In the *Diary of a Writer* (II 1, 3, 4, July-August, 1877) Dostoevskii ridicules Tolstoi's condemnation of all "violent resistance to evil." The attack is directed against Tolstoi's apparent sympathy with the Western liberal attitude of salutary neglect toward Turkish reprisals against the Southern Slavs. According to Professor Grishin, the *Diary* is the "final word in the development of Dostoevskii's ideas." "Together with the exhortation to suffering, forgiveness to enemies, and to neighborly love . . . we encounter outbursts of anger and uncontrollable passion, whenever Dostoevsky feels the need for a cruel punishment of all those who hold others in bondage and torment them."

Simultaneously, Dostoevskii's criticism of the Tolstoian-liberal indifference to universal suffering strikes at the two political options open to his contemporaries: the dehumanizing capitalism of the western democracies and the depersonalizing socialism of Western and Russian liberals. For Dostoevskii, both systems are vicious consequences of "enlightened" Western rationalism.

As a third solution, Dostoevskii offers an apocalyptic vision of a higher humanity of the future. According to Grishin, Dostoevskii anticipates a unification "of the intelligentsia with the popular masses capable of collaborating in brotherly companionship in the service of Russia, and through it, in the service of mankind."

It is through this new, acutely self-conscious collective that Dostoevskii believes the finite individual can find both secular perpetuity and god-like perfection in the here-and-now. The Russian of the future will become a savior of mankind through an act of supreme self-overcoming. Individual willfulness will be replaced by neighborly love. Resurgent Christian charity will re-embody the Word of Christ in the hearts of the martyr-believers of His truth.

Unlike his ethics, which waver between Christian forgiveness and militant disciplinarianism, Dostoevskii's intuitive metaphysics is consistent. He categorically rejects Western scientism and its spawn, the opportunist *Realpolitik* of the will to power.

Until this point, there seems to be little difference between Dostoevskii's
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intuitive reason and Tolstoi’s “instinct” which instructs the “awakening” self how to bow to the all-powerful love of mankind. But against Tolstoi’s liberal humanism, Dostoevskii raises the banner of a Slavic national collective-in-Christ. What he had written to Fonvizina in 1854 concerning the surrender to irrational truth, “as long as it is with Christ,” re-emerges in the Notes from Underground as the individual’s “own free unfettered choice, one’s caprice.” The idea matures in the Diary as the “last word, flung in the face of all social normalizers.” This word is “what the people always desire, unchangingly and eternally: the policy of [national] truth and honor” (I. 3, July-August 1876). This re-affirmation of a collective sense of pride in truth is the zhivaia zhizn’, the living life of a nation. Thus, the Diary restates speculatively what Shatov of the The Possessed utters as the cardinal principle of his love of mankind. “I believe in Russia. . . . I believe in her orthodoxy . . . I believe in the body of Christ . . . I believe that the new advent will take place in Russia. . . .”

The passage ends in an abrupt fervent “I believe” that points in the direction of a “not yet” convincing faith in a transcendent Being upon whom all intuitive truth depends for authenticity. In the Diary, Dostoevskii returns to the tormenting openness of this question: “where is truth? . . . will man ever get together; will truth ever be so strong as to subdue depravity, cynicism, and egoism of man?” Dostoevskii’s ultimate answer to Tolstoi’s rejection of violent repression of evil is tselitel’nost’ stradaniia, “the healing function of suffering... this too is the central idea of his Christian existentialism.

By contrast, the principal theme of Tolstoi’s secular existentialism is the vindication of life as a collective phenomenon, capable of perpetuating itself only by a constant preying on individual existence. Tolstoi’s ideal of future humanity is predicated on the negation of the ego as a meaningful, this-worldly substance of thought, feeling, and being. This subjective nihilism proceeds from a broader cosmic nihilism which denies the reality of a transcendent ground of Being or simply, of a divine author of the universe.

Dostoevskii’s dialectics between the mangod rebelling against transcendent authority and the godman who reconstructs that authority in the here-and-now through Christian love never finds a final positive synthesis. The problematic openness of this dialectics is painfully evident in the abrupt conclusion of the earlier mentioned profession of faith undertaken by Shatov. “I will believe in God” is all he can stammer. Ivan Karamazov’s censure of God for having made man “too broad” and thus fully capable of embracing the cosmic battle between good and evil, is a variant of the same theme. The final reconciliation of Dostoevskii’s suffering ego with a divine ground of