



HERITAGE

Scientific magazine

№ 1 (18) (2021)

Editorial council:

Uyba V.V. – Head of the Komi Republic, honored scientist of the Russian Federation, chairman of the Editorial council

Boronoyev A.O. – doctor of philosophy, academician of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, honorary professor of the St. Petersburg State University, honored worker of science of the Russian Federation

Gabusheva G.I. – Deputy Chairperson of the Government of the Komi Republic

Mangone E. – associate professor in sociology of culture and communication of the University of Salerno (Italy), director of the Mediterranean Knowledge International Centre for Studies and Research, editor in Chief of the Journal of Mediterranean Knowledge

Markov V.P. – candidate of physics and mathematics, associate professor, expert of the State Budget Organization of the Komi Republic «Center “Nasledie” after Pitirim Sorokin»

Nikolz L. – professor in sociology of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the West Virginia University (USA)

Roshchevsky M.P. – academician, the adviser of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Skvortsov N.G. – doctor of sociology, professor, dean of the faculty of sociology of St. Petersburg State University

Yakovets Yu.V. – doctor of economics, professor, academician of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, president of the International Institute of Pitirim Sorokin – Nikolay Kondratyev

Editorial board:

Kuzivanova O.Yu. – candidate of history, director of the State Budget Organization of the Komi Republic «Center “Nasledie” after Pitirim Sorokin», editor-in-chief

Chipsanova E.A. – deputy director of the State Budget Organization of the Komi Republic «Center “Nasledie” after Pitirim Sorokin», executive secretary

Члены редколлегии:

Bulanova M.B. – doctor of sociology, professor of the department of theory and history of sociology of the Russian State Humanitarian University

Zherebtsov I.L. – doctor of history, director of the Institute of Language, Literature and History of the Federal Research Center of the Komi Scientific Center of the Ural office of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Zyuzev N.F. – doctor of philosophy, professor of the Department of philosophy and sociopolitical sciences of the Syktyvkar State University after Pitirim Sorokin, research supervisor of the International Center of Social Research

Kuznetsova T.L. – candidate of philology, sector chief of literature of the Institute of Language, Literature and History of the Federal Research Center of the Komi Scientific Center of the Ural office of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Lomonosova M.V. – candidate of sociology, associate professor of the department of theory and history of sociology of the St. Petersburg State University

Savelyeva E.A. – doctor of history, chief researcher of the Institute of Language, Literature and History of the Federal Research Center of the Komi Scientific Center of the Ural office of the Russian Academy of Sciences

Sergiyeva N.S. – doctor of philology, professor of the Department of management and marketing of the Syktyvkar State University after Pitirim Sorokin

Terebikhin V.M. – candidate of philosophy, expert of the State Budget Organization of the Komi Republic «Center “Nasledie” after Pitirim Sorokin»

CONTENTS

Address of the Head of the Komi Republic V.V. Uyba to readers of magazine «Heritage»	5
Editorial	6

Sociocultural dynamics

<i>Hrenov N.A.</i> Sociological turn in the science of arts of the XIXth century: the concept of H. Taine as an anticipation of the cultural turn (Part 3).....	9
<i>Tulchinskiy G.L.</i> Soviet / Russian impact on the development of social semiotics in the 1970–2000s	37
<i>Mangone E.</i> Pitirim Sorokin's altruistic creative love: genesis and goals	55
<i>Zyuzev N.F.</i> Altruism and selfless rationalism (reflections on the E. Mangone's book «Beyond the Dichotomy Between Altruism and Egoism: Society, Relationship, and Responsibility»)	65

History of sociology

“Round table” «P.A. Sorokin as a historian of sociology (to the first edition in Russian of «Contemporary Sociological Theories»)	71
<i>Golovin N.A.</i> «There is much to be learned from Pitirim Sorokin, but one must argue with him»: to the publication of two review essays of the German sociologist L. von Wiese	94
<i>Von Wiese L.</i> Pitirim A. Sorokin	103

Name in the context of an epoch

<i>Rusanova V.S., Golovin N.A.</i> P.A. Sorokin and A.J. Toynbee: from acquaintance to friendship	116
<i>Sorokin P.A.</i> Arnold J. Toynbee.....	124

Reviews

<i>Tyugashev E.A.</i> How light does reach the stars that from afar... (Novel review): Zuzev N.F. Pitirim Alexandrovich Sorokin	130
--	-----

Sociocultural and political practices

<i>Bondarenko O.E., Balashova O.L.</i> From the history of teacher training in the Komi region (to the 100th anniversary of the Syktyvkar Humanitarian and Pedagogical College named after I.A. Kuratov)	135
--	-----

From scientific heritage

<i>Sergieva N.S., Smith R.W.</i> About Pitirim Sorokin's article «City and country (bio-sociological characteristics)» (Prague, 1923) (from the translators) (in Russian).....	150
<i>Sorokin P.A.</i> City and country (Bio-Sociological Characteristics) (in Russian)...	154
<i>Sergieva N.S., Smith R.W.</i> About Pitirim Sorokin's article «City and country (bio-sociological characteristics)» (Prague, 1923) (from the translators) (in English)	170
<i>Sorokin P.A.</i> City and country (Bio-Sociological Characteristics) (in English)....	174
Authors	190

№ 1 (18) (2021)
«Наследие»
N.S. Sergieva, Roger W. Smith
Syktyvkar, New York (USA)

ABOUT PITIRIM SOROKIN'S ARTICLE "CITY AND COUNTRY (BIO-SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS)" (PRAGUE, 1923)

Citation: Sergieva N.S., Smith R.W. [About Pitirim Sorokin's article «City and country (bio-sociological characteristics)» (Prague, 1923) (from the translators)] // Nasledie [Heritage]. 2021, No. 1 (18). – pp. 170–173.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31119/hrtg.2021.1.10>

Pitirim Sorokin's "return" to his homeland began in the late 1990s and continues to this day. Scholarly research and conferences devoted to the study of his legacy are being carried out, his social scientific works are translated into Russian and published. Russian language works of Sorokin that were previously locked away in special collections in the former USSR are now being republished, and work is underway to publish the complete works in Russian. But while Sorokin's works in English are being translated into and published in Russian sedulously, the reverse process – the translation of Sorokin's Russian works into English – was, and still is, exceedingly rare after the translation and publication in English of Sorokin's *The Sociology of the Revolution* (1925), which he wrote in Russian and translated with the assistance of the University of Illinois professor Edward Cary Hayes.

This can only be regretted, since by the time of his emigration to the United States in 1923 (he had already left his native country a year earlier), Pitirim Sorokin was a well known social scientist and the author of numerous publications, including scholarly articles and books, book reviews, ethnographic essays, and literary works, as well as many newspaper articles. (Sorokin, as is well known, was actively involved in political activities.) Among this array of works can be noted: *Преступление и кара, подвиг и награда. Социологический этюд об основных формах общественного поведения и морали* (Crime and Punishment, Deed and Reward: A Sociological Study of the Major Forms of Social Behavior and Morality; St. Petersburg, 1914), *Система социологии* (A System of Sociology; Petrograd, 1920), and (published in exile) *Современное состояние России* (Contemporary Conditions of Russia, Prague, 1922) and *Популярные очерки социальной педагогики и политики* (Essays on Popular Pedagogy and Politics; Uzhhorod, Czechoslovakia, 1923). The books and articles written and published in Russian by Sorokin remain inaccessible to foreign readers. However, they are of great interest for researchers of his life and work, to his students and followers, and for anyone who is attracted by the scholarly heritage and the very personality of an extraordinary person.

Between the Russian and American periods of Sorokin's life there was a short European period, which he spent mainly in Prague. Here's how Sorokin writes about it in his autobiography, *A Long Journey*: "On the fourth day of our stay in Berlin I received,

through the Czechoslovakian embassy, an invitation from my friend Dr. Masaryk, then President of the Czechoslovakian Republic, to come to Prague as a guest of the Republic".* During this meeting, Sorokin was offered a special scholarship, which allowed him to conduct active scholarly, pedagogical, and social/political activities without having to think about earning money.

Sorokin's Prague period is considered by his biographers to have been extremely productive, which was also due to the favorable circumstances existing in Prague for Russian emigrants.** "Czechoslovakia was one of the few European states where the government on its own initiative launched a programme of assistance to the Russian emigrants. Moreover, this aid programme, which was created in 1921 under the name "Ruská Pomocná Akce" (Russian Relief Action) had Russian academics, students and pupils as its primary target groups".*** The President of Czechoslovakia, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, supported this program from its beginnings and during the entire period of its existence. The beneficiaries of Russian Relief Action were primarily three groups of emigrants among whom Russian intellectuals (e.g., scholars and students, teachers, engineers, physicians, writers) occupied the first place.****

In Prague, Sorokin gave lectures at the *Russkii narodnyi universitet* (Russian People's University), delivered a huge number of reports and speeches to various audiences on Russian emigration, was a member of the Board of the Union of Russian Writers and Journalists, wrote books, published articles and reviews in émigré magazines, and participated in the Conradi trial as a witness. At the same time, he was preparing to leave for the United States – and studying English assiduously.

Sorokin's article *Город и деревня (Био-социологическая характеристика)* (City and Country (Bio-Sociological Characteristics))****, which we have selected for translation, was published in 1923 in the collection *Крестьянская Россия IV* under the editorship of A.A. Argunov, A.A. Bem, S.S. Maslov, and P.A. Sorokin. The compilations were published by Sergey Semyonovich Maslov, leader of the Peasant Russia group, which was well known to Sorokin from his joint work in the Socialist Revolutionary Party, the members of which group went legally abroad in 1921. In Prague, Maslov received a grant for the publication of periodical collections under the name *Крестьянская Россия. Сборник статей по вопросам общественно-политическим и экономическим* (Peasant Russia. Compilation of Articles on Socio-Political Issues and Economics). After arriving in Prague, Sorokin joined the editorial board, participated on the board until issue VI, and published five articles and several book reviews in *Крестьянская Россия*.*****

* Sorokin Pitirim A. Long Journey: The Autobiography of Pitirim A. Sorokin (New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1963. – P. 198.

** Дойков Ю.В. Питирим Сорокин в Праге (1922–1923) // Питирим Александрович Сорокин / Под ред. В.В. Сапова. М.: РОССПЭН, 2013. – С.404–405.

*** Mchitarjan I. Prague as the centre of Russian educational emigration: Czechoslovakia's educational policy for Russian emigrants (1918–1938). Paedagogica Historica. Vol. 45, No. 3 (June 2009). – P. 376.

**** Ibid. P. 377.

***** Сорокин П.А. Город и деревня (Биосоциологическая характеристика) // Крестьянская Россия. IV. Прага, 1923. – С. 3–23.

***** Соколов М.В. Политическая и издательская деятельность Сергея Маслова в эмиграции в 1921–24 гг. // Деятели книги: Михаил Николаевич Куфаев (1888–1948): сборник научных трудов по материалам 15-х Смирдинских чтений. СПб.: Изд-во Санкт-Петербургского гос. ун-та культуры и искусств, 2010. – С. 81.

The compilation of publications by Maslov and his colleagues in the mid-twenties actually constituted the strategic program of “Peasant Russia” as a future party. This party was to combine in its program national and governmental problems and the problem of protecting the interests of the most populous social stratum in postrevolutionary Russia – the peasantry.* Together with Maslov, members of the editorial Board of *Крестьянская Россия* and some professors, Sorokin planned to create an Institute of Peasant Culture in Prague.** *City and Country*, not being programmatic in form, contributes to the theoretical justification of the strategic program of the future peasant party. It is by this criterion that it should be considered.

Such is the macro-context that briefly explains the circumstances of the publication of the text of the article *City and Country*, its content, specifics of the language and style, and features of the translation.

Sorokin refers to his article *City and Country* in Chapter XVII (“The Causes of Revolution”) of *The Sociology of Revolution* – his work published (in 1925) in English – in which he states: “The cities are more often shaken by revolutionary fever than the villages; the former begin it whereas the latter usually put an end to it” and cites his article *City and Country* (from which he quotes freely in this chapter) in a footnote.*** Obviously, Sorokin’s ideas on the opposition of urban and rural sociology (the latter on which he published several works during his academic career in the United States) were central to him in formulating his theory of the causes of revolutions. It was this link that sparked our interest in *City and Country*.

Finding the original article of 1923, preparing the 1923 text for publication in Russian, and translating it into English turned out to be difficult. Sorokin has a peculiar, often idiomatic and emotional style. This is not dry sociology.

The text of *City and Country* itself is a bizarre combination of expository prose of a scholarly (social scientific) and journalistic nature, with the latter clearly prevailing. Sorokin’s essay (study) is based upon the juxtaposition of key features of cities and villages based upon a number of biological, psychological and social indicators, revealing their contradictory – indeed, antithetic, in Sorokin’s view – relationship and future prospects. The main method of drafting a text in the case of Sorokin’s article is antithesis – in both the text as a whole and in its component parts, which are based on antithesis (as noted above): the opposition of city and country, of cities and villages, based on their characteristic features (as the author sees them) and their peculiarities. Sorokin, the author, takes a pro-country, “pro-peasant” position, which is not surprising given his rural upbringing and his political views.

Let us dwell on some of the features of the transfer of the content and style of this article, which must be taken into account when translating into English.

Scholarly exposition is featured in the first section of Sorokin’s article. He uses abstract social scientific terms such as *брачность* (marriage), *рождаемость* (fertility), *смертность* (mortality) and provides statistical data buttressed by footnotes comprised of statistical tables and references to sources such as the *Bulletin de l’Institut international*

* Ibid. P. 84.

** Дойков Ю.В. О.р. cit. P. 405.

*** Sorokin Pitirim A. *The Sociology of Revolution*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1925. – Pp. 396–397.

de statistique. Up to this point, the article appears to exemplify logical if not dispassionate analysis and accuracy of presentation. The conceptual diagram (outline of the basic concepts) of the article is precise and unambiguous.

With respect to the scholarly apparatus, it should be remembered that *Крестьянская Россия* was not a scholarly publication, which may explain the carelessness and inaccuracies in the preparation of the footnotes. Another reason is that Sorokin simply did not have access to his sources, and the ability to verify them. Sorokin – despite the statistics he provides – was not writing here as an empirically oriented scholar, nor as a social scientist engaged in research, but more as a journalist/essayist and polemicist. When preparing the text for publication in Russian and in the process of translation, we tried to be careful with the peculiarities of the author's language and style. Only obvious errors and misprints were corrected.

Another notable peculiarity of the text of *City and Country* is its journalistic nature – and, even more so – rhetorical. With a few abbreviations and edits, Sorokin's article can be read out loud to an audience. The text is rich in rhetorical tropes and figures, and the article uses metaphors, idioms, and various types of citation. It can be assumed that the article was based on the text of a public speech by Sorokin, or that it was written with the expectation of its being used for public speaking practice. The journalistic nature of the text is particularly noticeable in Sections 2 and 3. Undoubtedly, the journalistic experience of Sorokin, the former editor of two major Socialist-Revolutionary newspapers, inclined him (and gave him an aptitude) to write quickly, expressively, and emotionally, in order to have an impact on the reader.

Thus, it can be stated that the text of *City and Country* shows the idiosyncrasies of Sorokin's language and style, an amalgam of scholarly and journalistic prose that was characteristic of many subsequent works of Sorokin in different formats. Objective presentation is combined with the categorical, sweeping statement and rhetoric characteristic of political speeches. Aimed at persuading as much if not more in such instances (i.e., in prose passages of this nature) than scholarship, explication, or analysis. Such features of the author, Sorokin's, content, ideas, and style require not only the accurate transmission of the informational and emotional-stylistic component of the text, but also the ability of the translator to immerse oneself in Sorokin's worldview and his oeuvre as a whole.

Acknowledgments: We wish to thank Natalia Rakhmanchik for her diligence in preparing a complete transcript of the original text of "City and Country" and for updating the Russian orthography. And to Marina Lomonosova for her crucial and invaluable help in finding the text of the original article.

PITIRIM SOROKIN

CITY AND COUNTRY

(Bio-Sociological Characteristics)*

1

City and country! Two worlds, now hostile, now in solidarity, but always sharply different from one another! There is no way to put them side by side in the same category. To prescribe the same prescriptions to them as being equally suitable (as is often done) is unwise. To advocate for the complete identity of the interests of the rural and urban populations amounts to being unrealistic. If this is at all true, then it follows that in rebuilding Russia it is necessary to take into special account its “rural” character – the fact that 86 percent of its population are villagers, and 74.6 percent are employed in agriculture and professions allied with it. Consideration of this fact is also necessary in order to know what the pluses and minuses are for the matter of reviving the rural character of Russia, what is its strength and what is its weakness.

Of course, like the majority of countries, Russia will be “urbanized,” there will be growth in the percentage of the urban population at the expense of the rural population, but it will be decades before this percentage amounts to at least half of the total population.

Let’s move on to a brief outline of the differences between the city and country.

2

Let’s start with the *biological* differences.

The indigenous inhabitants of the country and the city are far from being all the same from a *biological* point of view. As a general rule, *not the city, but the village is a national reservoir of health*. Despite the fact that in cities more funds are spent on hygienic, sanitary and medical measures than in villages, a series of generations living in cities are inferior in vitality to the indigenous inhabitants of villages. The huge population density in cities, the multiplicity of factories and plants, the employment and confinement of the inhabitants in enclosed spaces, the predominance of mental work over muscular, the exceptional complexity of urban life, etc. – all this quickly “wears down” the urban populace and over a series of generations degenerates it biologically. To the same “wear,” generally speaking, *the lesser adaptation of a person to modern urban life also contributes*. The “urban environment” is a relatively new phenomenon in the life of mankind. “Industrial cities” of the modern type have existed for no more than a few decades, or at the most, a century or two. “Cities” in general, as administrative and consumer centers (for example, the cities of the ancient East) appeared only two or three thousand years ago. In addition, until recently, an insignificant percentage of humanity lived in them. A huge part of the

* Translated by Natalia S. Sergieva and Roger W. Smith: Сорокин П.А. Город и деревня: био-социологическая характеристика // Крестьянская Россия. IV. Прага, 1923. – С. 3–23.

latter, for many, many millennia, lived under “rural” conditions, in the “bosom of nature,” engaged in agriculture, hunting, fishing and cattle-breeding.

All behavior – reflexes, instincts, impulses – and the whole human organism in the course of this history of many thousands of years, was adapted to “country” rather than city life. The natural environment for it was the former, not the latter. Is it any wonder, then, that when conditions made it necessary for a person to be placed amidst the urban environment of modern London, New York and Chicago, an environment to which history had not accustomed him, his organism and the entirety of his deepest impulses and instincts were not adapted to it. He had and has to destroy them abruptly. This process could not and cannot be painless. Just as any organism, transferred to new and sharply different from customary conditions, often cannot endure them and dies, or gradually begins to become weak, so the organisms of “city dwellers” could not and cannot even biologically adapt to the city. Hence the rapid “biological wearing out” of the urban population, hence the rural population’s health advantage over the urban population.

What facts confirm this statement? – Many. First, routine observation of each one of us. A physically strong person, “in the pink, ruddy,” and so on, we associate not with a “city slicker,” but with a “hick.” And vice versa: a pale, tired face, nervous, sickly, marked by the imprint of tuberculosis and exhaustion, underdevelopment and weakness, or, on the contrary, the imprint of unhealthy obesity and morbid corpulence – is this not the face and figure of a city dweller? There are, of course, exceptions, sometimes very significant ones, but we are talking about a general norm, and not about exceptions.

Statistics of *occupational morbidity and mortality* also tell the same thing. The agricultural profession is one of the best in this respect.* The profession of industrial workers and a number of other urban professions is one of the worst.

The contrast between the rural and urban populations in this regard would have been much more marked if we had a purely urban population, not replenished continuously by the influx of “hicks,” but left to their own devices, so to speak. In this case the biological degeneration of the city would have been incomparably clearer. The degeneration is now concealed precisely by the fact of the enormous and constant “refreshment” of the urban

* Here are some of many examples.

For the same number of persons of different professions aged 25 to 65 years, in England during 1900–1902 the number of deaths due to the following diseases were:

	farmers	construction workers	salesmen	butchers	doctors
Inflammation of kidneys	14	39	41	46	44
Liver disease	8	21	60	60	54
Digestive diseases	20	24	28	29	46
Diabetes	6	7	15	20	24
Rheumatism	-	3	4	5	3
Total	48	94	148	160	171
Taking the indicator of farmers equal to 100	100	196	308	333	356
Diseases of the nervous system	54	94	125	133	132

«Наследие» № 1 (18) (2021)
 population by that of the countryside. Large cities are continuously “suctioning” from the villages the most healthy, most able-bodied, most energetic elements of the population. The former grow and live for the most part at the expense of the latter, not their own. Without such “suction,” large cities could hardly maintain their biological balance. On the other hand, *had it not been for this ebb from the countryside of the most healthy and able-bodied elements of its population – the biological “passport” of the latter would have been even better.* I will illustrate the foregoing with several data.

Berlin population statistics in 1900 showed that only 40.3 percent of its population consists of persons born in Berlin. The remaining 59.7 percent of “Berliners” are newcomers, among them the main percentage is comprised of natives of villages. If you look at the age composition of the “newcomers” and the “native Berliners,” the picture is drawn in the following form: among newcomers, the percentage of persons aged 16 to 50 years (i.e., percentage of able-bodied) is 69.8 percent, among the second only 43.8 percent. Of 427,445 persons who were born and graduated from rural schools in East Prussia, only 222,915, or 52 percent, were settled in the countryside and engaged in agriculture, of the rest, 204,530 persons, or 48 percent, the vast majority were settled in cities.* The same thing happens in other countries, including Russia. Of all those persons who left for seasonal work from the Yaroslavl province in 1893, 72.2 percent went to the capitals. In Moscow, according to the census of 1871, 43 percent of the population consisted of immigrant peasants, according to the census of 1882 – they accounted for 49.2 percent. In St. Petersburg, according to the census of 1869, peasants, i.e., newcomers from villages, accounted for 33.9 percent of the total population, according to the 1881 census their percentage increased to 40.8 percent, according to the 1897 census – 59 percent. The population growth of St. Petersburg over six years, equal to 178,000, was caused by an influx of 150,000 from the outside, of which 85 percent were peasants, i.e. “hicks.”** Of these examples, which are typical of the vast majority of countries, the indicated “suctioning” role of cities is clear, as is also that the rampant growth of their population over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.*** Occurred not due to the multiplication of native townspeople, but due to the population of villages continuously pouring into the cities, and the more intense the larger the city. (Carey even formulated the “social law of gravity,” which states that the attractive power of cities is directly proportional to the mass of their population and inversely proportional to the square of the distance).

This fact is confirmed by a number of other data, which in turn characterize further differences in biological processes among urban and rural populations.

* Stieger, *ibid.* 160–61.

** Brockhaus and Efron, *Encyclopedic Dictionary*, vol. 54, 268 pp.

*** Here are the numbers

		1800		1900–07	
London	population	958	thousand	4 758	thousand
New York	"	60	"	4 113	"
Paris	"	648	"	2 763	"
Berlin	"	172	"	2 049	"
Chicago	"	003	"	2 049	"
Petersburg	"	220	"	1 939	"

Levasseur: La répartition de la race humaine. In *Bull. Inst. Int. de Statistique*, vol. XVIII, 11. 57.

First, the birth rate of cities, as a general rule, is significantly lower than the birth rate of the rural population. In Germany, for example, births per 1,000 inhabitants in 1900 amounted to: in cities 34.8, in villages 39.5. For 1,000 married women under 50 in 1899–1902, there are 240 births in cities, 287 in villages.* The same is true in other countries.** The same in Russia. For example, in the five years of 1907–1912 the natural population growth in villages was 17.6 per 1,000 population, in cities – 10.2. At the same time the birth rate for European Russia during the nineteenth century fluctuated between 40 and 52 per 1,000 population, in 1910 it was 44.1, in 1911 – 43; in Moscow, it did not rise above 30; in 1911 – 13, in 1911–13 it was 28.9. In Petrograd, it was also close to these figures, in 1910 it was 29.9, in 1911 – 29.2.*** This fact again suggests that the main place of “production of people” is a village, not a city. Moreover, the larger the latter, the lower the birth rate.

The same applies to a large extent to marriage rate. It is usually lower in cities than in villages. For example, in Russia in the nineteenth century, the marriage rate fluctuated between 8 and 10 per 1,000, in 1910, it was equal to 8.2, in 1911, 8.7; in Moscow in 1910–14, it was only 5.8, in Petrograd in 1910, 5.9, in 1911, 6.3; it was generally lower than in rural Russia. The same phenomenon is observed in other countries. It makes it all the more important that the age composition of the urban population, it would seem, should have entailed increased marriage and fertility. Due to the outflow of mainly able-bodied age classes (16–50 years old) from the country (i.e. layers capable of producing children), their percentage in the urban population is usually higher than in the countryside. And yet, despite this, the urban environment allows for reduced fertility**** and even nuptiality.

With regard to mortality, it is not higher in cities, at times is even lower than in villages, but this is largely explained by the fact that here the percentages of children and the elderly, that is, the age groups giving the highest mortality rates, are less than in villages. Consequently, this phenomenon cannot serve in favor of the biological advantage of the urban population.

All these facts indicate that *biologically the city is a “consumer” of the population, not its “producer.” It “spends” health, but does not “accumulate” it.*

Given a number of such data, Ammon sketched the whole picture and gave some details of this “biological” exploitation of a village by a city. In his opinion and calculations, the population of a city would have died out for several generations if it had not been for this influx of “hicks.” The influx is a savior. It fills that “emptiness” which is formed by the continuous extinction of “city folk” who have behind them several generations of ancestors who lived in the city. The place of the dying is filled with more and more newcomers from the villages. In the first generation, they merge mainly with the lower strata of the urban population; their children are already, to a large extent, included in the middle and

* Stieger, *ibid.* 158.

** See Mayr’s works, *Statistics and Social Studies*, by *Levasseur*: La population française. For America, see *E. Ross*: *The Principles of Sociology*, 1920 Ch. 11.

*** Statistical Yearbook of Russia for 1913. Krasnaya Moskva. Materials on the statistics of Petrograd, vol. V. 19.

**** See von Mayr: “Statistics and Social Science,” 113–115. *Mayo-Smith*. 54

MacGarr: *The Rural Community*, 1922. 20–22. *Annuaire stat. des grandes villes européennes*, 1913. 40–42.

upper strata of the city, occupying the “empty places” of the extinct “townspeople”; their grandchildren rise even higher. But through this ascent, these descendants of “hicks” become urbanized, urbanizing in turn, weaken, begin to die out themselves, like their predecessors, and leave “empty” spaces, filling with new tides of the village population, etc.*

Such is the “cycle” of phenomena in the life of the urban population and the role of the country in maintaining its biological balance.

From the foregoing, I believe, the “biological” role of the country in the fate of any nation is clear, its difference and advantage over the city in this regard.

This explains the potential advantage of “agricultural” countries like Russia over highly industrialized nations.

The fact of stopping the influx of village blood can threaten the “decay” of an overly urbanized population. Rural countries are less in danger of degeneration. The very fact of a higher birth and death rate in such countries, with all its negative aspects, has a positive one. No matter how cruel such a method of “selection” is, yet objectively, for the maintenance and survival of the strong elements of the population, for maintaining the health and strength of the nation, it is almost more expedient than the humane policy of reducing the fertility and mortality of urbanized countries, which completely upsets the mechanism of “selection” and leads to a hothouse preservation of life and to the hothouse breeding of “hothouse people.” Such a “sluggish” “metabolism” leads to an accumulation and the contamination of the “social organism” with “poor quality” elements, is able to reduce the viability of the latter and can contribute to its degeneration.** Large mortality with a large birth rate of the rural population in Russia means, on the contrary, “energy metabolism.” Under normal conditions, it leads to the survival of the strongest and the withering away of the weakest, and therefore, for all its cruelty, it was and is one of the factors in maintaining the vitality, health and energy of the people.

With 86% of the rural population, we can afford the luxury of urbanization. The dangers of hyper-urbanization are very far from us. Therefore, potentially, “social organisms” like the population of Russia have a better chance of survival in the future than in countries with an overdeveloped urban life.

* Ex. In Karlsruhe, 82% of the rural newcomers entered the lower strata of the population; of their sons already only 41%, of their grandchildren – only 40%. In the first generation, only 14% of the newcomers belonged to the middle class, and, of their sons, already 49%. Aliens comprised only 4% of officialdom, 10% of their sons, and 25% of their grandchildren.

O. Ammon: Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürlichen Grundlagen, 1895.143 ff. Of the 88 professors and Lehramtskandidaten in southern German cities, 45% had farm fathers, and 57% had grandfathers.

P. Mombert: Zur Frage der Klassenbildung. Kölner Vierteljahresshefte für Sozialwissenschaften, I. Jahrg., Heft 3, 40–44.

For a general theory of social circulation, see my System of Sociology, Vol. II. On the other hand, E.F. Hoag looked at the fate of students from the American village of Belleville (having no more than 500 inhabitants) over 100 years. It is clear from his interesting and excellent research that of the 3,043 students who graduated from this village in 100 years and had farming fathers, only 948 became farmers. With respect to place of residence, only 35.3% lived in villages (with a population of less than 1,000), of the rest, 17.4% lived in towns with a population of 1,000 to 5,000, 22.6% – in cities with a population of over 1,000,000. See E.F. Hoag: The National Influence of a Single Farm Community, 1921.

** See on this score a number of correct considerations in G.T.W. Patrick: The Psychology of Social Reconstruction, 1920. 117 ff; 237 et seq.

The environment surrounding a person in the countryside and in the city is completely heterogeneous. And therefore, neither can the behavior – reflexes, acts, deeds and mental experiences – of a native city dweller and a villager, in particular a farmer, be similar either. From biology and especially from a new discipline – *the science of the behavior of organisms and in particular people** – we know that the behavior of people (A) represents the result (“function”) of two main causes, two “independent variables”: the nature of the organism with all of its hereditarily obtained properties (B) and the nature of the environment, as a complex of stimuli (C), acting upon the body and causing on its part reciprocal acts (“reactions”), in their totality and composite behavior.

$$A = f(B + C)$$

If therefore in this equation the organism (B) or the sphere (C) or both “independent variables” change, then the behavior also changes (A). The environment (C) of a city and the environment of a village are profoundly different from one another, and due to the difference in this “variable,” the behavior (as well as the psyche) of a city dweller and a farmer will also be distinctly different. The first lives mainly “in the bosom of culture,” the second – “in the bosom of nature.” The first is in an “artificial,” the second – in a “natural” environment. Iron, concrete and stones, steam and electricity, a huge overcrowding of the population, shops, cafes, newspapers, telephones, factories, cars, a constantly moving stream of trams, cars and trains, the crazy hustle and bustle in the streets – this is the environment of a city dweller. He perceives the whole world through the prism of “culture,” he himself, so to speak, is all wrapped up in newspapers and diapers of “civilization” and is only occasionally exposed to the direct influence of “nature.” It is not a natural wind that blows it, but a stream of ventilated air, the real sun is replaced by an electric chandelier, the soil is pavement, a river is compressed into iron and concrete, a canal stained with oil, a forest and trees are a trimmed and powdered and polished park, the wonders and the life of nature he sees only in the “cinema,” the life of animals – in a “zoological garden.” He himself is all “stylized” and “cultured,” starting with false teeth, powder, a corset, and ending ... with petroleum, engine oil and coal soot ...

The environment of the village is the complete opposite ... Here, the layer of the “diapers of culture and civilization” is thinner, only partially, in the form of patches, they “wrap” a person and separate him from the “bosom of nature.” And, therefore, there are differences in the foundation and nature of the “reactions” of the “peasant” as opposed to the city dweller, because the content and pace of their mental life are also different. Let’s note some of these differences. Firstly, the insane complexity and variability of the urban environment *require from the city dweller quick and flexible reactions, complexity and rapid variability of behavior* ... “Be on the lookout” on the street, otherwise you will be crushed by a crowd, a car and a tram. “Be on the lookout,” standing near a car, otherwise you will be left without a finger or a head. “Be on the lookout” at work – in a factory, in

* See the literature about this in my System of Sociology, vol. I. It has undergone the greatest development in Russia (the works of I. P. Pavlov and his students, Bekhterev, V. Wagner) and in America («behaviorism,” represented by the works of Thorndike, Watson, Meyer, Bentley, Jennings, Lashley, etc.)

an office, in a shop, otherwise you will be fired and left without a piece of bread; “hurry up” and read the newspaper, hurry up in your efforts and in your creativity, otherwise you will be overtaken by others, you will remain on the “margins of life”... Every minute and hourly thousands of irritants (newspapers, telephone, mail, boss, subordinates, petitioners, electrical effects, shop windows, a continuous crowd on the street, noise, din, shouts, advertisements, etc.) here affect the individual and demand from him quick, flexible and complex reactions – reciprocal, “adaptive” acts. Otherwise, death. Hence the exceptional speed, the deliberate fussiness (“time is money,” “everything is on the clock”) and the flexibility of the behavior of the city dweller.

A completely different “complex of irritants” exists for the villager. His structure and rhythm of life are infinitely simpler. He is adapted only to the slow rhythm of nature (night and day, spring, – summer, – autumn, – winter), here is silence, solid slowness and a strong persistence of movements (oxen and horses, plowing and sowing, etc.); here “haste makes waste,” there is no danger of being crushed on the street, newspapers are rare, books – the same, there is no huge crowd and crush; all that is needed is strength, perseverance, thoroughness in performing a number of basic tasks; what is required is the correspondence of the response “reactions” not to capricious changes in the madly rushing world of people, but to a less capricious and incomparably slower and simpler rhythm of natural phenomena ...

Hence it is clear why the behavior of a city dweller is incomparably more fussy, faster and more flexible than the “sedate” movements of the “country laggard.”

In this connection, there is another characteristic of difference. *The scope of “experience,” of the mental “outlook” (or in objective language of the “conditioned reflexes”) of a city dweller is much broader than that of a “hick.” But it is incomparably less stable and much more superficial, dilettantish, than the scope of the latter’s “experience.”* The city dweller “knows everything”: his newspapers inform him about the events of the whole world, his cinematographs show him thousands of peripeteias of human life, his museums and theaters, exhibitions and shops introduce him to the most diverse miracles and phenomena, from the books he reads, he knows a lot, finally, from lectures and meetings, from conversations and meetings, he gleans a wide variety of information.

But at the same time – he knows all this superficially, and therefore a huge part of his experience (“conditioned reactions”), his beliefs, his tastes, and assessments – is unstable, inconstant and changeable. All this information was acquired by him *not in genuine life experience, not in responding to these very stimuli, but indirectly, only from the pale shadows of those genuine stimuli*: through books, movies, stories, theaters and hearsay. Therefore, his “experience” in a huge part is “pseudo-experience,” his “knowledge” “pseudo-knowledge.” Speaking in the language of objectivists, I would say more precisely that most of the conditioned or combined reactions of a city dweller represent “artificial” rather than “natural” reflexes.*

Thus, with such an “indirect” acquaintance with the phenomena, distortions of the latter are possible and even inevitable (one can never be sure how much nonsense is written in books, newspapers, shown in the movies, is spoken at mass meetings, etc., nonsense often

* See concerning this difference the works of Acad. I. P. Pavlov and his students.

getting things completely wrong), quite often this dilettantish “knowledge” is an acute form of ignorance, much more harmful than simple ignorance.*

As an acute example of this can serve the many “intellectuells” (intelligentsia) with their “bookish” pseudo-knowledge, with their detachment from life, who confidently offer “corrective” recipes, in fact, often leading to death (the Russian Bolsheviks are an example). The same dilettantism is also caused by the huge amount of information acquired by the city dweller. There is so much “news,” “information,” “knowledge” that there is no physical possibility to verify, study and research them. Thus, the city dweller knows everything, but in reality he does not know anything except a limited amount of genuine experience in his specialty. Is it any wonder, therefore, that with such dilettantism this pseudo-experience is unstable. Today, according to the newspaper, the city dweller thinks so (after reading a “refutation” or “criticism”) – tomorrow, differently. Today someone in his favor, tomorrow, others. “*Sensation*” is one soul of the city. “*Fashion*” is another. *Paradoxism* and *extravagance* are the third. *Imbalance* is the fourth. These are other names for this instability and variability of the “content of consciousness” of the city dweller. “*Fashion*” reigns here everywhere. “*Fashion*” for costumes, for plays, for poets, for dances, for styles, for ideologies, for beliefs, for tastes. And not even just “*fashion*,” but “the last cry of fashion.” One wave of “*fashion*” for everything replaces another in order to immediately make way for a new one.

The city is alive with “sensations.” From one “sensation” to another. Newspapers, shops, writers and poets accentuate the sensation. Everything and everyone here seeks to stun and daze the city dweller: with an extraordinary effect, advertising, paradox, any absurdity and extreme. Here the mania for “imitation” is at the same time a mania for “originality.” “Common sense,” poise here are not held in high esteem. To call a poet or writer unoriginal is to insult him. To be well adjusted means to be uninteresting, etc.

The “experience” and the “content of consciousness” of the peasant-farmer are completely different. The world of his “experience” is relatively narrow, “the content of consciousness” is limited. He knows neither about the change of ministries in foreign countries, nor what is being done there, nor “new trends” in poetry and art, nor the new dances, nor new styles of dresses, etc. He is not an encyclopedist like a city dweller. His mental baggage is not in the least like the “warehouse of various and random things” with which are filled the head of a city dweller. But *what he knows, he knows firmly and thoroughly. His experience is direct. And this direct experience is broader for him than the direct experience of a city dweller.* The first has to deal not with the book world, but with “things,” not with “shadows of phenomena,” but with the phenomena themselves. With real animals, with real plants, with real land, with a real change of phenomena in the life of nature. “Bookish,” “cognitive experience,” in his real, practical experience, plays a small and always secondary role. He learns everything literally “with his body,” with his hands, feet and body, and not “from books,” not from “pictures,” nor only with his eyes. Thanks to all this, he is an incomparably better naturalist than a city dweller.

* In an objective study of human behavior, the difference between this “direct experience” and “conditional, ordinary experience” acquires incomparably greater significance than is usually attributed to it. The value of the latter is infinitely less than the first. It is often even negative. See on this score the correct observations in an article by V. Savich: “An attempt to understand the process of creativity from the point of view of a reflective act.” *Krasnaya Nov’*, No. 4, 1922.

«Наследие» № 1 (18) (2021)

His knowledge in this area is often such that a specialist scientist might envy it. Oh, he certainly does not know the theories of Darwin and Mendel (however, besides the names, 90 percent of the townspeople do not know them), he has not even heard their names, but he knows the life of his forest, his field, animals, the change of phenomena in nature, their signs are in such details, so true, so accurate that he leaves the city dweller far behind him ... By virtue of this “immediacy of experience,” it is firmly established with him, for it is adequate for the phenomena. It does not require quick adjustments, like the inadequate experience of a city dweller. Therefore, it is *not subject to rapid fluctuations and rapid changes*. The latter cannot be so abrupt for him also because in his experience the share of “middling,” “inauthentic experience” occupies only a small role, in contrast to the city dweller, who is entirely a book and newspaper person. That is why *the peasant farmer is inevitably conservative*, not in the specific political sense of “reactionary,” but in the sense of the greater constancy of his reflexes, habits, views, tastes, and convictions. They change incomparably more slowly for him than for a city dweller. Instead of “fashion,” “tradition” reigns here, instead of “the latest sensation” – “the precepts of grandfathers and great-grandfathers,” following that which was “from time immemorial,” looking not forward but backward. “Sensation” is not held in high esteem here. Extremes and loudness the same. Calm equanimity and the realm of common sense – find, on the contrary, good ground.

Hence, it is clear, as will be indicated below, why *the city – especially a large city – has always been a hotbed of innovation, change, social unrest, a “fashion” bellwether, in a word, “a fermenting enzyme” in the life of the whole country*. The village, on the contrary, in addition to an exceptional combination of conditions, was and remains, until urbanized, a “stronghold of order,” conservatism, a bearer and custodian of “national traits,” “traditions,” more broadly – the entire history of the country. Separate from the country its large cities, leave them to themselves – and they will very quickly lose their “national face,” the history and properties of their people, in the pursuit of “fashion” they will quickly forget the customs, traditions, faith, views and way of life of their country, will soon become “denationalized” or internationalized. This is also facilitated by the “international” composition of their population. For the city, unlike the village, is always “a mixture of peoples, persons, tribes, dialects, conditions.” The village, on the contrary, was and remains the “chain” that connects the past of a country with its future, preserves and passes from generation to generation “national traits and characteristics, a way and style of life.” The city is an internationalizing factor, the countryside is a nationalizing factor – *par excellence*. This explains the fact that non-urbanized peoples (Ireland, Serbia, Bulgaria, etc.), even having fallen under the rule of foreigners and living under this rule for centuries, did not lose their national identity and were resurrected again in the form of autonomous political-national bodies. That is why the loss of political independence and falling under someone else’s power for a rural country is not at all a loss of nationality.* It can live under these conditions for many, many centuries.

* See on this point the correct provisions in an article of *A. van Gemep*: *Class rural, noblesse et nationalité*. Revue de l’Institut de Sociologie. No. 2, 1921.

Among the peasantry and landowners, a national tendency develops for the first time and grows, while among the townspeople: the aristocracy, the court, the bureaucracy, the indigenous townspeople, industrialists and workers, we see either the opposite tendency or only a following of the national movement of the countryside, such is the author’s main thesis. In the history of a number of countries, he convincingly confirms it.

In connection with this same extremely complex environment of the city, there is a further distinction between a city and a village. *The city in the «social organism» of a country represents the center of an unusually intense nervous life, innovative creativity and management, the center of nervous expenditure, and thus all the vital energy of the country; the village, on the contrary, was and remains the center of the creation and accumulation of this energy, which is wastefully spent by the city.*

On the nervous system of the city dweller every hour there falls such a huge amount of “irritation,” that which hardly falls on the nervous system of a villager in a week. The nervous system, and with it the whole organism of the city dweller, must react to all these “irritations.” They are constantly in an “overexcited” state. They constantly expend nervous and vital energy. Hence – the exceptional tension of the nervous activity of the city. Hence – *its creativity, its innovation, its creative productivity in industry, science, art, politics, etc.* Due to the same circumstances, the same city dweller himself is as active as possible, daring, always an adventurer to one degree or another, sometimes cunning, sometimes clever, then brutal. He is an inventor. He is an innovator. He is a bundle of nerves. Waves of innovation come and go from the city.

At the same time, due to the same overstrain of nervous life, the city was and *remains the “nervous system of the country” in the sense of the center that regulates and controls it.* Connected with the country by thousands of telegraph-telephone-radio lines, by railways and mail, it, in the person of the government, the boards of trusts and banks, of all kinds of committees of various societies, the center of “public opinion,” sends one order after another to the country, sets in motion a “loose” and “awkward” body of the latter, restrains it in some movements and stimulates with others.

But in the same strength of the city lie its weakness. “Wasteful expenditure” of nervous energy by the city will inevitably lead to collapse, to the “nervous bankruptcy” of the city, if this expenditure is not replenished with “fresh nerves” brought in by the continuous influx of “hicks.” By wringing the nerves of its inhabitants, it makes them further unfit. Hence a number of particular phenomena in the neural life of the people.

1. *The percentage of neurologically ill in the city is usually higher than in the countryside.*
2. *The percentage of suicides – persons with a poor nervous system – the same.*
3. *The percentage of sick and “scrawny” among the indigenous townspeople – the same.*
4. *There is no need to talk about the exceptional “nervousness” of the city.*

From what has been said also become apparent *such phenomena as the high prevalence in the city of alcoholism and various intoxicating substances.* The usual pathogens are not enough to keep the nervous system stimulated; artificial and strong narcotic substances or other “strongly acting pathogens” are needed. All this – sometimes imperceptibly, sometimes manifestly, but assuredly leads to “nervous prostration”... The only thing that saves the city from this – and even then not always – is a continuous inflow of fresh nerves, fed and watered by the village and its inhabitants. *The village is precisely the center where*

nervous energy is created and accumulated, but not consumed. Here the latter is cultivated. From here it is taken by the city. Without the former, the latter would have been unable to make a “wastefully luxurious,” brilliantly nervous life. That is why the city hardly has the right to particularly strut in this respect before the village ... In any case, this makes clear the danger of hyper-urbanization of any country if the tide of its own or someone else’s “hicks” with their strong nerves stops.*

From the fact of a person’s historical inability to adapt to city living, from the fact of the complexity of the urban environment and the nervous overstrain ensuing from this, an excess of pseudo-experience, an excess of mental instability and innovation, it follows then evidently that the city was and remains a *“fermenting source” in the life of a country, a hotbed of unrest and revolutionary fever.* The city is the antipode of order. It is always fluttering with a fever of excitement. And it can’t help but flutter. Why? I have indicated the reasons above. For the sake of clarity, I will provide only a couple of illustrations.

Take the huge stratum of the urban population – the workers. Think seriously about the situation and environment of their life. Work in enclosed spaces. A kingdom of machines, steel and coal. Rumbling and noise. Day after day the same work, monotonous, mechanical, not offering anything for the mind or the heart. Where and when in the historical process were man and his main impulses prepared for such a life and for such an environment? Wasn’t the environment the complete opposite during those millennia that humanity and its ancestors lived and during the course of which those hereditary impulses – reflexes, instincts and difficulties – were laid and established, which are very strong, which cannot be destroyed in one or two generations, which require release and fulfillment? Are they and the person adapted to this environment? Can they find a normal way out and satisfaction? – Of course not. The monotony and mechanics of work are deadly. Neither the “instinct” of creativity and “inventions,” nor the “instinct” of variety and life changes, nor the love of adventure, nor curiosity or a number of other innate inclinations that, in fact, contrary to rationalists, control the life and behavior of a person – they absolutely cannot find satisfaction ... Hence – inevitable discontent. Hence – continuous attempts to find a way out. Hence – the permanent revolutionary fever of the city. Put a person to sleep on a bunch of thorns – he will, of course, continually try to change this position to which he is not adapted. The working class is in the same position in the modern prison of iron and stone called the city. This is the main reason for its revolutionary nature. Commonly cited reasons: poverty, misery, long working hours, the contrast between poverty and wealth – by themselves they are either of secondary importance or at times represent only “symbols” of this discontent, points about which they “find fault” in order to give vent to it.**

* See on this a number of correct observations in *E.C. Hayes: Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, *E.A. Ross: The Principles of Sociology*, articles of Simmel and Petermann in the collection *Die Grosstädte und das Geistesleben*.

** For in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries before the war, the well-being of workers had doubled or tripled, according to the research of Bowley, Wood, Giffen, Levasseur and others, but their revolutionary fervor did not disappear. And conversely, the standard of living of the peasants was and remains in many respects lower than that of the workers, and, nevertheless, they are “tranquil.” A person willingly works at his favorite work not eight, but 12–16 hours, and it is not a burden to him. It is difficult to work at a disliked one even for three or four hours. From this point of view, well argued by Patrick, I cannot but agree with him, that as long as this “unnatural” city environment remains or until – for many generations – humanity will not adapt to it, nor to the introduction of 8–6–4 hour workdays, nor to an increase in the material security of workers, nor to the «socialization» of factories, nor to all the measures suggested by socialists, syndicalists, communists,

As long as this “unnatural” environment remains, or until human impulses are adapted to it – and this takes a very long time – the city has been and will remain a “hotbed of revolutionism,” *unrest and coups*. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the life of many peoples the period of revolutions and social storms began precisely at the moment of their significant urbanization, the acquisition of political power by the city and its population and a decline in the influence of the countryside and the peasantry.

“In the first period of the history of Rome, when an entirely conservative peasantry, firmly holding on to the land, undoubtedly dominated the Forum, it is striking that there was no mention of any sharp class antagonisms, of deep class conflicts, or of attacks on the social order,” says Pelman. With the urbanization and proletarianization of Rome, the picture changed dramatically. The same can be said about a number of other cases. (See Pelman: “The History of Ancient Socialism and Communism.” St. Petersburg 1912 546-8.) The working class will certainly toss and turn on the “bed of nails” on which history has laid it.

The village is different from the city in this respect. Perhaps it lives more poorly and modestly than the city, in all probability the peasant does not work 8 hours a day, but much more and ... however, except in cases of absolutely impossible living conditions causing peasant “jacqueries” and riots (literal hunger, etc.), the village does not “tremble” with revolutionary fervor. *Since these extraordinary conditions do not exist, it was and remains, as a norm, a “stronghold of order.”* It was from it, ultimately, that were broken up most revolutions. It was it that put a bridle on them. It was it who led them into safe harbors ... It was so. This is the situation now ... (Hungary, Bavaria, Russia). One of the common reasons for this phenomenon is the great naturalness of the village environment, which has been cultivated for millennia, the adaptability of a person to it, the great opportunity to find satisfaction here for the main impulses of the latter. Further reasons are partly indicated above ...

In connection with the same environment, there are certain further – not only in form, but in content, differences *in the spiritual appearance of the city and village*.

a) *Criticism and skepticism, a spirit of doubt and the undermining of dogmas, beliefs and generally all values* are causally connected with the atmosphere of a modern city. How can there exist here for a long time a strong, fervent and vibrant faith, firm conviction and unshakable devotion to whatever “covenants,” when everything here changes so quickly, when everything is subject to the law of “fashion,” when hundreds of thinkers are “undermining” each belief, against whatever value emerge hundreds of “counter-values”? “A pillar and unshakable ground of the truth” [modified 1 Tim 3:15] is not possible here. Only a temporary and partial triumph of one or another – scientific, religious, political, aesthetic – “fashion” and ... is possible. It is easier to make Montaigne himself a believer than “the soul of the city,” which has heard a lot, seen a lot, corroded by skepticism and a

etc. unable to end this revolutionary urban fervor with all its concomitants: class antagonisms, civil war, etc. The disease lies deeper than is usually thought. And the recommended recipes for its treatment are designed for people who on earth, and especially in cities, do not exist. All of them completely fail to take into account the subconscious-instinctive – the main and basic – side of a person’s life.

The real person is much closer to Dostoevsky’s “Man from the Underground” than to the “Chocolate Angels” depicted by these plans. The disease lies not only in the “social environment,” but also in the person himself, in the world of his impulses, reflexes and instincts.

kind of nihilism ... This was the case in the cities of ancient Greece and Rome, and this is the case now.

A different picture is seen in the village ... Its soul is fresh. It is not overwhelmed with skepticism. *Convictions are strong here. Covenants are holy ... Creeds live long ... Dogmatism and faith are powerful.*

b) In this regard, in moral and legal terms, a number of moral rules and norms in the countryside are incomparably stronger than in the city. Take sex life, for example. The purity and strength of family and marriage are much higher in the countryside than in the city. The overstrained nervous life of a city dweller, with its instability, with its search for “strong stimuli”, leads him “to seek variety” in this area as well. Hence – the early and intensified sex life in the city, the increase in divorce, in proportion to urbanization, the growth of extramarital affairs, births and miscarriages, and the consumption of preventative drugs.*

Criminal statistics show further that *the city is more criminal than the village, and in most other crimes, especially property crime*** (excluding a few, like infanticide, and that is because the city replaces it with ... abortion). In this respect, the city ... is seriously ill.

c) The same difference in the environment and, in particular, the difference in professions inevitably leaves its stamp on the character of the worldview of the city and the countryside, in particular, on the worldview of workers and farmers. The profession and professional environment is of great importance, deforms and stamps in its own image and likeness the entire physical and mental nature of a person.*** What is the professional environment of the urban worker? Stone, iron, soulless machines. *Everything here is dead, mechanical, materialistic.* What is his job? Again, in the simple material transformation of one thing into another. Everything here is subject to the law of necessity, everything is calculated, measured, determined. No will, no soul, no freedom can be seen. People are surrounded by dead automatic machines – and they themselves are automatons. Such a “professional environment” inevitably *makes the worldview of workers mechanical, materialistic, atheistic, deterministic.* This is what we see in reality. *The mechanical-materialistic and atheistic-deterministic worldview is the result of an urban, industrialized environment.* It is functionally connected with it. That is why it is not surprising that with the growth of cities, materialism, atheism, etc., also grow.**** The professional environment and the work

* For example, in Russia for the decade 1884–1894, the percentage of out of wedlock births in cities was 10.89%, in villages – 1.84. The largest percentage of them fell on Moscow (30%), Petersburg (26%), Kiev (20.8%). Encyclopedic Dictionary, vol. 54, – p. 97.

The similarities are observed in other countries as well. As urbanization rises, so does the divorce rate. In Belgium, for example, in cities with a population of over 100,000, their percentage is 10 times higher than in communities with a population of less than 500. The number of divorces with the urbanization process is growing rapidly in all countries except Japan, and the percentage is much higher in cities and in industrial centers compared to with the village. The number of abortions in centers such as Paris, New York, etc. is about 100,000 annually.

See my System of Sociology, vol. 2. 379, ibidem and the literature.

** See about this a number of courses on moral statistics, like Oettingen, Mayr and known works of criminologists like *Aschaffenburg*: “Crime and the Fight against It,” *Gernet*: “Crime and the Fight against It,” *Zhizhilenko*: “Crime and Its Factors,” etc.

*** See on this *Sorokin*: System of Sociology, Vol. 2, *Sorokin*: The Influence of Profession on Human Behavior and Reflexology of Professional Groups. Bulletin of the Study and Education of Personality. No. 2, 1922. St. Petersburg. *Langerock*: Professionalism, American Journ. of Sociology, vol. XXI.

**** See on this *Hoxie*: Class Conflicts in America. American Journ. of Sociology, vol. 13, 776–81.

of the peasant are completely different. *He is always in the midst of living, not dead nature.* He deals with living plants, with living animals, with a living world that is born, grows and dies, where there is a kind of “soul,” joy and suffering, there is a semblance of “pain,” there is his “mind” and life. Here everything is anti-mechanical, everything is spiritualized. The surrounding nature has its own “mystery” and its own mysticism ... *Such an environment and professional work inevitably make the peasant’s worldview antimechanistic, animistic, undeterministic, religious-mystical ...* As a general norm, it is radically different from the worldview of the city worker, and it is painted in completely different colors. It is not the imaginary mind of the city dweller nor the imaginary stupidity of the peasant that causes this difference, but above all the difference in their environment and their professions. That is why the village in its worldview was, is and will be radically different from the city. The first is the center and seat of materialism (economism) and atheism, the second is the source and home of *mysticism, animism and religious spiritualism.*

d) Finally, the difference between the same environments implies a difference between the city dweller, especially the urban worker, and the farmer, in their *attitude to property, to economic collectivism and individualism.* In the broadest sense of the word, all people, of course, are owners and individualists. Reflexes of individual appropriation and seizure, otherwise the “reflex” or “instinct” of property, are given in all organisms and form one of the most basic human instincts.* In this sense, there are no non-owners among them, except for pathological types. Assurances of the absence of “fondness” for private property among workers, socialists, etc. are a simple misunderstanding. The only question is *in what forms can this ineradicable instinct of private property be best satisfied under various conditions, in particular in the city and country, among the worker and the farmer?* This question has to be answered as follows. In the city, with a muscular and intelligent proletariat, it does not find its complete satisfaction under conditions of private property. The proletariat has so little, while others have so much, he is so poor, while others are so rich that, by contrast, his instinct for ownership is “constrained” (in the terminology of Freud and his school). He can repeat the words of an ancient writer: *omnia mea mecum porto* (all that is mine I carry with me). The tools and means of his work are not his own, his apartment is not his, his furniture is not his own, the great riches that plague his eyes do not belong to him. Only a tiny drop of them comes into his possession. The danger of want is constant, his future is not secure. Naturally, his instinct for ownership remains unsatisfied. And therefore – inevitably pushes him to find a way out. This way out is naturally seen in taking possession of at least part of the vast wealth. And since he knows that thousands of the same people claim the same thing, then this dictates the way out of “collectivism” and “socialization.” The same is facilitated by *collective work in factories and plants, mass actions related to the profession.* Hence – *the development and prosperity of socialism, collectivism, ideologies of egalitarianism.* For the prosperity of all these ideologies, there are, of course, a number of other reasons. Some of them, especially for egalitarian ideologies, are indicated in Bouglé’s book “Egalitarianism” (the role of population density and social differentiation in cities) [The actual title of Bouglé’s work was *Les idées égalitaires: étude sociologique* (1899) – translator’s note] *and equalization in the cities, especially among the physical and mental proletariat.* The curve of their success may temporarily fluctuate, depending on a number of conditions, but in cities it was and is and will be high.

* See on this R. Petrucci: *Les origines naturelles de la propriété*, 1905. See the corresponding chapters in the works of Thorndike, McDougall and others.

Conditions in the countryside are significantly different. Here the work is not carried out collectively, not in a building where thousands of people are gathered, but individually. The division of labor and the interdependence of the actions of some individuals from others are much less. The tools and means of production here are not so huge, not so expensive, they do and can belong to individuals. The individual here has and can have his own home, household, equipment and much more. His “property instinct” can find its satisfaction here. He is “not constrained,” as in the city. In addition, according to the working conditions, here the *individuality* of the worker is of great importance in a purely economic sense: his work, attention, efforts, concern for the farm. In the city, in the factory, machines “equalize” individual work, requiring only the average automatic performance of a number of functions. This is not the case here. Here you can’t make do with automation. Here, output is determined primarily by the personal efforts *and individuality of the worker*.

Here the working conditions do not allow the equalizing that is effectuated by the city. They are inherently hostile to placing everyone under the same rank, to equalizing all in the sense of identical economic units, and therefore they are hostile to leveling socialization and collectivization. The latter is conceivable here only in those forms of *free cooperation* that do not “infringe” on the sense of ownership and individual independence, but only complement it. Any universal forced socialization here inevitably leads to “infringement” of the property instinct, and therefore – to the struggle against such infringement, that is, the very phenomenon of collectivization of socialization. This has happened many times in the past. Experiments in the actual practice of communism and socialism (in Egypt, Rome, China in the eleventh century, etc.) have usually died under the pressure of an “infringed property instinct” in the countryside. The same thing has been repeated in our years (Hungary, Bavaria, Russia).

Of course, if conditions in the village itself are such that the instinct of ownership of property is “infringed” and does not find satisfaction (if the peasants do not own land, do not have their own fixed means of production, their own house, farm, etc.), then, due to the same “infringement,” the ideology of redistribution and equalization of the land, its “nationalization,” in a word, the ideals of agrarian socialism find firm ground here too. But only ... before the seizure of land and its appropriation by farmers. As soon as this is accomplished, as soon as the “infringement” of the “property” instinct ends, agrarian socialism disappears, and the peasant owner takes over (we see this even now in Russia).

These are some of the main differences between the city and country. From them we see that there are actually two different worlds – different biologically, mentally and socially. We see that each of them has its own advantages and disadvantages, its own diseases and dangers. From what has been said, it is clear that an urbanized country will always be much more active, it will display incomparably greater kinetic energy than a rural country.* But only as long as it has a village “rearguard,” replenishing its colossal spending. Otherwise, it hangs by a thread. Sooner or later, it is threatened with decline: biological, spiritual, moral and any other. It is similar to a consumptive who is still alive, feverishly active, and

* Kost develops this aspect of the matter especially strongly in his *Outline of Sociology and The Experience of Nations*.

energetic, but the more he manifests activity, the more certain and closer is his exhaustion, loss of strength and ... the end. For a number of countries, this danger has begun to threaten. Moreover, present-day Europe, which is beginning to exhibit a number of symptoms of decline, so close to the symptoms of decline of ancient Rome,* in large measure owes this to its far-reaching urbanization. These symptoms are the first warning signs. Not entirely groundless from this point of view are those currently fashionable views which assert that the future belongs to new, non-European, less urbanized countries. If in Europe there is not enough strength to maintain the balance of city and country, if because of this it collapses, then, of course, someone must arrive to "replace" it. And this "someone" can, of course, only be a fresh, "young" country, not yet aged and worn out with a nervous fever, in the creative but at the same time murderous atmosphere of the city.

But in order that there be a huge kinetic force, to reveal their enormous potential energy, such countries – Russia among them – will also have to strengthen their urbanization. The best solution, however, for these and other countries would be "rurbanization," i.e., a form of community life where the positive sides of the city and country would be combined into one, where instead of modern cities there would be "city-gardens," "city-villages," and vice versa – the villages would have positive aspects of the city, starting with telephones and communication facilities and ending with libraries, schools, laboratories, museums, lectures and clubs. Work in this direction is now underway in several countries, in particular in America ...

Another conclusion is apparent from what has been said. As long as this "rurbanization" does not exist, as long as there is a contemporary contrast between the city and the country, especially in countries such as Russia, it would be naive to believe that it is possible (as a rule, and not as an exception) to unite in the same associations, groups and parties of the population of a country and a city, in particular, an association of peasants and workers. In a few cases this is possible on the basis of a few common interests. But to believe that their complete and long-term unification is possible, at least under the name of "a single working people," means to live in a utopia, not much different than uniting into one unified group the Abyssinians and ... the residents of London. Only a great illusionism can assert this. Hence follows not only the possibility, but the necessity and expediency of the task of uniting a special stratum of the population of the villages – farmers, uniting them within boundaries of one country, uniting them – for a number of purposes – and internationally. The need for the former is obvious for us, Russians. The need for the latter is no less clear. In our time of "international unions of urban workers" and "international unions of capital," from the mutual struggle of which "heads crack" among the entire population, the mutual struggle of which is destroying the world, makes all social life unstable, violates the rights of not only the enemy, but also the huge "neutral" mass of farmers and citizens – such an association is vital. It, and only it, can bring stability to social life, stop the destruction of all the foundations of community life, which in the heat of the struggle – voluntarily and involuntarily – is produced by the contending parties, to protect and save not only their rights and interests, but also the entire edifice of culture, the whole legacy of previous generations, undermined and swayed by the struggling Samsons of urban labor and capital ...

* See on this subject at a minimum a recent book on this topic by Ferrero and Rostovtzeff's article «On the Decline of Ancient Civilization,» in *Russkaya Mysl'* for 1922, Vipper's book *The Cycle of History*.

Сведения об авторах

Балашова Ольга Лавровна, директор Музея истории Сыктывкарского гуманитарно-педагогического колледжа им. И.А. Куратова (Сыктывкар).

sgpk@minobr.rkomi.ru

Balashova Olga Lavrovna, director of the History Museum of Syktывkar Humanitarian-Pedagogical College named after I.A. Kuratov (Syktывkar).

Бондаренко Ольга Евтихеевна, кандидат исторических наук, доцент (Сыктывкар).

pi-muzist@syktsu.ru

Bondarenko Olga Evtikheevna, candidate of history, associate professor (Syktывkar).

Головин Николай Александрович, доктор социологических наук, профессор кафедры теории и истории социологии Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета, Почетный работник высшего образования РФ (Санкт-Петербург).

n.golovin@spbu.ru

Golovin Nikolay Aleksandrovich, doctor of sociology, professor of the Department of theory and history of sociology of the Saint Petersburg State University, Honorary worker of the Higher professional education of the Russian Federation (St. Petersburg).

Зюзов Николай Федосеевич, доктор философских наук, профессор кафедры философии и социально-политических наук Сыктывкарского государственного университета имени Питирима Сорокина, научный руководитель Международного центра социальных исследований (Сыктывкар).

nzyuzev@gmail.com

Zyuzev Nikolay Fedoseevich, doctor of philosophy, professor of the Department of philosophy and socio-political sciences of the Syktывkar State University after Pitirim Sorokin, research supervisor of the International center of social research (Syktывkar).

Мангоне Эмилиана, профессор социологии культуры и коммуникации Университета Салерно, директор Международного исследовательского центра «Средиземноморское знание», редактор издания «Журнал средиземноморского знания» (Фишано, Италия).

emangone@unisa.it

Mangone Emiliana, associate professor in sociology of culture and communication of the University of Salerno (Italy), director of Mediterranean Knowledge International Centre for Studies and Research, editor in chief of the Journal of Mediterranean Knowledge (Fishano, Italy).

Русанова Вера Сергеевна, преподаватель кафедры истории России и зарубежных стран Сыктывкарского государственного университета имени Питирима Сорокина (Сыктывкар).

vera.petrashun@yandex.ru

Rusanova Vera Sergeevna, lecturer of the Department of history of Russia and foreign countries of the Syktyvkar State University after Pitirim Sorokin (Syktyvkar).

Сергиева Наталья Станиславовна, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры менеджмента и маркетинга Сыктывкарского государственного университета имени Питирима Сорокина (Сыктывкар).

nsergieva@yandex.ru

Sergiyeva Natalya Stanislavovna, doctor of philology, professor of the Department of management and marketing of the Syktyvkar State University of Pitirim Sorokin (Syktyvkar).

Смит Роджер В., независимый исследователь, магистр по специальности «Журналистика», автор сайта, посвященного Питириму Сорокину <https://pitirimsorokin.com/> (Нью-Йорк, США).

brandeis106@gmail.com

Smith Roger W., independent scholar, MA, journalism, the author of the site Pitirim Alexandrovich Sorokin at <https://pitirimsorokin.com/> (New York, USA).

Тулчинский Григорий Львович, доктор философских наук, профессор департамента государственного администрирования Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики» (СПб.), заслуженный деятель науки РФ (Санкт-Петербург).

gtul@mail.ru

Tulchinsky Grigory L'vovich, doctor of philosophy, professor of the Department of the state management of the National Research University «Higher School of Economics» (SPB), honored science worker of the Russian Federation (St. Petersburg).

Тюгашев Евгений Александрович, доктор философских наук, доцент кафедры теории и истории государства и права, конституционного права Института философии и права Новосибирского национального исследовательского государственного университета (Новосибирск).

filosof10@yandex.ru

Tyugashev Evgeny Aleksandrovich, doctor of philosophy, associate professor of the Department of theory and history of state, law and constitutional rights of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Novosibirsk National Research State University (Novosibirsk).

Хренов Николай Андреевич, доктор философских наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Отдела медийных и массовых искусств Государственного института искусствознания Министерства культуры Российской Федерации (Москва).

nihrenov@mail.ru

Khrenov Nikolay Andreevich, doctor of philosophy, professor, chief researcher of the Department of media and mass arts of the State Institute of Art Studies of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation (Moscow).