

NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

as a manuscript

Andrei A. Ilyin

**HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT “REVOLUTION” IN THE WORKS OF A.I.
HERZEN AND M.A. BAKUNIN**

Summary of the PhD thesis

Academic supervisor:
Dr.Sc., Vadim S. Parsamov

Moscow 2018

Introduction

Concept *revolyutsiya* (revolution) had a special place among vast variety of notions and discourses appeared in imperial Russia¹. This concept associated with change of political regimes and drastic transformations in the different spheres of society. It was thought that revolutions were crises, the decisive events. Some saw them as an immense danger whereas others believed they were a solution to all modern problems. So the *revolyutsiya* had acquired importance long before 1905-1907 when the first Russian revolution actually took place. *Revolution* was rather a matter of expectation than of experience.

The thesis deals with a history of *revolution* not on the whole, but with the crucial stages of its formation. They are perceived through the prism of intellectual biographies of A.I. Herzen and M.A. Bakunin, influential public figures, journalists and thinkers of their time.

Herzen and Bakunin distinguished from their contemporaries for a number of features. They were among the first who came to grips with the theory and practice of revolution. They tackled translation and distribution of the Western radical ideas that were circulating in the revolutionary movement. They have lived and worked in Western Europe without losing touch with Russia for a long time. Hence, their position of emigrants substantially facilitated them reaching their goals. Other radical authors followed Herzen and Bakunin and thus they reinforced their statuses of creators of the new intellectual and political movement.

There is a vast amount of works dedicated to different aspects of Herzen and Bakunin intellectual biographies. Nevertheless, revolutionary conceptions of the authors and also their role in creation of *revolyutsiya* have always been out of scholar's consideration. In the absence of such a study understanding of their works and political activities is incomplete.

Besides, examination of historical semantics might become a pivotal addition to the body of literature on Russian radicalism and its opposing forces.

¹ See: *Veselitskij V.V. Revolyuciya // Russkij yazyk. 1968. № 3. P. 68–73.*

Moreover, scrutinizing of the concept helps to clarify the terminological apparatus used by the scholars of Russian 19th century.

Present state of research

First scholar to devote a special study to the history of *revolution* was E. Rosenstock-Huessy. In order to draw a broad picture, he focused on West European and North American countries². Rosenstock-Huessy laid the ground for the conceptual history methodology; his influence is noticeable in the subsequent studies in more or less degree. R. Koselleck and J. Dunn are noteworthy later scholars of *revolution*³.

Russian *revolyutsiya* also attracted attention of philosophers, philologists and historians of ideas. Distinguished specialist in lexicography V.V. Veselitsky wrote a concise paper on the meaning of “*revolyutsiya*”. He made a series of observations relevant to conceptual history although he considered a word, not a notion⁴. The monograph “European ideas in the socio-political vocabulary of the educated Russian subject” by D.V. Timofeev comprises a quiet detailed review of *revolyutsiya* in the late 18th – early 19th centuries. He shows it in context of other concepts and discourses evolved during the Enlightenment⁵.

There are other studies based on the methodologies far from one of conceptual history. “Herzen’s Social Philosophy” by Z.V. Smirnova is one of these

² *Kamenka E.* The Concept of Political Revolution // *Revolution* / ed. by C.J. Friedrich. N. Y., 1966. P. 122–135. See: *Rosenstock–Huessy E.* Velikie revolyutsii: Avtobiografiya zapadnogo cheloveka. Tenafly, 1999.

³ *Koselleck R.* Critique and Crisis. Cambridge, 1988; *Idem.* Historical Criteria of the Modern Concept of Revolution // *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time.* N. Y., 2004. P. 43–57; *Bulst N., Fisch J. Koselleck R., Meier Ch.* Revolyutsiya // *Slovar' osnovnykh istoricheskikh ponyatij: Izbrannye stat'i:* in 2 vols. M., 2014. Vol. 1. P. 520–728; *Dunn J.* Modern Revolutions: An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon. Cambridge, 1972; *Idem.* Revolution // *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* / ed. by T. Ball, J. Farr, R.L. Hanson. Cambridge, 1989. P. 333–356. See also: *Snow V.* The Concept of Revolution in Seventeenth–Century England // *The Historical Journal.* 1962. Vol. 5. № 2. P. 167–174; *Hatto A.* “Revolution”: An Enquiry Into the Usefulness of an Historical Term // *Mind.* 1949. Vol. 58. № 232. P. 495–517.

⁴ *Veselitskij V.V.* Op. cit.

⁵ *Timofeev D.V.* Evropejskie idei v sotsial'no–politicheskom leksikone obrazovannogo rossijskogo poddannogo pervoj chetverti XIX veka. Chelyabinsk, 2011.

works⁶. Also the R.N. Blum study is worth mention. He examined views of Russian radical authors on revolutionary causes, tactics and outcomes⁷. M.P. Odessky and D.M. Feldman “Poetics of Power” takes a different stance scrutinizing the means of expression used in political discourses. Authors denote their object as “ideologems” i.e. discursive “nodal spots”. They took *revolyutsiya* as one of these “ideologems”⁸.

It’s impossible not to say about studies of Herzen and Bakunin speaking of current state of research. Particular works written in the early 20th century preserved the importance in Herzen studies. Their authors have made much to establish crucial facts and outline turning points of his biography. These scholars were M.P. Dragomanov⁹, V.Ya. Bogucharsky¹⁰ and M.K. Lemke. Lemke edited and published the first Collected Works of Herzen. It is still important largely because of its extensive and thorough commentaries. They are unique because there are sources cited by Lemke that were subsequently lost¹¹. M.O. Gershenzon was a friend and supporter of Lemke, who published sources on biographies of Herzen and N.P. Ogarev¹².

⁶ Smirnova Z.V. Sotsial'naya filosofiya Gertsena. M., 1973. P. 101–117. See: Isakova I.P. Frantsuzskij revolyutsionarizm v sisteme sotsial'no-politicheskikh vozzrenij A.I. Herzena: avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk. M., 2007.

⁷ Blum R.N. Poiski putej k svobode. Problema revolyutsii v nemarksistskoj obshhestvennoj mysli XIX veka. Tallin, 1985. On Herzen and Bakunin see: P. 87–103, 118–133. See also: Amelina E.M. Nesostoyatel'nost' anarkhistskogo ideala M.A. Bakunina i P.A. Kropotkina v svete istoricheskogo materializma // Teoriya revolyutsii. Istorija i sovremennost': sb. st. / pod red. M.Ya. Koval'zona. M., 1984. P. 37–48.

⁸ Odesskij M.P., Feldman D.M. Poetika vlasti. Tiranoborcestvo. Revolyutsiya. Terror. M., 2012.

⁹ Pis'ma M. A. Bakunina k A. I. Herzenu i N. P. Ogarevu (1860–1874) s prilozheniem ego pamfletov, biograficheskim vvedeniem i ob"yasnitel'nymi primechanijami M. P. Dragomanova. Geneva, 1896; Pis'ma K. Dm. Kavelina i Iv. S. Turgeneva k Al. Iv. Herzenu s ob"yasnitel'nymi primechanijami M. Dragomanova. Geneva, 1892; Iz bumag redaktsii “Kolokola”. VI. Pis'ma CH. k A. I. Herzenu // Vol'noe slovo. 1883. № 61–62. P. 4–7.

¹⁰ Bogucharskij V.Ya. A.I. Herzen M., 1920.

¹¹ Herzen A.I. Sobranie sochinenij: in 22 vols. / ed. by M.K. Lemke. Petrograd., 1915–1923. Vol. 1–22. Lemke commented Herzen’s works and letters using his previous studies. Lemke M.K. Ocherki osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniya "shestidesyatykh godov". SPb., 1908; Lemke M.K. Nikolayevskiye zhandarmy i literatura 1826–1855 gg. SPb., 1909.

¹² Russkiye propilei: sobral i prigotovil k pečati M. Gershenzon: in 6 vols. M., 1917. Vol. 4.

After the 1917 soviet scholars placed Herzen into the revolutionary tradition stemmed from the Decembrists and culminated in Bolshevism¹³. Then there was a splash of interest in Herzen during the Thaw in 1950-1960s. Some researchers headed by M.V. Nechkina occupied an orthodox position in that period. They argued that Herzen had been a leader or “revolutionary centre” and his activities had contributed largely to the “first revolutionary situation”, 1859-1861¹⁴. There was also more moderate point of view, whose supporters belonged to the younger generation: N.M. Pirumova, V.I. Poroh, E.G. Bushkanec, T.I. Usakina, S.D. Gurvich-Lishhiner, N.Ya. Jejdelman, V.A. Prokofev¹⁵. Some of these specialists were involved into preparation of a new edition of Herzen’s Collected Works. Famous historian of socialism V.P. Volgin, B.P. Kozmin, U.G. Oksman, D.D. Blagoj, V.A. Putincev, I.G. Ptushkina, L.K. Chukovskaja, L.Ya. Ginzburg, E.N. Dryzhakova were also members of editorial board¹⁶.

There were a few other interpretations besides soviet one. I. Berlin and his disciples from the Oxford university insisted that Herzen was a sober and moderate thinker, who realized poor consequences of revolutions quite well¹⁷. Berlin was

¹³*Problemy izucheniya Herzena* / ed. by Yu.G. Oksman. M., 1963.

¹⁴*Nechkina M.V.* "Zemlya i volya" 1860–kh godov // *Istoriya SSSR*. 1957. № 1. P. 105–133.

¹⁵*Pirumova N.M.* Aleksandr Herzen – revolyutsioner, myslitel', chelovek. M., 1989; *Porokh I.V.* Polemika Herzena s Chicherinym i otklik na neye v “Sovremennike” // *Istoriograficheskiy sbornik*. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta, 1965. Vyp. 2. P. 45–75; *Bushkanets Ye.G.* O dvukh “pis'makh” v redaktsiyu “Kolokola” // *Literaturnoye nasledstvo* / ed. by A.N. Dubovikov, L.R. Lanskoj, N.A. Roskina, N.D. Efros. M., 1956. Vol. 63. P. 212–219; *Eydel'man N.Ya.* Herzen protiv samoderzhaviya (sekretnaya politicheskaya istoriya Rossii XVIII–XIX vekov i Vol'naya russkaya pechat'). M., 1973; *Prokof'yev V.A.* Herzen. M., 1979.

¹⁶*Putintsev V.A.* Herzen–pisatel. M., 1963; *Chukovskaya L.K.* “Byloe i dumy” Herzena. M., 1966; *Ginzburg L.Ya.* “Byloe i dumy” Herzena. M., 1957; *Herzen A.I.* Sobranie sochinenij: in 30 vol. / ed. by V.P. Volgin et al. M., 1954–1965. Vol. 1–30.

¹⁷*Berlin I.* Herzen i Bakunin o svobode lichnosti // *Istoriya svobody*. Rossiya. M., 2001. P. 85–126. See: *Ignatieff M.* Isaiah Berlin: A Life. N. Y., 1998. P. 71.

supported by A. Kelly and E. Acton¹⁸. Also A. Walicki experienced the influence of Berlin, his supervisor at the Oxford University¹⁹.

Regardless of the interpretation, the habitual aim of the studies in Herzen's ideas was to find intrinsic system in it and to fit it into one of the contemporary intellectual directions. O. Sperber, A.I. Volodin, Z.V. Smirnova, V.A. Malinin and a few others adhered to this approach²⁰. Many of these works were multilateral and scrupulous, albeit they suffered from the lack of contextual sensitivity.

Bakunin studies are akin to that of Herzen²¹. Subsequent researchers are greatly indebted to J. Guillaume, disciple and friend of Bakunin. He gathered teacher's archive and published his works along with documents on the First international²². He was assisted by the prominent historian of anarchism and biographer of Bakunin M. Nettlau²³.

Nettlau carefully traced a history of Bakunin's intellectual development, but he saw it as a path to anarchism, that he presented as holistic and hardly changeable phenomenon with centuries-old history²⁴. Unfortunately, this large-

¹⁸*Kelly A.* Views from the Other Shore: Essays on Herzen, Chekhov, and Bakhtin. New Haven, 1999; *Eadem.* Toward Another Shore: Russian Thinkers Between Necessity and Chance. New Haven, 1998; *Eadem.* The Discovery of Chance: The Life and Thought of Alexander Herzen. Cambridge, 2016; *Acton E.* Alexander Herzen and the Role of the Intellectual Revolutionary. Cambridge, 1979.

¹⁹*Walicki A.* Filosofiya prava russkogo liberalizma. M., 2012. P. 17; *Walicki A.* Istoriya russkoj mysli ot prosveshheniya do marksizma. M., 2013. P. 143–149, 177–195.

²⁰*Sperber O.* Die socialpolitischen Ideen Alexander Herzens. Leipzig, 1894; *Volodin A.I.* Herzen. M., 1970; *Smirnova Z.V.* Op. cit.; *Pavlov S.I.* Sotsial'naya filosofiya A.I. Herzena. Murmansk, 2011; *Malinin V.A.* Filosofiya revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva. M., 1972. See also: *Galaktionov A.A., Nikandrov P.F.* Ideologiya russkogo narodnichestva. Leningrad, 1966; *Pantin I.K., Plimak E.G., Khoros V.G.* Revolyutsionnaya traditsiya v Rossii: 1783–1883 gg. M., 1986.

²¹ For the most detailed review of literature see: *Kamiński A.* Michał Bakunin. Życie i myśl: w 3 t. Wrocław, 2012–2013. T. 1. S. 22–80.

²² *Guillaume J.* L'Internationale, documents et souvenirs: en 4 vol. Paris, 1905–1910. Vol. 1–4.

²³ Bakounine M. Oeuvres: en 6 t. / ed. par J. Guillaume, M. Nettlau. Paris, P.–V. Stock, 1895–1913. See: *Nettlau M.* Zhizn' i tvorchestvo Mikhaila Bakunina. M.; Petrograd, 1920. His monumental biography of Bakunin has never been published. It exists only as a lithographed handwritten text. Digital copy is available online: *Nettlau M.* Michael Bakunin. Eine Biographie. [electronic resource] URL:

<http://search.socialhistory.org/Record/ARCH01001/ArchiveContentList#A684a22aa5b>.

²⁴ See: *Nettlau M.* Ocherki po istorii anarkhicheskikh idej. Detroit: Profsoyuz g. Detrojta, 1951.

scale approach to some extent overshadowed concrete ideas, circumstances, Bakunin's relationships with contemporaries and their mutual influences.

A. Lehning continued collection and publication of sources that had been initiated by Guillaume and Nettlau²⁵. Lehning led the project of International Institute of Social History (IISH) at Amsterdam for publishing the materials for the biography of Bakunin that aimed to complete the old Collected Works. His commentaries and introductory articles, in fact, made up a separate substantive research²⁶. The main result of IISH activities was a publication of complete works of Bakunin in 2000. It was designed as a CD with digital texts and additional materials²⁷.

Guillaume, Nettlau and Lehning scrutinized biography of Bakunin mainly in context of Western European revolutionary movement. Their notable successor A. Kamiński wrote a more diverse work, that covers extensively early Russian years of Bakunin, unfortunately it is to be completed and now covers only Bakunin's life up to 1864²⁸. Soviet scholars predictably paid way more attention to the Russian ties of Bakunin. For instance, soviet biographer and historian of the first International Yu.M. Steklov and editor of the 3-volumed Materials for the biography of anarchist V.P. Polonskiy presented him as a predecessor of Bolshevism and prophet of the Russian revolution²⁹. Interest in Bakunin reborn in 1950-60-s after a period of several decades of oblivion. N.M. Pirumova was a most influential soviet specialist of the postwar period, she wrote a biographical study and inquiry into "social doctrine" of Bakunin³⁰.

²⁵ *Lehning A.* From Buonarroti to Bakunin. Leiden, 1970; *Bakounine et les autres* / ed. par A. Lehning. Paris, 1976.

²⁶ *Archives Bakounine: en 7 vol.* / ed. par A. Lehning. Leiden, 1961–1981. Vol. 1–7.

²⁷ *Bakounine M.* Oeuvres complètes [electronic resource]. Amsterdam: International Institute of Social History, Netherlands Institute for Scientific Information Services, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2000. CD-ROM.

²⁸ *Kamiński A.* Michał Bakunin. Życie i myśl: w 3 t. Wrocław, 2012–2013. T. 1–2.

²⁹ *Steklov Yu.M.* Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bakunin, ego zhizn' i deyatel'nost'. 1814–1876: in 4 vols. M., 1926–1927; *Materialy dlya biografii M. Bakunina*: in 3 vols. / ed. by V.P. Polonskiy. M., 1933. Vol. 1–3.

³⁰ *Pirumova N.M.* Bakunin. M., 1970; *Eadem.* Sotsial'naya doktrina M.A. Bakunina. M., 1990.

There were several topics attracted researcher's attention. Scholars frequently examined the role of bakunists in the First international and relations of their leader with Marx³¹. Likewise, cooperation between Bakunin and odious revolutionary S.G. Nechaev and probable similarity of their ideas became a topic of heated debate³². Some of the Bakunin's biographers sought to find explanations with the psychological and even psychopathological interpretations³³, scrutinizing his childhood and personal traits³⁴.

Although Bakunin refuted philosophy for the sake of practice in young age, studies in the intellectual heritage of the revolutionary occupy a special place in literature. It's worth to note a monograph by P. McLaughlin, who is the only one to offer a general survey of Bakunin's philosophical views³⁵. There are also a lot of works devoted to particular aspects of Bakunin's theory³⁶.

³¹ *Eckhardt W.* The First Socialist Schism: Bakunin vs. Marx in the International Working Men's Association. Oakland, 2016; *Steklov Yu.M.* Op. cit. Vols. 3–4; *Mikhajlov M.I.* Bor'ba protiv Bakunizma v I Internatsionale. M., 1976; *Lehning A.* Introduction // Archives Bakounine. Michel Bakounine et les conflits dans l'Internationale 1872. Textes établis et annotés par Arthur Lehning. Leiden, 1965. P. IX–LX; *Woodcock G.* Anarchism. A history of Libertarian Ideas and Movements. Cleveland, 1962; *Brupbacher F.* Marx und Bakunin. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Internationalen Arbeiterassoziation. Berlin, 1922.

³² *Engel B.* Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth–Century Russia. Evanston, 2000. P. 215. All the documents on Nechaev affair, discovered by M. Confino and A. Lehning were translated into Russian and published: *Zhitomirskaya S.V., Pirumova N.M.* Ogarev, Bakunin i N.A. Herzen–doch' v “nechayevskoy” istorii (1870 g.) // Literaturnoye nasledstvo. M., 1985. Vol. 96. P. 413–546.

³³ *Malinin I.* Kompleks Edipa i sud'ba Mikhaila Bakunina. K voprosu o psikhologii Bunta. Belgrade, 1934; *Katler R.* Bakunin i psikhobiografy: Anarkhist kak mificheskiy i istoricheskiy ob'yekt // Klio. 2010. № 2. P. 115–124.

³⁴ *Carr E.* Michael Bakunin. London, 1975; *Kelly A.* Mikhail Bakunin: A Study in the Psychology and Politics of Utopianism. New Haven, 1987.

³⁵ *McLaughlin P.* Mikhail Bakunin: The Philosophical Basis of His Theory of Anarchism. N. Y., 2002.

³⁶ *Grafskij V.G.* Mikhail Bakunin. M., 1985; *Moiseev P.I.* Kritika filosofii M.A. Bakunina i sovremennost'. Irkutsk, 1981; *Ryabov P.V.* Problema lichnosti i filosofii klassicheskogo anarkhizma: dis. ... kand. filos. nauk. M., 1993. See also: *Zil'berman I.B.* Politicheskaya teoriya anarkhizma M.A. Bakunina. Leningrad, 1969; *Pamyati M.A. Bakunina* / ed. by N.K. Figurovskaya. M., 2000.

A complex of the works by Herzen and Bakunin and also oeuvres constituting the background for their thought are an object of the study. Its subject is *revolution* from Herzen's and Bakunin's texts

This paper aims to identify the main features of *revolution* in Herzen's and Bakunin's works in the context of contemporary political and intellectual conditions.

The aim presupposes following objectives:

- 1) To single out main features and dynamics of the *revolyutsiya* in the period of Herzen's and Bakunin's activity. These features affected the intellectual development of the mentioned authors and made the conditions for shaping their own conceptions of revolution. It can't be completed without an analysis of conceptual transfer and censorship.
- 2) To determine the meaning and function of the *revolyutsiya* in the public debate of 1850-60s on the future development of Russia. It's also important to examine the influence of these discussions on Herzen's and Bakunin's ideas on revolutions.
- 3) To study activities of Herzen and Bakunin, that impacted on the shaping of their theories. In order to do this, it is necessary to scrutinize the connection of their conceptions with the West European and Russian contexts of their theoretical developments.
- 4) To ascertain the ways in which *revolution* interacted with other notions important for Herzen and Bakunin (*history, freedom and war*), and with their ideas on the role of emotions in politics
- 5) To compare Herzen's and Bakunin's conceptions of revolution, elucidating similarities and differences in their thought.

Chronological framework of the study is the second half of the 1820-s – 1876. First date is connected with the emerging interest in politics shown by the young Herzen after the Decembrist revolt and ensuing political reaction to it. Second date is the year of Bakunin's death.

The methodology of the thesis is based on the Cambridge school of intellectual history and also on particular elements of the conceptual history (Begriffsgeschichte).

J. Pocock and Q. Skinner have developed an approach, that allows to enquire into historical sources in their concrete historical contexts avoiding anachronisms and helping to find more cautious and reflexive way to the subsequent generalizations³⁷.

Pocock uses terms “discourse” or “language” which mean “vocabulary; a grammar; a rhetoric; and a set of usages, assumptions, and implications”³⁸. Discourses shape historical context that enables to understand the meaning of the concepts used in them.

Q. Skinner scrutinizes intellectual history mainly on a micro-level dealing usually with the classical authors. He perceives their texts as rational and deliberate “answers” to the certain “questions”, such as rival conceptions, theories and works. He and advocates of his approach see intellectual history as a constant debate, requiring from its participants to react to each other’s contributions³⁹. Skinner’s suggestions combine history of discourse or concepts with the history of concrete authors’ actions. Thus they help to redefine and to clarify biographical and comparative methods that are employed in the study.

Cambridge school approach enables one to discard quite common belief that ideas of each author establish unified and barely changeable system, that can be reconstructed with carefully selected and lined up quotations from works created at

³⁷ *Skinner Q.* The Rise of, Challenge to and Prospects for Collingwoodian Approach to the History of Political Thought // *The History of Political Thought in National Context*. Cambridge, 2001. P. 175. See also: *Idem.* Meaning and Understanding of History of Ideas // *History and Theory*. 1969. № 1. P. 3–53.

³⁸ *Pocock J.* Concepts and Discourses: A Difference in Culture? Comment on a Paper by Melvin Richter // *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte* / ed. by H. Lehmann, M. Richter. Washington, 1996. P. 53. Slightly different definition can be found in another article: *Pocock J.* Foundations and Moments // *Rethinking The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* / ed. by A. Brett, J. Tully, H. Hamilton–Bleakley. Cambridge, 2006. P. 37.

³⁹ Answer can look like explicit theory, but also can be concrete and situational. For example, Skinner studied quotations and allusions in the texts of the civil humanists and reformers. See: *Skinner Q.* *Foundations of Modern Political Thought*: in 2 vols. Cambridge, 1978. Vol. 1–2.

different times and on various occasions. Furthermore, this approach helps to use genetic method more carefully and to trace the development of historical phenomena keeping in mind the danger of “idol of the origins” and of uncritically built genealogies of thought based on the superficial resemblance.

Contextualization of the each work is especially important in cases of Herzen and Bakunin, who were not systematic thinkers, since they usually took on the role of journalists, reacting to the changing agendas and states of affairs. Conceptual analysis of the journalistic texts supposes the close attention to details, accents, quotations and allusions. They not only express author’s opinion on current situation but also indicate shifts and changes in his theoretical views.

Another important advantage of the methodology is that it takes concepts not only as tools for the description of reality; they have something to do with action. They usually serve to justify particular institutions or practices and to affirm viewpoints, which meet the interests of the one or another social group⁴⁰. For example, *revolyutsiya* can describe large-scale political conflicts and change brought about by them. Noteworthy, it is also able to provide a justification of violence and violation of law and status quo, committed by revolutionaries or their rivals⁴¹.

German conceptual history (Begriffsgeschichte) and R. Koselleck’s theory of historical time complement the methodology of the research. Koselleck has shown that concepts are connected with “space of experience” and with “horizon of expectation”, with the present and the future.⁴² The theory can be applied to the *revolyutsiya* in the 19th-century Russia that described certain (mostly foreign) experience and also referred to the anticipated future event.

Balance between examination of particular author and exploration of his context is pivotal for the Herzen and Bakunin studies. This context embodies political and intellectual situation of the particular periods, and also broad

⁴⁰ Skinner Q. Retrospect: Studying rhetoric and conceptual change // Visions of Politics: in 3 vols. Cambridge, 2002. Vol. 1. P. 168–169.

⁴¹ See: Bulst N., Fisch J. Koselleck R., Meier Ch. Op. cit.

⁴² Koselleck R. “Space of Experience” and “Horizon of Expectation”: Two Historical Categories // Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time. N. Y., 2004. P. 255–276.

processes in politics and social sphere. It's impossible to understand and explain why the author took up certain position in disputes and acted according to it without taken into consideration external circumstances. On the other hand, this kind of contextualization facilitates theorizing; hence it goes beyond traditional descriptive approach to the life and works of well-known personalities. Attention to the micro-level circumvents usual for the history of ideas quandary, caused by the difficulty finding the main direction of thought of the author in focus.

Overview of sources

Works and letters both by Herzen and Bakunin along with additional materials were published in Collected Works. Journalistic texts occupy significant part of these editions and they are valuable for the research. Herzen and Bakunin wrote newspaper and journal articles and journalistic works to come out as separate editions. Journalist works by other authors, who influenced Herzen and Bakunin or conditioned their reactions and replies, also belong to this group to sources.

Some oeuvres of the studied authors combine philosophical and journalistic features. They include reactions to the current events, expressions of the writer's opinion and philosophical content in a proper sense. It's worth to mention Herzen's series of articles "Dilettantism in Science" and "Letters on the Study of Nature".⁴³ They were followed by the articles written in 1848-1851 that contain his considerations about contemporary revolutions. Herzen described the events and his own experience and also he elaborated on the nature and causes of revolutions. These articles made up books "From the Other Shore" and "Letters from France and Italy"⁴⁴. Theorizing about the subject continued in his "On the Development of Revolutionary Ideas in Russia" and "My Past and Thoughts". The later one is his

⁴³ *Herzen A.I.* Dilettantizm v nauke // *Sobraniye sochineniy*: in 30 vols. M., 1954. Vol. 3. P. 5–88; *Herzen A.I.* Pis'ma ob izuchenii prirody // *Ibid.* P. 89–315.

⁴⁴ *Herzen A.I.* Pis'ma iz Frantsii i Italii // *Sobraniye sochineniy*: in 30 vols. M., 1955. Vol. 5. P. 7–226. *Herzen A.I.* S togo berega // *Sobraniye sochineniy*: in 30 vols. M., 1955. Vol. 6. P. 7–142.

memoirs that include elements of journalism and philosophical work, woven into biographical narrative.⁴⁵

Similar multilateralism is inherent in Bakunin's "Federalism, Socialism, Anti-Theologism" and "Knuto-Germanic Empire and the Social Revolution" (it consists of two parts and has many posthumously published additions and variants). *Revolyutsiya* also became one of the main subjects of his last major work "Statism and Anarchy"⁴⁶.

It's impossible to scrutinize *revolution* without taking into account various political activities of Herzen and Bakunin that had an effect on texts of political programs, secret statutes and regulations. Present research examines first of all conceptual features of these documents.

Egodocuments, namely letters, diaries and memoirs are also utilized in the study. Letters are of great value for biographical reconstructions; furthermore, they also can be seen as a background and context for the larger texts. Noteworthy, they enable one to learn about how the books were read and interpreted.

Part of the documents used in research are stored at the State Archive of the Russian Federation, (Gosudarstvennyj arhiv Rossijskoj Federacii, GARF), fond of Bakunins family (f. 825). Some of the materials stored in M. Bakunin fond (f. 206), Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj arhiv social'no-politicheskoj istorii (RGASPI) and at IISH (Michail Aleksandrovič Bakunin Papers).

Official reports and police files give an indication how police officers and government officials reacted to activities and writings of Herzen and Bakunin. They are concentrated at GARF, f. 109 (archive of the Third Section of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery) and f. 112 (fond of the Justice Ministry). These collections, in appreciable part, comprise evidences in the cases of political

⁴⁵ *Herzen A.I.* O razvitií revolyucionnykh idej v Rossii // Sobraniye sochineniy: in 30 vols. M., 1954. Vol. 7. P. 137–266. "My Past and Thoughts" is published in the volumes 8–11 of the Collected Works.

⁴⁶ *Bakunin M.A.* Gosudarstvennost' i anarkhiya // Izbrannyye sochineniya: in 5 vols. Petrograd; M., 1919. Vol.1; *Bakunin M.A.* Knuto–germanskaya imperiya i sotsial'naya revolyutsiya. Vyp. 1 // Izbrannyye sochineniya: in 5 vols. Petrograd; M., 1919. Vol. 2. P. 17–132; *Bakunin M.A.* Knuto–germanskaya imperiya i sotsial'naya revolyutsiya. Vyp. 2 // Ibid. P. 137–195.

crimes, such as fragmental and complete copies of the perlustrated letters, confiscated during searches manuscripts. They allow to judge about broad audience response to the Herezen and Bakunin ideas and actions, and also they shed the light on the reactions of early revolutionary movement and Russian leftist youth of that time.

Novelty

The paper presents a first special study of *revolution* in 19-th century Russia. In order to do this conceptual history methodology is applied to the subject. *Revolutsiya* is examined as a many-sided phenomenon occupying an important place in the Herzen and Bakunin theories. New intellectual influences were traced and textual borrowings were found in the process of research. Archival sources helped to explain better the background for Herzen and Bakunin intellectual biographies. All this facilitated the deeper understanding of the context and their thought itself.

The main **theses** of the dissertation:

1) *Revolutsiya* consisted of dissimilar elements. Asynchrony was their important feature that was flattening out in course of their development. Any fundamental and fast change in some sphere of human life was likely to be called a “*revolutsiya*”. Notwithstanding the relatively prevalence of the word, modern and neutral meaning wasn’t used in the context of current political events due to the censorship. In this case the word had archaic meaning with negative connotations. As a rule, it meant illegitimate encroachment of the monarch’s subjects on her God-given rights. The meaning of this word underwent significant changes because of liberalization of the Alexander the II, and emerging revolutionary movement. New and modern conceptions of political and social revolutions complemented previous archaic ones.

2) Debates about revolution and reform ensued in Russia in 1850-1860s. Threat of revolution was a tool used by the government in order to justify its reformatory undertakings, but, references to revolutionary menace also helped public figures and movements to press on the government. Thanks to these developments

revolyutsiya in the modern sense was partially legitimized, that sanctioned public use of modern versions of the concept. Herzen and Bakunin were among those who presented their own considerations on revolution. Particularly, they contributed to the development of “revolution from above” conception. It meant that significant and democratic change was to make under the direction of the monarchic government.

3) Herzen’s and Bakunin’s ideas and theories concerning the revolutions took roots in 1830-1850s. They both were consequently influenced by the early French socialism, radical republicanism, German classical philosophy and Proudhonism. *Revolution* became one of the central concepts for these authors. They comprehended various theoretical issues, current political events and their own biographies with its help. Herzen and Bakunin usually presented themselves as revolutionaries, or at least as advocates and supporters of revolution.

4) Herzen’s and Bakunin’s revolutionary conceptions were partially shaped by the transfer of the West European ideas and theories. These authors tried to apply them to the Russian conditions without changing them sufficiently. As a result, their conceptions were quite peculiar for the Russia of this period. They were almost devoid of monarchist and religious influence. Instead, they had positive connotations and were focused on political action. Herzen and Bakunin opposed conservative and liberal theories of revolution. These authors thought that it was a progressive event marking new historical era. As a rule, they understood the revolution as an act of popular self-liberation accompanied by the complex social and political change. Critics often condemned revolutions for their violence and terror; Herzen and Bakunin sometimes agreed with them, but more often they insisted that in some cases use of force could be justified. They employed different argumentative strategies, appealing to morals or historical necessity. Herzen and Bakunin were of the opinion that complete rationalization of politics and expulsion of feelings from it would be potentially harmful. In order to substantiate their views, they referred to history of revolutions oftentimes. They tended to think that

sincerity and passion of the participants accounted for the positive aspects of the revolutionary events.

5) There were sufficient differences between Herzen's and Bakunin's revolutionary conceptions. First of all, the attitude towards the actual revolutionary practices distinguished them from each other. Herzen preferred to set himself aside from the professional revolutionaries, their ideas and organizations. He thought of himself as of critical and ironical observer. As a result, his conception of revolution is characterized by the certain abstractness. *Revolution* in his works referred to the future and to the past; it's connections with the present usually were more weak. Unlike Herzen, Bakunin took identity of revolutionary and didn't distance himself from the radical organizations. His views on the revolution were rather practical. Theory for him was indistinguishable from the planning and justification of current political action. Another important difference was in personal dimension of the *revolution*. Herzen related this concept with the author's personal experience and introspection, whereas Bakunin tended to neglect these aspects of the *revolution*.

Reliability and approbation of the results

Main theses were presented at conferences and seminars: international academic young scientists and scholars undergraduate and graduate students conference "Lomonosov" (Moscow, 2015, 2016), conference "Phenomenon of M.A. Bakunin: a Gaze from the 21st Century" (St.-Petersburg, 2015), Priamukhino readings (Tver region, Priamukhino 2015, 2016 and 2017), conference "Problematics of War in Humanities: History and Research Perspectives" (Moscow, 2015), GRACEH2016: The 10th Graduate Conference in European History (Budapest, 2016), conference "The Modes of thinking, the Ways of Speaking" (Moscow, 2017). Main results of the dissertation were published in journals which are on the list of the Higher Attestation Commission.

Structure of the study corresponds to its aim and objectives. The work consists of introduction, three chapters, conclusion and references.

Summary of the dissertation

First chapter “**The Origins of Herzen’s and Bakunin’s Conceptions of Revolution**” consists of two paragraphs. First one «**To the History of *Revolutsiya* in Russia**» deals with the emergence and development of *revolutsiya* in the period between the end of the 18th century and 1870s. It is traced in periodicals, dictionaries, legislative acts and in writings of the important authors. Its history is inseparable from the problem of translation and adaptation to the local circumstances. *Revolution* in its modern form emerged in the West and was adopted in Russia, where it faced with the censorship and rival archaic theories and ideas. Special attention therefore is given to the predominant in Russia in the first half of the 19th century religious and monarchic point of view on revolutions.

It is pointed out that positively evaluated conceptions of revolutions were scarcely presented in the public sphere. The main reason for this was a censorship and political control by the authorities. Impact of the Western European examples was quite limited also due to the common tradition to translate the foreign words and expressions non-literally, excluding dangerous political connotations. Under these circumstances political revolution normally depicted as a conflict between supreme (usually monarchic) authority and the subjects, encroaching on its traditional and sanctified rights. As a result, Russian observers of the revolution tended to neglect many of its political and social issues, which were conspicuous to the western contemporaries. Nonetheless, it should be said that some of the educated Russians didn’t agree with this conservative approach. For instance, Herzen and Bakunin reacted to the dominating representations of the revolutions with criticism and irony.

Next section is called “**Revolution and Reform**”. It deals with the public debate over the alternative between revolution and reform that took place in 1850-1860s. It is shown, that *revolutsiya* had particular pragmatic function. It served as a threat or worst case scenario that was necessary to prevent. Thus *revolutsiya* facilitated the justification of reforms. But also there was a conception of revolution from above supported by the part of the lefts. They believed that

reforms made by the government should be revolutionary in its character, that is to say genuinely fundamental and democratic. Herzen and Bakunin also endorsed this conception. Also they confronted the opinion supported by their opponents M.N. Pogodin and bishop Ignatius (Bryanchaninov), that reform is gift from the government to the populace.

Advocates of the reformist path did not deny progress, but gave preference to the peaceful and legal alternative to the revolution. The *reform* got almost a universal support during the first years of Alexander the II's reign, but then it as well as the *revolution* became a tool for political demarcation. Reformists were confronted by the party of revolutionary supporters.

The second and the third chapters deal with Herzen's and Bakunin's ideas. It should be said that they have similar structure, so to enable parallels and comparisons. Second chapter "**The Place of *Revolution* in the Herzen's Ideas**" consists of four paragraphs. First one is "**Revolution and Autobiographical narrative**". It explores the ways Herzen created an image of the independent public figure in his memoirs and in other works. This image largely defined his autobiographical narrative and the *revolution* played an important role in this. Herzen expressed a sympathy to the revolutions in his "My Past and Thoughts", yet he showed himself as a detached spectator, who followed the development of the revolutionary movement without taking a serious part in it. His political position was constantly changing as he avoided to identify fully as radical or moderate liberal. The paragraph also deals with the public attitude to Herzen in Russia in 1840-1860s. Sufficient part of the educated public saw in him radical and revolutionary.

The second section "**Revolution, History and Freedom**" is dedicated to the changing relations between the concepts. For Herzen the revolution was a significant event in the World history that helped to achieve political freedom. Herzen sometimes assumed that revolution would make Russia a historical nation, introducing modernity and political self-determination into it.

Next paragraph “**A Problem of the Revolutionary Violence**” shows that this issue was of great importance to Herzen, that’s why he elaborated a number of strategies to describe and justify political violence. Herzen hold radical opinions on the subject in his younger years and also during and shortly after the revolution of 1848-1849. In these moments he admitted the necessity of violence, the sole mean to destroy the old world. In the later years, he developed a theory that violence could be useful and we had to evaluate costs and outcomes in each case. Thereby Herzen distanced himself both from radicalism and conservative approach to the issue.

The fourth paragraph “**Revolution and the Problem of Emotions in Politics**” shows how Herzen advocated utility and necessity of emotions in political life. A Hegelian aesthetic theory of H.T. Rötischer was a starting point for his reflections on emotions. Arguments against excessive rationalism of Rötischer were later used by Herzen in his dispute with B.N. Chicherin, Hegelian and adherent of pure rationalism in politics. Past revolution were examples of emotionally-colored politics, that Herzen repeatedly used.

Third chapter is entitled “**The Place of Revolution in the Bakunin’s Ideas**” consists of four paragraphs. First one “**Revolution as Concept and Activity**” is devoted to the issue of Bakunin’s revolutionary identity. Early philosophical articles of Bakunin are examined in order to analyze the influence of Fichte and especially Hegel. Bakunin’s political activities of the later years are also considered. In addition, paragraph deals with the vocabulary of Bakunin and tropes that he used to describe revolution as an event, principle or political movement.

Bakunin’s conception of the World history and its connection with the *revolution* are scrutinized in the paragraph «**Revolution and the World History**». Bakunin consistently avoided conception of history as an organic and slow growth of institutions. He preferred to present it as a sequence of abrupt jumps and brakes with the past. So he sought to substantiate that revolutionary path of development was a rule, not the exception. Bakunin combined the thesis of historical necessity of the revolutions with the conviction that they were substantially chaotic and

indeterminate events. Thus he amalgamated determinism with the belief in freedom and political action.

Paragraph “***Revolution and Civil War***” is devoted to the complicated and repeatedly changed Bakunin’s position on the issue of political violence. Bakunin was under the influence of the Western European radical tradition since 1842, so he tended to justify use of force by the revolutionaries. He reconsidered his position in 1860s due to pacifist and socialist movements evolving throughout Western Europe and affecting many of the radicals, not excluding himself. He was looking for a revolutionary formula that would not contradict ideas of peaceful and harmonious development. However, he lost an interest in it after 1870, primarily because he had witnessed the Franco-Prussian war, Paris commune and other social struggles in France and other countries. Bakunin started to problematize and examine the phenomenon of the civil war and almost identified it with the revolution.

The fourth paragraph “***Revolution and Passion***” explores sentimentalist and romantic roots of Bakunin’s conception of passion. According to his view, passion was an inartificial and genuine expression of the human nature. Therefore, it was able to get over almost every kind of psychological and even material constraint. Bakunin thought that passion ideally served to motivate a person to act politically; he also considered passion to be a recipe for success of the revolution. Bakunin reformulated his conception in terms of neurophysiology and positivism in 1860s in order to get rid of “idealistic” romantic associations.

Conclusion

Revolyutsiya took shape by the beginning of 19th century largely under the influence of the French ideas and events. During the first stage of its history it absorbed principles of Enlightenment historiosophy and particular ideas concerning main characteristics of modern political life. Generally revolution was understood as a large-scale and fundamental innovation that impacted on the historical process. Both supporters and opponents of revolutionary change concurred that it was not an exclusively spontaneous event. They thought there

were some causes for it, and they also acknowledged that it had something to do with human reason and action. Its participants usually considered as those, who (fortunately or not) violated the boundaries, traditional rules and hierarchies set by the ancien régime. The results of such violations were political freedom and autonomy.

The first and main meaning of words *revolyutsiya* and synonymic *perevorot* was political. But as a result of metaphorical transfer they also signified crucial changes in nature, general worldview or particular field of knowledge, artistic culture or even in life of particular person.

During its development in the first half of the 19th century *revolyutsiya* was influenced by the complicated constellation of factors. Western experience and ideas, censorship and other forms of political control and monarchism played their roles. Duality and asynchrony were its key features. They manifested itself in coexistence of the old and the new, of archaism and novelties resulting from the recent developments and borrowings.

Relative freedom to use both the word and the concept adjoined with serious constraints. It was possible to talk freely about revolutions in the sense of natural, cultural or ideal events. Nevertheless, things were different with the political revolution. The problem was that every reference to *revolyutsiya* was inseparable from the knowledge of the French and other revolutions that threatened to happen once again. There always was a possibility that propaganda would follow the mere ascertaining of facts. It made the *revolyutsiya* potentially dangerous for the authorities, so they decisively suppressed all real and assumed attempts to move from the description to the justification of political revolutions.

The concept didn't become an instrument of radical propaganda in this period, yet it was an important element of political struggle. Prepositions, predictions, fears, suspicions, threats and accusations were articulated with it fairly often.

A boundary between “dangerous” and “safe” variants of the concept was uneven and unsteady. It depended on context and interpretations made by censors,

literati and police officers. Their activities were complemented by various informal prohibitions and limitations, which included notable phenomenon of the translational censorship. Translation of words and conceptual adaptation, as a rule, were accompanied by the pursuit to avoid literalism. Politically dangerous connotations were to be eliminated with a help of paraphrases.

Political *revolution* functioned in hierarchically structured discourse with an irresistible gap between the speaker and its object. Revolution was a crime; hence any interest in its causes or details could be regarded as suspicious and inappropriate. That's why Russian authors sometimes dwelled on the condemning comments of a general nature and avoided going into details about pivotal features of revolutions, such as changes in political institutions, shifts in the social sphere and intellectual transformations.

Lacuna made by the censorship and other limitations was filled by traditional conceptions of political conflict. Even if an event was called "revolyutsiya" or "perevorot", the meaning of the words wasn't far from archaic ones of "bunt", "vosstanie" or "mjatezh" ("rebellion", "insurrection", "revolt"). Revolution in the political sense remained archaic. Innovatory and liberating sides of revolutions usually were not highlighted in the *revolyutsiya*. Instead, it was depicted as subjects' illegitimate encroachment on the God-given rights of the monarch.

The concept became far more complicated after the 1855. It was connected with the liberalization and the reforms of Alexander the II and with the emergence of the revolutionary movement. These changes signaled that second stage of *revolyutsiya* development had started. The impact of censorship and archaic ideas was steadily decreasing, while modern ones were replacing them. Western thought became more important; uniquely negative evaluations of revolutions were succeeded by more diverse and nuanced ones. There were moderately critical liberal conceptions and radical positive notions of political and social revolutions. All of them coexisted with the remaining monarchic and Christian ideas.

Revolyutsiya was a collision point for different political efforts and theories that showed little interest in rational dialogue and discussion.

The situation with the concept was influenced by the broad public discussion on revolutions and reforms that took place at the beginning of the Alexander the II's reign. Debates on peaceful and violent ways of the country's development indicated that nearly all political forces sided with the government. It was widely believed that it could avert possible future revolution with the complex reform.

It seemed that state-driven change gained almost universal approval. Nevertheless, there was no agreement on its details and parameters. Moreover, *revolyutsiya* was a double-edged sword in these debates. Those who spoke on behalf of the government referred to the menace of the revolution to justify actions taken by the authorities. At the same time, their opponents spoke about *revolution*, intending to exert pressure on the statesmen and to promote their own ideas and plans. As a result, *revolyutsiya* found a legitimate place in public sphere, although it was only a negative and threatening scenario.

Leftists also participated in the debates. They grouped around Herzen's "Kolokol". Herzen and Bakunin, who cooperated with him, took part in the discussion along with others. They partially agreed with the liberal pro-government agenda, since they thought that reform is a peaceful and for this reason desired alternative to the revolution. At the same time, they had no intention to abandon their habitual leftist viewpoint completely. They started a semantical experiment, elaborating a conception of revolution from above. It combined elements of both *revolution* and *reform*. "Revolution from above" contained assurance of loyalty to authorities and demand for political liberation, accompanied by quite radical socialist program.

This discussion showed a relative popularity of the left ideas and slogans. Herzen and Bakunin were among the most prominent advocates of them. Furthermore, Herzen and Bakunin occupied similar places in the epoch's intellectual landscape, despite of the fact that differences between them became more visible over the years. Herzen attacked widespread ideas, and that's why he

was criticized not only by conservatives, but by recent adherents too. Bakunin also was accustomed to the role of an intellectual and political troublemaker.

Herzen and Bakunin popularized their conceptions in 1850-1870s Russia, but they were the products of the long and nonlinear development. These authors got their education in aristocratic milieu, hence, most likely they were aware of the dominating traditional monarchic conception of political revolution. It found an expression in their writings, nevertheless both authors were definitely more committed to theories and ideas far from conventional.

Herzen was under the influence of the Western European radical ideas from his youth. So his conception of revolution was out of ordinary. His theorizing on the political revolution had little in common with the traditional religious monarchism. Revolution wasn't something remote from the reality for him. He connected the concept with the painfully urgent problems of political constitution, action and violence.

The development of Bakunin's conceptions of revolution resembles that of Herzen only to some extent. He became a well-intentioned conservative in 1830-s, blaming the revolutions of the past from the religious and monarchic point of view. Conservatively interpreted Hegelianism made his thesis more persuasive. In 1840 he went abroad and soon fell for far left republicanism and socialism and became greatly interested in history and practice of political and social revolutions.

Bakunin's ideas on revolution stood out because of their abstract character, absence of negative connotations in them and close connection with the current political life. He as well as Herzen regularly borrowed ideas, conceptions and rhetorical formula to apply them to the Russian reality without significant changes.

Besides history of the oeuvres and their reception, Herzen and Bakunin can be compared on a basis of semasiological analysis, i.e. study of different meanings of the same lexical unit. Their vocabularies had undergone similar changes for a long time. As a rule, in 1830s they meant by "revolution" particular events, only occasionally it implied some general principle of the World history. In the next decade "revolution" was seen more often as an abstract rule or tenet to believe in.

They were sure that the revolution defined the development of the society. Later, (Herzen by the end of the 1840s, Bakunin in 1860s) they began to call the revolutionary movement a “revolution”. It was a consequence of their close acquaintance with the professional revolutionaries.

Herzen and Bakunin talked about “revolution” not only referring to the large-scale events and phenomena, they also comprehended their own biographies, presenting themselves as revolutionaries or, at least, as sympathizers of the revolutionary cause.

Herzen frequently showed his solidarity with the revolutionaries of the past and future, but avoided to claim himself a revolutionary in present time. Revolution as theoretical and critical project of liberation of minds, as economic and social change belonged to indefinite future, tend to overshadow concrete and present political events. He was more of detached and ironic spectator, than fiery revolutionary.

On the contrary, Bakunin was ready to see a nascent revolution in almost every local conflict or disturbance. Bakunin’s thinking was a continuation of his current plans and ideas; it was aimed to clarify and justify them. He thought that revolutionary movement is incompatible with any personal interest, hence it required genuine allegiance.

Both authors highly evaluated practical activities. They promoted the actualization of *revolutsiya* in the Russian empire. It transformed from abstraction into slogan and political demand. Besides other things, theory of the Russian socialism facilitated this metamorphosis. The theory was developed under the strong influence of Herzen; Bakunin also contributed to its elaboration. According to this theory, future communist society will grow from the traditional rural communes of the Russian peasants. They were seen as a key element of the future revolutionary reorganization of the Russian economy and society.

It should be highlighted that Herzen and Bakunin didn’t imply that revolution was only a tool meant to solve particular economical and/or social problems. Not infrequently, they described it in a way more abstract terms. Herzen

and Bakunin believed in possibility of comprehensive and amplitudinous reorganization of Russia. Occasionally they supposed that it would take shape of upheaval that would start the modern epoch in the country. They usually affirmed that revolution was democratic by its nature, that's why they portrayed the revolution as an act of self-liberation that gave birth to the people, new subject of politics.

Problem of political violence was a decisive component of discussion among radical activist and beyond their circle. Contemporaries and some of the later commentators believed that Herzen personified moderate and mostly peaceful approach to politics, and Bakunin, to the contrary, stood for extremism and violence. The situation was complicated by the fact that Herzen and Bakunin were changing their points of view throughout their lives. Interestingly enough, Herzen repeatedly took the most radical position and Bakunin shown that he could be cautious with this issue.

Despite all the changes, Herzen's and Bakunin's views had much in common. They didn't support political violence in most cases, distancing with the demands for objective evaluation of its advisability (Herzen) or via reasoning about its historical necessity (Bakunin).

Herzen's and Bakunin's oeuvres affected ideas concerning the role of emotions in politics that prevailed among Russian revolutionaries. Their attitude was contrary to the liberal conceptions of "bad passions" associated with the violence and unrests. Studied authors represented revolutions as examples of sincerity in expressing one's emotions and models for political action driven by authentic feelings.

But there were also significant differences between Herzen and Bakunin on this issue. Bakunin paid attention to the revolutionary terror and victims as far as they were important for the tactics of revolutionary struggle. He rarely perceived them as a personal matter. Bakunin thought about them as a sui generis strategic recourse for motivation of professional conspirators and political fighters. Quite on

the contrary, most of the Herzen's works showed marked personal and heartfelt dimension of the revolution.

Journal publications:

1. Ilyin A. A. Problema revolyucionnogo nasiliya u A.I. Herzena / A. A. Ilyin // Rossiya i sovremennyj mir. – 2018. – № 1. – P. 47–62.
2. Ilyin A. A. Razdirayushchij dushu vopl' : spor A.I. Herzena i B.N. Chicherina o roli ehmocij v politike / A. A. Ilyin // Dialog so vremenem. – 2017. – № 61. – P. 247–261.
3. Ilyin A. A. Ponyatie “revolyutsiya” u M.A. Bakunina : problema ambivalentnosti / A. A. Ilyin // Vestnik Russkoj hristianskoj gumanitarnoj akademii. – 2016. – № 4. – P. 169–177.