace" while ignoring the impoverished and denying marriages of those who cannot pay.[47]

These observations regarding the inhumanity of the Europeans and the hypocrisy of the Church of England again mimic the sentiments of the Slavophiles. In particular, the argument against the Western Christianity is extremely like Khomiakov and Kireevsky's original ideas that Orthodoxy is the only religion that continues to uphold morals, values, and traditions. Additionally, Dostoyevsky's accounts of the hypocritical and unsympathetic European people further enhance Kireevsky's argument that those who do not follow the Orthodox tradition are morally bankrupt and corrupt.

Ivan Turgenev and Westernism

"Turgueneff[48] was very probably the great novelwriter of his century."[49] Kropotkin is eager to explain that Turgenev was specifically a politically philosophical novelist.

> "When some human problem had thus taken possession of Turgueneff's mind, he evidently could not discuss it in terms of logic – this would have been the manner of the political writer – he

> conceived it in the shape of images and scenes. .. His novels are a succession of scenes – Some of them of the most exquisite beauty – each of which helps him further to characterize his heroes."[50]

There is an intense relation that a reader may feel with Turgenev's characters, as the author is a brilliant specialist in showcasing the real men and women of his time. Kropotkin offers flowing praise in his review and is determined to make his reader understand that Turgenev is a novelist with meaning and reason, not distracted with "sensational episodes."[51]

Ivan Turgenev (1818-1883) is one of the most extreme voices in literature. As noted previously, there was no specific shared doctrine amongst the Westernizers. In fact, an increasing number of radical Westernizers began to appear, challenging the entire Russian and European system, calling for a revolution. Among these, Turgenev's nihilist hero Bazarov (*Fathers and Sons*) is placed. Additionally, the young radicals that he develops in *Virgin Soil* are models of the young revolutionary. This identification of a new generation serves as a social term, as the "fathers" of the 1840s begin to find conflict with the "sons" of the 1860s. Turgenev is focused on the coexistence of the older generation still immersed in romanticism and idealism, and the younger generation who spoke on such new terms as "nihilism," "realism," "utilitarianism," and "materialism."[52]

Victor Terras pinpoints many realties about Turgenev's writing, contrasting it with that of the Slavophilic Dostoyevsky and comparing it to other Western writers. Terras states that Turgenev was vehemently against psychological analysis, the very thing that Dostoyevsky is most praised for.[53] Instead, Turgenev focuses on the reality of the characters seeking "to represent, accurately and with power, the truth, the reality of life," stating that it "is a writer's highest happiness." [54]

In addition, Terras further identifies several consistencies between Turgenev and his Western counterparts. "Like his Western colleagues, Turgenev believes, rightly or wrongly, that his types,

even his ideal types, were created directly from observed socio-historical reality."[55] Turgenev's concentration on creating stories based on non-fictional individuals is, according to Terras, comparable to the Western writers' creative practices. Furthermore, Turgenev's staunch opposition to moralism in art also mimics that of Western writers, calling the idea of art to be an "imitation of nature, something that only stupid pedants could believe."[56]

These principles are acted by Turgenev's characters, particularly in *Fathers and Sons.* With the introduction of Bazarov, the nihilist, and his friend (and disciple) Arcady, Turgenev begins to assign characteristics to this new generation of sons. In the very beginning of *Fathers and Sons*, Turgenev offers a definition of a nihilist through dialogue as "a man who admits no established authorities, who takes no principles for granted, however much they may be respected."[57] Turgenev also uses the character Paul Petrovich to show the continuum that presents itself, "Formerly we had the Hegelians, and now the Nihilists."[58] With ongoing dialogue, it becomes clear that Bazarov (and nihilism in general, as he speaks on behalf of it) respects nothing, including art and poetry.[59]

Fathers and Sons seeks to confront the completely opposing ideologies held by the two generations. Berlin describes it as "the confrontation of the old and young, of liberals and radicals, traditional civilization and the new, harsh positivism which has no use for anything except what is needed by a rational man."[60] This is fully described in both the character development and the actual action of the story. Nicholas and Paul Petrovich represent the older, traditional generation who cling to the Slavophile ideology of romanticism and *sobornost*. Upon meeting these two radicalists, the older generation cannot fully understand it. Bazarov has a distaste for "petty aristocrats" which culminates into a debate between he and Paul, resulting in harsh words, personal attacks, and the eventual storming exit of the younger two.[61]

This fictional debate between traditionalism and radicalism well imitates the debates that were happening throughout Russia's intellectual salons. This argument that focused on the philosophies of life that will best enhance Russia's future was a cornerstone in the Intelligentsia and can even be described as a watershed movement that influenced the Bolsheviks. In fact, Berlin mentions that Bazarov may even be considered the first Bolshevik, as he encourages change and does not deny the possibility of using brute force.[62]

In *Virgin Soil*, Turgenev narrows his focus on just the young radicals, leaving the argument with traditionalists in his past works. The novel's main characters are Nezhdanov and Marianna, two young radical intellectuals who meet as tutor and student, respectively. They become attracted to each other, mostly out of a common desire to overthrow the social order, and eventually run away in order to distribute the doctrine of social revolution. The story ends with a feeling of futility. Nezhdanov cannot express his beliefs to the Russian people efficiently and becomes frustrated when he is not understood. As a result, he commits suicide out of sheer frustration and leaves Marianna to their mutual friend Solomin.

Turgenev's account of the fledging radical movement is mostly true, exhibiting only a few minor inaccuracies, mainly out of a lack of knowledge of the youths' inner circles.[63] Though Turgenev fully understood the unique characteristic traits of the movement, Kropotkin states that "no one could possibly have known the youth of our circles unless he had himself belonged to them."[64] These two key features were the misconception of the Russian peasantry and the inability for the young radicalists to identify and understand the peasants.[65] Again, Turgenev takes these very real dilemmas of Russian thought and transplants it into the lives of his characters.

Slavophilism and Westernism: A Brief Epilogue

Eventually, Slavophilism and Westernism began to disintegrate and evolve into newer ideologies to fit the dynamic times in Russia's history. Slavophilism gave way to Panslavism, an extended

version of Slavophilism that accounted for all Slavs, not only Russian.[66] Panslavism enjoyed a brief period of popularity with the politics surrounding the Crimean War, as many Russians sympathized with the Balkan Slavs. Once Slavophilism evolved into Panslavism, it became more of an attitude, rather than an ideology. This Russian-centric mindset played to the advantage of the growing nationalistic radicalism that culminated into the Bolshevik Revolution. With the emergence of Communism, a Neo-Slavophilism appeared, offering a better understanding of the new, uniquely Russian government that was appearing.

The Westernizers utilized the growing radicalism that was exemplified in Turgenev's novels and the October Revolution was a physical product of this. Industrialization emerged in Russia at the turn of the 20th century and continued mixing the old gentry and the serfs, a process that had begun with the Emancipation in 1861.[67] More existential philosophy began to emerge, such as Vladimir Soloviev's *A Justification of the Good*, that critiqued the intelligentsia and the radicalists.[68] However, the entire Russian intellectual group drastically changed with the emergence of World War I and the October Revolution.

With the Revolution in 1917 and the dawning of Soviet Russia, all schools of thought were overshadowed by Leninism and Marxism. However, literature continued to play an important role in trying to understand the relationship Russia should, and did, have with the West. A growing trend continued, comparing Russian politics and society in philosophical fiction.

Conclusion

The debate between Slavophilism and Westernism had a significantly large impact on Russian history. With the growing Westernization that had been set forth by Peter the Great, the next centuries would prove this movement towards Europeanization irreversible. When confronted with the question of where Russia's future lay, these groups of intellectuals sought to find the final answers. Many turned to religion, such as Khomiakov and his ecclesiastical approach to

Slavophilism. In contrast, many turned to agnosticism and secularism in order to understand the growing Russian social and political trends. From this, the two groups flourished and began to impact not only the Russian Intelligentsia, but also Russian culture as a whole.

The affects on literature proved to be significant. Prominent authors were involved in these intellectual circles and began to formulate their own ideas and philosophies, loosely aligning themselves with either Slavophilism or Westernism. In particular, Dostoyevsky and Turgenev, both key contributors to the advancement of Russian literature and culture, were immersed in philosophical fiction, a new kind of literature that even Kropotkin finds to be refreshing amongst normal political literature.[69]

Dostoyevsky's famous *The Idiot* and his memoirs of Europe, *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*, impacted the literary community. *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*, written six years prior to *The Idiot*, paved the way for his understanding of European cities and culture. His travels bring him nothing but bitterness and the awareness of a distinctively Western hypocrisy. These perceptions of a vile culture, filled with corruption and mean-spiritedness are then transcended into the new world that Myshkin enters. *The Idiot* proves that good individuals cannot survive in evil environments, drawing a parallel between the good, traditional Russian values and his recently formed assessment of the evil, corrupted Europe.

Simultaneously, Turgenev emerged with his *Fathers and Sons* and, later, *Virgin Soil.* Like Dostoyevsky, Turgenev incorporated his philosophical beliefs into his writings, offering a differing point of view from even that of the average Westernizer. Focusing on the ideology behind nihilism, in *Fathers and Sons* Turgenev introduced the beginnings of an entirely new school of thought, the radicalists. Showing the confrontations between the old generation and the new generation, Turgenev offered philosophical clarity within the dialogues. Not distracted by a

complex and artistically written storyline, Turgenev instead concentrates on the sentiments of the growing circles of radical youth in *Virgin Soil*.

The lasting effects that this had on Russian culture is misleading. Despite the fact that the actual circles of Slavophilism and Westernism did not really remain past the 19th century, the effects that this philosophical literature has had on the culture has been lasting. Authors after Dostoyevsky and Turgenev continued the trend of philosophical fiction, including writers such as Fedin and Madame Voinova.[70]

The role that philosophical literature has played in the historical aspect of Russian culture, truly has proved to be revolutionary. The conversation still exists today regarding whether Russia is unique in her traditions and should continue in the way of her history or whether the country should follow the rest of the Western world. The names are no longer Slavophilism and Westernism, but are instead based on the historical Soviet ideology versus the capitalist Democracy of the United States and England. "As long as Russian national consciousness exists, the problem of Westernism and Slavophilism does not completely lose its significance and literature continues to refer to these ideologies of the nineteenth century."[71]

1 Bertrand Russell (defending the harsh Bolshevik rule) as quoted by Aileen Kelly, introduction to *Russian Thinkers* by Isaiah Berlin (London, England: Penguin Books Ltd, 1978), xiii.
2 Isaiah Berlin. *Russian Thinkers* (London, England: Penguin Books Ltd, 1978), 117.
3 Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. *A History of Russia* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2000), 234-7.
4 Ibid., 240.
5 Berlin, *Russian Thinkers*, 117.
6 Riasanovsky, *History of Russia*, 242.
7 Ibid., 245.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid, 246.
10 Ibid., 248.

11 Catherine the Great, *MSN Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2007,* ed. Nicholas V. Riasanovsky , http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761559802/Catherine_the_Great.html (accessed April 13, 2007).
12 Ibid.
13 James Edie, ed. *Russian Philosophy Vol.* 1 (Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1976), 101.
14 Peter Chaadayev. "Philosophical Letters," in *Teleskop*, Vol 1 of *Russian Philosophy,* ed. James Edie (Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1976), 116.
15 Ibid., 115
16 William Leatherbarrow and D.C. Offord trans and ed. *A Documentary History of Russian Thought From the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987), 64.
17 Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought From the Enlightenment to Marxism*, trans. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1979), 92.
18 Ibid.
19 Robert Bird, introduction to *On Spiritual Unity: A Slavophile Reader* by A. Khomiakov and I. Kireevsky, trans and ed Boris Jakim and Robert Bird (Hudson, New York: Lindisfarne Books, 1998), 11.
20 A. Khomiakov "On the Church" (1855) of *Russian Thought* ed. Leatherbarrow, 91.
21 V. V. Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy* (New York, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1953), 185.
22 Riasanovsky *History of Russia*, 362.
23 A. Khomiakov "To the Serbs. An Epistle from Moscow" (1860) of *Russian Thought* ed. Leatherbarrow, 94.
24 I. Kireevsky "A Reply to A.S. Khomyakov" (1839) of *Russian Thought* ed. Leatherbarrow, 79.
25 I. Kireevsky "On the Nature of European Culture and on Its Relationship to Russian Culture" (1852) of *On Spiritual Unity* ed. Bird, 229.
26 Riasanovsky, *History of Russia*, 363.
27 Walicki, *History of Russian Though*, 92.
28 Ibid., 135.
29 Riasanovsky, *History of Russia*, 364
30 Ibid.
31 Vissarion Belinsky, "The Russian Nation and the Russian Tsar" trans. James Scalan, Vol 1 of *Russian Philosophy* ed. James Edie, 298.
32 Alexander Herzen "The Russian People and Socialism" (1851) of *Russian Thought* ed. Leatherbarrow, 148.
33 Fyodor Dostoevsky *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1997), 8.
34 Ibid.
35 Sarah Hudspith, *Dostoevsky and the Idea of Russianness* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), 17.
36 Irina Titova and Paul Richardson, "Fyodor Mikhailovich," *Russian Life* (Nov/Dec 2006) http://content.epnet.com/pdf18_21/pdf/2006/RSL/01Nov06/22956702.pdf?T=P&P=AN&K=22956702&EbscoContent=dGJyMNHr7ESep7M4v+bwOLCmrk+eqK5Ssq+4S

37 Ibid.
38 Peter Kropotkin, *Ideas and Realities of Russian Literature* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1925), chapter 5 http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/ANARCHIST_ARCHIVES/kropotkin/literature/russianlit_ch5.html
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
41 I. Kireevsky "On the Nature of European Culture and on Its Relationship to Russian Culture" (1852) of *On Spiritual Unity* ed. Bird, 229.
42 Hudspith, *Dostoyevsky*, 153.
43 Dostoevsky *Winter Notes*, 7.
44 Ibid., 9.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., 35.
47 Ibid. 42.
48 Whether it is a transliteration problem, or simply a misprint continuing throughout the work of Kropotkin's writing, the version that I have been using specifically spells Turgenev "Turgueneff" and Dostoyevsky "Dostoyeskiy."
49 Kropotkin, *Russian Literature*, Ch 4 http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/ANARCHIST_ARCHIVES/kropotkin/literature/russianlit_ch4.html
50 Ibid.
51 Ibid.
52 Riasanovsky, *History of Russia*, 381.
53 Victor Terras, "Turgenev's Aesthetic and Western Realism" *Comparative Literature* Vol. 22, No. 1. (Winter, 1970), 23.
54 Turgenev, regarding *Fathers and Sons*, Ibid.
55 Ibid., 25.
56 Ibid., 26.
57 Ivan Turgenev, *Fathers and Sons* (New York: New American Library, 2005), 25.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., 57.
60 Berlin, *Russian Thinkers*, 277.
61 Turgenev, *Fathers and Sons*, 57-63.
62 Berlin, *Russian Thinkers*, 279.
63 Kropotkin, *Russian Literature*, Ch 4.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
66 BH Sumner, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th Ser., Vol. 18. (1935), 28.
67 Riasanovsky, *History of Russia*, 424-5.
68 Ibid., 451.
69 Kropotkin, *Russian Literature*, Ch 4
70 George C Guins analyzes these authors in the article "East and West in Soviet Ideology" and compares his evaluations to the current debate regarding whether Russia should be more Eastern or Western. *Russian Review,* Vol 8, No. 4 (1949), pp 271-283.
71 Ibid., 274.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Belinsky, Vissarion. "The Russian Nation and the Russian Tsar." Translated by James Scalan. In *Russian Philosophy,* edited by James Edie. Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1976.

Chaadayev, Peter. "Philosophical Letters." In *Russian Philosophy,* edited by James Edie. Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1976.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions.* Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1997.

Herzen, Alexander. "The Russian People and Socialism." In *Russian Thought,* edited William Leatherbarrow. Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987.

Khomiakov, Alexei. "On the Church." In *Russian Though,t* edited William Leatherbarrow. Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987.

Khomiakov, Alexei. "To the Serbs. An Epistle from Moscow." In *Russian Thought,* edited William Leatherbarrow. Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987.

Kireevsky, Ivan. "A Reply to A.S. Khomyakov." In *Russian Thought,* edited William Leatherbarrow. Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987.

Kireevsky, Ivan. "On the Nature of European Culture and on Its Relationship to Russian Culture." In *Russian Thought,* edited William Leatherbarrow. Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987.

Kropotkin, Peter. *Ideas and Realities of Russian Literature.* New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1925.<http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/ANARCHIST_ARCHIVES/kropotkin/literature/russianlittoc.html>

Turgenev, Ivan. *Fathers and Sons.* New York: New American Library, 2005.

Secondary Sources

Berlin, Isaiah. *Russian Thinkers.* London, England: Penguin Books Ltd, 1978.

Bird, Robert and Boris Jakim, trans. and ed. *On Spiritual Unity: A Slavophile Reader by A. Khomiakov and I. Kireevsky*. Hudson, New York: Lindisfarne Books, 1998.

Edie, James, ed. *Russian Philosophy Vol. 1*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of

Tennessee Press, 1976.

Guins, George C.. "East and West in Soviet Ideology." *Russian Review,* Vol 8, No. 4. 1949.

Hudspith, Sarah. *Dostoevsky and the Idea of Russianness.* New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.

Leatherbarrow, William and D.C. Offord, trans and ed. *A Documentary History of Russian Thought From the Enlightenment to Marxism.* Michigan: Ardis Publishers, 1987.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V.. *A History of Russia.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V., ed. "Catherine the Great." *MSN Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2007.* http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761559802/Catherine_the_Great.html

Sumner, B.H.. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th Ser., Vol. 18. 1935.

Titova, Irina and Paul Richardson. "Fyodor Mikhailovich." *Russian Life* (Nov/Dec 2006) <http://content.epnet.com/pdf18_21/pdf/2006/RSL/01Nov06/22956702.pdf?T=P&P=AN&K=22956702&EbscoContent=dGJyMNHr7ESep7M4v+bwOLCmrk+eqK5

Terras, Victor. "Turgenev's Aesthetic and Western Realism." *Comparative Literature,* Vol. 22, No. 1. Winter, 1970.

Walicki, Andrzej. *A History of Russian Thought From the Enlightenment to Marxism*. Translated by Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1979.

Zenkovsky, V. V.. *A History of Russian Philosophy.* New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1953.