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For Vera Dunham, Soviet ideology has always been part of a broader political culture, existing within a particular social and historical context and necessarily changing over time. Her sensitivity to language makes her observations on this process of evolution particularly insightful. One example is her discussion of the "pronominal shift" in Soviet poetry, illuminating important changes in Soviet political culture and regime values during the thirty years following the October Revolution.

Early post-revolutionary poetry proclaimed the invincibility of the collective, focusing on the "we" that made the revolution and destroyed the old order. Eventually, however, revolutionary ardor waned, particularly as a result of Stalin's accusations against many of the revolution's heroes. In the 1930s, at the height of the purges and Stalin's power, "he" became the most important pronoun. And there was no question in the Soviet reader's mind to whom "he" referred. During the war, when it became clear that "he" was not invincible and the very existence of Soviet society was threatened by the disaster of the war, personal values began to enter Soviet lyrics. "I" replaced "he" as the center of poetic attention. After the war, when the danger to the regime had passed, one of the goals of the cultural retrenchment headed by Andrei Zhdanov was the restoration of the centrality of regime values in literature, downplaying the focus on individual needs and extolling the virtues of the positive hero engaged in the postwar reconstruction effort.
Following Vera Dunham's example, the essays in this section examine different aspects of ideology in terms of their historical evolution and changing semantic formulation.
This paper traces the gradual changes in the treatment by Soviet historians of individuals active in the 19th century revolutionary movement to buttress the validity of the 1917 Revolution. The image they seek to create is one of consensus, as though all "right minded" thinkers agreed on the correctness and inevitability of the course which led to the Marxist revolution led by Lenin. The changing biographies which the paper examines in detail are those of Alexander Herzen, Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Lavrov and Sergei Kravchinsky. All four men had some direct relationship, sometimes adversary, with Marx and Engels but did not become Marxists. All were subject to sharp criticism in early Soviet historiography, and all have enjoyed considerable rehabilitation more recently.

As a consequence of this gradual conversion of 'demons' into 'angels' the modern Soviet reader may find comfort in the thought that progress to socialism was not the work of a few persons with a true vision and an iron will, but rather the result of the efforts of all men of good will.

*Prepared by the staff of the National Council
CREATING A CONSENSUS:

SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY

MOVEMENT IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Alfred Erich Senn

Vera Dunham's work in interpreting Soviet society testifies eloquently to the close relationship between history and literature. Her image of the "Iskra complex" in Soviet literature -- the official belief in the role of the printed word as the instrument for organizing right thought -- emphasizes the prerevolutionary foundations of Soviet thought, and in turn one is tempted to invoke the principles of Socialist Realism as an artistic method in considering the broad trends of Soviet historiography of those prerevolutionary developments. The historians, of course, already know the road for which they are to provide the lighting, namely the path to the Great October Revolution.

While the principles of Socialist Realism are said to be universal and eternal, their specific application, as Prof. Dunham has so well shown, varies from generation to generation and reflects changing values. So too do the historians find it desirable and useful to modify and alter their images of revolutionary angels and demons as they demonstrate the zakonomernost' of the Russian revolutionary movement. The recent historiography of the pre-Leninist, pre-Marxist,
pre-"proletarian" phase of the revolutionary movement has accordingly shown an interesting tendency toward creating a consensus among its leading figures, as if, put in a different time and place, they would naturally have been Marxists and Leninists.

The treatment of Alexander Herzen, Mikhail Bakunin, Petr Lavrov, and Sergei Kravchinsky illustrate this trend in a particularly illuminating way, since all four of these men had had some sort of direct relationship with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "the founders of scientific socialism." and yet they had failed to become Marxists. They have each been the targets of sharp criticism in the past, but in more recent years they have enjoyed considerable rehabilitation.

Herzen tasted both the joy of victory and the agony of defeat in his lifetime. Having founded the Russian Free Press in 1853 and thereby having laid the groundwork for the development of nineteenth century tamizdat, uncensored printing and publishing in Western Europe, he clashed with the younger radicals of the late 1850s and the 1860s. His meeting with Nikolai Chernyshevsky in London in 1859 symbolized the divergence between the "fathers and sons" of the era, and in the 1860s the Young Emigration, the elements of "Young Russia" that had fled the homeland, openly mocked him. When he suggested that he and Chernyshevsky, the hero of these young men, actually complemented one another, Alexander Serno-Solovevich denounced him as a "tsarist socialist" who
could not understand the imperatives of the revolutionary movement. Chernyshevsky and Herzen, Serno insisted, were "representatives of two hostile natures that do not complement each other but rather destroy each other." ¹

Marx and Engels were themselves critical of Herzen. Marx considered him a man of letters and not a political leader. "I never want to be associated with Herzen anywhere," he wrote in 1855. Herzen's variety of Russian socialism made no sense to him, and he was suspicious of the influences behind the Russian. "Herzen," Marx wrote, "received annually for his 'Bell' and for Russian propaganda a rather large sum from 'democratic pan-Slavs' in Russia." Particularly damning in Marx's view was Herzen's long friendship with Bakunin. ²

V. I. Lenin praised Herzen for his founding of the Russian Free Press, but he saw the man as an example of noble liberalism of the first half of the nineteenth century, a man who outlived his time and could not understand the new generation of the 1860s. Lenin approved of the Young Emigres' attacks on Herzen. Noting their objections to Herzen's writing open letters to the monarch, Lenin exclaimed that one could not read these documents "without feeling disgust." Chernyshevsky and Serno, he declared, "representing a new generation of revolutionary raznochintsy, were a thousand times correct when they criticized Herzen for these retreats from democratism to liberalism." While Herzen had strong democratic instincts, Lenin argued, he still had to be understood as a member of the
landlord class in Russia. 3

Under these circumstances it was natural for Soviet historians long to take a somewhat mixed position in studying Herzen, considering him a liberal but still a democrat in the 1850s, a radical in the aftermath of the emigration (when his newspaper Kolokol provided the ringing slogans that excited the youth), and then a man who had outlived his time in the latter 1860s. The first edition of the Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia referred to him as a utopian socialist and praised his "flaming hatred for the bourgeois order" and his continued struggle for the "emancipation of humanity from the yoke of capital." But historians did not long remain so kind. In speaking of Serno's attack on Herzen, Boris Kozmin wrote, "Much was fully correct in Serno-Solovevich's charges." Serno had justifiably attacked "Herzen's liberal illusions" in speaking of the desirability of revolution without bloodshed. Serno erred only in his unacceptable tone and in not recognizing that Herzen could at times be a democrat too; Herzen and Chernyshevsky, after all, "stood on the same side of the barricade." Even so, Kozmin insisted, Herzen spoke kindly of Serno after the latter's suicide. 4

In the 1960s, after the formation of the study group to examine "The First Revolutionary Situation in Russia, 1859-1861," Herzen became pictured as a more consistent revolutionary. In the introduction to a reprinting of Kolokol, E. A. Rudnitskaia complained that Mikhail Pokrovsky had
hampered the Soviet interpretation of Herzen's work by his acceptance of "liberal bourgeois traditions" in having considered Herzen a liberal. She also directed barbs at other authors, such as Z. P. Bazileva, for having succumbed to "old bourgeois-liberal literature" and having viewed Herzen as a liberal. One should, Rudnitskaia argued, recognize "the class face and basic line" of Kolokol and thereby grant Herzen his due as a revolutionary.  

Rudnitskaia praised Shneer Levin's essay on the history of Russian social thought as the first genuinely Marxist interpretation of Herzen's work. Levin complained that historians had concentrated "all attention only on the fact of the differences and arguments of Herzen with Chernyshevsky" and had thereby depicted two distinct "tendencies." Lenin, Levin argued, had pointed out both Herzen's good points and his bad, but he had basically praised the man's "unforgettable services as an outstanding progressive thinker and theoretician." Levin dismissed as "left vulgarization" the view that Herzen was a liberal.  

In recent years, M. V. Nechkina has taken a prominent place in defining Herzen's historical role. In her capacity as the head of the study group for "The First Revolutionary Situation," she took advantage of having outlived Kozmin and used him as her foil, insisting that she had long argued that Herzen and Chernyshevsky had "not stood on different sides of the barricades." Kozmin was wrong, she argued, in stating that
Chernyshevsky had dismissed Herzen as a liberal. Kozmin's interpretation, she declared, constituted "a transformation of the known liberal-bourgeois conception considering Herzen a liberal and sharply distinguishing Herzen and Chernyshevsky, juxtaposing them." In her own work, "after many years of studying the activity of N. G. Chernyshevsky, I came to the conclusion that his role in the Russian revolutionary movement, like the role of his contemporaries A. I. Herzen and N. P. Ogarev, has been examined extremely incompletely in our scientific literature and has been wrongly interpreted."

Pointing to Ogarev's plan for a secret revolutionary society, she depicted Herzen and his friend as almost Leninists in ovo. Even Serno's pamphlet should not be taken as evidence of a rift between Herzen and the younger generation; by Serno's own testimony, Herzen had helped pay Serno's medical costs.7

Nechkina herself should not be completely exonerated of any blame for the long domination of "liberal-bourgeois conceptions" in Soviet historiography. In a textbook published in 1940, she credited Herzen with having revolutionary and patriotic feelings, but she added, "Herzen did not arrive at the materialist conception of history, for he was incapable of finding his way in the footsteps of Marx and Engels along the logical road of social development and of noting the correct historical perspectives." She noted with approval Lenin's judgment that Herzen's idealization of the Russian peasant contained "not a grain of socialism."8
Vadim Prokofiev has more recently provided a portrait of
Herzen in the inspirational series Lives of Remarkable People,
calling Herzen and his friend Ogarev "new people" (novye
liudi) something beautiful to observe, but lamenting that
unfortunately Natalia Alekseevna Tuchkova-Ogareva was
"something else," not of their quality. Not all the Young
Emigres, Prokofiev wrote, approved of Serno's attack on Herzen,
and the younger man's exaggerations "deeply wounded" the
revolutionary veteran. As for the question of Herzen's
relations with Marx and Engels, "It remains only to regret that
the force of circumstances prevented a rapprochement between
Aleksandr Ivanovich and the 'Marksids'," he declared. "Perhaps
none of Herzen's contemporaries stood so close to Marx and
Engels in their philosophical views." 9

In the case of Mikhail Bakunin, the historiographical
questions vexing Soviet specialists have been quite different.
Bakunin was a revolutionary enthusiast; no one could doubt his
opposition to the existing social order; but he challenged Marx
for control of the Workers' International in the late 1860s and
early 1870s. How should a Soviet historian deal with such a
figure, unquestionably a popular Russian revolutionary whose
influence extended even to generations unborn in his time?
Other Russian revolutionaries had opposed Marx in specific
questions, but Bakunin had challenged Marx's leadership of the
International. In the 1920s, historians seemed fascinated with
him. In the first edition of the Bolshaia Sovetskaia
Entsiklopediia, he was called an "anarchist revolutionary," an intellectual victim of Russian backwardness who exerted greater influence through his deeds than through his writings.

In Stalin's time historical judgment turned harshly against Bakunin. Kozmin wrote, "The petty bourgeois individualist-anarchist Bakunin served as a rallying point for anti-Marxist elements... Marx and Engels considered the Bakunists the worst enemies of Marxism." A. M. Pankratova said of him, "Bakunin was an enemy of the working class and a disorganizer of the international labor movement." Nor did Nechkina see any value in his work: "Bakunin, a violent opponent of Marx and of revolutionary Marxism, played an extremely negative role in the international workers' movement and in every way strove to divert the workers' movement from the true path." The second edition of the Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia called him a "fanatical enemy of Marxism."

After Stalin's demise, Bakunin's image improved, especially as Soviet historians found the study of narodnichestvo more interesting and positive. To be sure, progress could come only slowly, and then at the expense of other historical figures, chief among them being Nikolai Utin. The son of a wealthy businessman, of Jewish background, Utin clashed head-on with Bakunin, who accused him of being a "womanizer" and complained bitterly about this zhid's intrigues. But Utin became a correspondent of Karl Marx and played a key role in the formation of a Russian section of the
First International. Writing in 1965 one Soviet author praised Utin for having exposed Bakunin's "dictatorial manner" and for having criticized his "revolutionary romanticism and adventurism." Utin collected "enormous factual material" that helped Marx to counteract "Bakunin's wrecking activity" within the First International. Yet, writing just a few years later, another author, N. Pirumova, accused Utin of having indulged in his own intrigues and lies in his campaign to discredit Bakunin.

Pirumova's biography of Bakunin, included in Lives of Remarkable People, offered a new image of the anarchist. "Marx's and Engels's struggle against anarchism was a deeply principled struggle of ideas," she wrote. "But some of the ideological opponents of Bakunism did not always limit themselves to acceptable forms of political polemics." This in turn led Bakunin to resort to excesses in his responses; yet he respectfully would not attack Marx personally. Admitting that Bakunin bore a measure of responsibility for having endorsed Nechaev, Pirumova insisted that it was only out of "warm friendly feelings" for Natalie Herzen that Bakunin had urged her to cooperate with Nechaev. Ultimately Bakunin's error lay in his failure to recognize that he and Marx were really following the same path, differing only in terms of tactics, as, for example, in the question of how long the state should continue to exist after the revolution.

A recently published critique of "bourgeois
Anglo-American" historiography on Bakunin complained that falsifiers of history concentrate on attacking Marx's methods in winning his "Pyrrhic victory" over Bakunin for control of the First International. "The conflict and the delimitation between Bakunists and Marxists," wrote V. G. Dzhangirian, "were not only historically inevitable but also useful." Western historians, he argued, intent on discrediting Marx, refuse to recognize the "essence of the Marxists' struggle against Bakunism, considering it a struggle for leadership called forth by political ambitions and psychological incompatibility."

Both Marx and Bakunin, the author insisted, regarded each other respectfully and with personal good will, but since Bakunism was a form of "utopian socialism," the two were doomed to clash.\textsuperscript{14}

Petr Lavrov offers an example of a man who disagreed with Marx and Engels on ideological questions but who remained a personal friend. Lavrov came West in 1870, just two months after Herzen's death. He witnessed the brief but intense flaming of the Paris Commune, he first met Marx on a visit to London in 1871, and in 1872 he embarked on a relatively brief career as a publisher and editor, directing \textit{Vpered!} both as an anthology and as a newspaper over the next four years. An intellectual who could inspire but not direct a political movement, he soon became more or less the grand old man of the emigration, a figure whose counsel many sought but whom no one really accepted as a leader.
When Lavrov brought *Vpered!* to London in 1874, Marx and Engels treated his political views with something less than full respect. While Engels referred to Lavrov as a "highly respected Russian scholar," he called him an "eclectic, who tries to choose the best from the most varied systems and theories." Engels could not forgive Lavrov's effort, in the time of Marx's struggle against "the false machinations, deceptions, and lies" of the Bakunists, "to reconcile all these mutually hostile people." Fortunately for his historical image, Lavrov chose not to become upset with Engels's comments -- he was more interested at the time in Engels's criticisms of Petr Tkachev -- and he soon became friendly with both Marx and Engels.

Lavrov had an excellent entry into Marx's company in the person of German Lopatin, one of the fascinating figures of this period, another Russian friend of Marx's who still refused to become a Marxist. Lopatin charmed Marx when the two men first met in 1870; Marx objected only to the young man's views on the Polish Question -- "On this point Lopatin speaks just like an Englishman, let's say an English chartist of the old school, about Ireland." Marx later had the same complaint about Lavrov, and Lavrov complained that Marx was failing to understand how the common revolutionary struggle should cut across the national antagonisms between the Poles and the Russian authorities. Despite such differences, however, Marx obviously enjoyed his conversations with both Lavrov and
Lopatin.

Lavrov helped to publicize the works of both Marx and Engels in Russian journals, but he would not accept Marxism. In the 1880s, when G. V. Plekhanov broke away from the editorial board of *Vestnik Narodnoi voli* to found a Marxist publishing group, called "Liberation of Labor," Lavrov criticized him for disrupting the common revolutionary front. The Russian Marxists complained endlessly both about Lavrov's efforts to unify the revolutionary forces and also about his obscure style of writing. Vera Zasulich said of one of his essays that it was easier to understand Hegel. 17

The first edition of the *Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* called Lavrov a "petty bourgeois socialist, a theorist and publicist of narodnichestvo," and saw his views as something akin to Bakunin's. Because he refused to join the Marxists, he "evoked decisive criticisms from the founders of Marxism." The second edition of the encyclopedia, dated 1953, denounced his "reactionary idealist views." In her time, Pankratova wrote of him, "Although Lavrov was acquainted with K. Marx and his works, he did not understand Marxism." 18

Writing in 1971, Boris Itenberg and A. Volodin emphasized Lavrov's friendship with Marx, declaring, "To be sure, Lavrov did not become a Marxist, although some of the narodniks accused him of this." Lavrov, however, did accept the principle of the class struggle, and he played a major role in propagandizing "Marx's name and ideas in Russian literature and
in the preparation of the revolutionary youth of Russia for the acceptance of Marxist teaching."  

Volodin's entry on Lavrov in the third edition of the Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia argued that despite the "subjective idealistic character" of his writings, "Lavrov's sociology played a progressive role in Russia." In 1981 Lavrov joined the pantheon Lives of Remarkable People, and Volodin and Itenberg suggested that while Lavrov respected Marx and listened to him, he was perhaps simply too old to accept the new teachings.  

In contrast to Lavrov, Sergei Kravchinsky-Stepniak has yet to be accepted into the select circle of Lives of Remarkable People. Certainly one of the most colorful of the nineteenth-century Russian revolutionaries, Kravchinsky gained note in the 1870s as a writer, a rebel, and the assassin of the police chief Mezentsev. Pursued by the authorities, he went into the emigration, and in order to support himself, he wrote the classic Underground Russia, using the penname "Stepniak." In 1884 he settled in London, where he met Engels and went on to make a career for himself interpreting the Russian revolutionary movement for the western public. His romanticized images of the terrorists played an important role in winning western support for the revolutionaries.  

Within the revolutionary movement, however, Kravchinsky was a controversial figure; his compatriots frequently complained that he was watering down the ideological content of their struggle in his effort to win the support of the British
bourgeoisie. When the American George Kennan depicted them as liberals, they did not object too much, but they could not tolerate the same distortion in Kravchinsky's statements. Lavrov would have nothing to do with him, but the Marxist group Liberation of Labor maintained friendly relations with him, in no small measure helped by the friendship established in 1878 between Kravchinsky and Vera Zasulich.

Soviet historiography long tended to ignore Kravchinsky, seeing him as a terrorist of the 1870s who in the emigration had turned into a writer. The first edition of the Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia criticized his idealization of the Russian terrorists, noting that the Marxists had disapproved of individual terrorism. The second edition pictured him as a bold activist, but a man cut off from contact with the masses.

With time, Kravchinsky was bound to win more attention. Besides the fact of his friendship with Zasulich, he was responsible for Plekhanov's being invited to attend the founding congress of the Second International in 1889, he helped Plekhanov then make a visit to London, and he introduced the father of Russian Marxism to Friedrich Engels. One Soviet study distinguished four periods in his career: 1872-1875, when he favored popular revolution before the triumph of capitalism in Russia; 1876 to 1879, when he saw the failure of revolution in the lack of organization and he turned to direct action; 1881-1889, when he recognized the value of the political struggle and abandoned his anarchist ways; and 1890
to 1895, when he was leaning toward the Marxist position and coming to understand the role of the urban workers in the revolutionary process. Soviet historians now make special note of Kravchinsky's renunciation of individual terror as a revolutionary weapon, made public in 1893.

Evgeniia Taratuta has taken the lead in reviving Kravchinsky's memory; among other studies she has produced a large-scale biography in full harmony with Kravchinsky's own romantic nature. Even she, however, found it desirable to tone down some of Kravchinsky's enthusiasms. In the April 1878 issue of Obshchina, printed in Geneva, Kravchinsky went on at length speculating about Vera Zasulich's character -- he had not yet met her -- and he asked, "...kak liubit?" Taratuta chose to recast his question as "...chto liubit?" Nevertheless she noted that the Liberation of Labor group regarded Stepan Kravchinsky its edinomyshlennik, and other writers have approvingly recounted Kravchinsky's relations with western intellectuals.

Not all efforts to incorporate controversial historical figures into the revolutionary mainstream have been quite so successful as the rehabilitation of Lavrov or Kravchinsky. One case in point would be that of Mikhail Elpidin, an emigre printer and publisher, who had participated in the Kazan conspiracy of the early 1860s, had printed the first edition as a book of Chernyshevsky's What is to be Done?, and by the 1880s had come to dominate the book trade in uncensored Russian
publications. Elpidin had also sponsored Bakunin's membership in the First International. For a long time Soviet publications took note of charges that he had worked for the tsarist okhranka in Paris, but in recent years these references have been omitted.

In the 1960s M. T. Pinaev, a literary historian in Volgograd, took up Elpidin's cause as a revolutionary hailing from the Volga region, vigorously and even ferociously defending him against such slanders as having betrayed German Lopatin's bold effort in 1870 to rescue Chernyshevsky from Siberia and as having entered the service of the okhranka. Insisting that the latter charge was only a figment of Lev Deich's imagination, Pinaev exalted Elpidin as a revolutionary pioneer: a man who went to the people in the 1860s, who responded to needs of Russian emigres in Geneva by organizing a printing press, who anticipated the development of the political struggle by publishing the newspaper Obshchee delo, and who alerted emigres to the presence of tsarist spies in their midst. Other Soviet historians, however, have remained rather unconvinced, remembering Elpidin best for Deich's complaint that he had cheated the group Liberation of Labor in the marketing of its publications. The fact also remains that Elpidin did indeed take money from the okhranka, and Pinaev could not do much with the fact that Marx despised Elpidin.

In the spirit of Socialist Realism, the process of building a consensus among the revolutionary leaders of the
nineteenth century seems to represent a distinct trend -- Herzen, Lavrov, Bakunin and Kravchinsky were preparing the way for Lenin. They showed the proper qualities of universality and class consciousness, and since they had not met Lenin, their lack of partiinost' can be excused; their errors, on the other hand, showed that revolutionary virtue had to be taught, and herein one can find the foundation for the "Iskra complex." At the same time, the Soviet reader might even seek comfort in the thought that progress has become not just the work of a few persons with a true vision and an iron will, but rather the result of the efforts of all men of good will.
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