To go into exile is to lose your place in the world.

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE
The Russian Emigré Press: In the Shadows of Kolokol

Although we have considered aspects of émigré journalism in the context of the individual émigrés who edited or contributed to Russian publications abroad, we have not as yet examined the evolution of the Russian émigré press as a whole. The general trend of this evolution, as will shortly become evident, is very much a reflection of the currents that dominated the development of the émigré communities.

The Russian émigré press was at first inspired by Herzen's Free Press in London, then competed with it, and ultimately succeeded it. Always, however, particularly during the height of Kolokol's influence, the émigré press functioned in the shadow of Herzen's paper. Most of the newspapers, journals, and other periodicals initiated by Russian émigrés in Europe were ephemeral; none lasted nearly as long as Kolokol, nor did any single émigré publication achieve either the immediate or the enduring influence of Herzen's paper. Nevertheless, it would be historically inaccurate to assume that Herzen's paper was the émigré press. Yet, because so little has been known about Russian émigré journalism during this period, this is exactly what historians have tended to do—to equate Kolokol and Herzen's other publications with the entirety of the émigré press. The reality of the situation was actually quite different. The journalistic endeavors of the Russian émigrés were rich, varied, and a permanent feature of émigré life.

Before turning to an analysis of the émigré press, however, we must first review the origins of Russian journalism in Europe. In this book, we have disputed many of the claims made by Herzen and by historians of Herzen regarding the emigration, but one achievement is indisputably his: Herzen founded émigré journalism. He was actively involved with journalism almost from the moment of his
arrival in Western Europe. Undoubtedly he was influenced by the deluge of political journals and newspapers that flooded Paris during the revolutionary year of 1848. Alongside these periodicals were the political clubs that in some cases published the radical journals and newspapers. Herzen was briefly associated with one of these groups, the Club de la Fraternité des Peuples, which had an international membership that also included Sazonov and Golovin among its Russian constituents.

Herzen seemed somewhat torn at this time over whether to associate with a European-international kind of journalism or to launch a publication dealing exclusively with Russian affairs. On the one hand, he was asked to involve himself in journalistic projects by supporters of European intellectuals as diverse as Mazzini, Proudhon, and Fazy. On the other hand, he wrote that he had been considering a Russian-language publication and printing press as early as 1849, and was in touch with his “friends in Russia” about this venture. Nothing concrete was realized in this period, however, in part because of Herzen’s peripatetic existence. Between 1849 and 1852 he moved from Paris to Fribourg and to Nice before settling in London. Once in London, he began to prepare for a series of Russian émigré publications in 1853. He announced to one of his friends in a letter in the spring of that year that “there will be a printing press,” which he was certain would be “the best thing I’ve done in my life.” He was very conscious of the necessity for individuals in Russia to support this émigré press both by contributing and by subscribing. Without this active involvement from the homeland, the venture could not succeed. The choice, as Herzen saw it, was between silence and the continuation of autocratic oppression, or the possibility of freedom through uncensored politics as expressed in his émigré press. In this way, he inaugurated the Russian Free Press in 1853 and the first émigré periodical, Poliar­naia zvezda, in 1855. Explicitly linked with the Decembrist tradition, Herzen declared in the introduction to this new journal that his press would be “dedicated to the question of Russian liberation, and the spreading throughout Russia of a free form of thought,” unfettered by political restrictions. It was a formulation that would generate a great deal of activity abroad in addition to the contributions from Russia that he called for.

Herzen filled the pages of his new journal with an impressive variety of documents, all of which were intended to demonstrate the necessity of social change. In the first issue, he published an open
letter to the new emperor, Alexander II, in which he made clear his concerns for the immediate future. The main goal was to bring about conditions of freedom for the intelligentsia and land for the peasantry. He stated that his journal would have "no system, no doctrine" to propound, and he issued an invitation to all sectors of Russian society, to Westerners as well as Slavophiles, "to the moderate and the extreme," to join in a united effort to realize a free Russia. Concerning the means to that end, he wrote, "We open our doors wide, we summon all arguments."7

In addition, beginning in the first issue of Poliarnaia zvezda, Herzen published his magnificent memoir, My Past and Thoughts, in serialized form. He also printed the 1847 correspondence between Gogol and Belinskii, which included Belinskii’s famous attack on Gogol’s Correspondence with Friends, and an abstract treatise, "What is the State?" written by his émigré friend V. A. Engel’son, with whom, however, he had serious disagreements. This was followed in future issues by the poetry of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Ryleev, contributions by his closest colleague, Ogarev, on the emancipation question, and the memoirs of the Decembrist I. D. Iakushkin, to mention only a small portion of the overall contributions.8 Herzen’s main objectives were to provide a forum for discussion of Russia’s path from autocracy to political liberty, and to connect these contemporary problems to the developments that had spawned them since the 1825 Decembrist uprising. For Herzen, the thirty-year reign of Nicholas I was no longer to be seen as the apogee of autocracy, but rather as the prelude to the age of freedom he believed was now dawning in Russia.

In an effort to present the views of such prominent liberals as Boris Chicherin and Konstantin Kavelin, Herzen started a separate publication, Golosa iz Rossii (Voices from Russia). Many of his own concepts about the obshchina (commune) and Russian socialism emerged from his debate with these liberals, for whom Herzen had genuine respect in spite of disagreements with them.

Within two years, Herzen sensed the need for a new émigré organ with a different format. With the death of Nicholas I, followed by Alexander II’s accession to the throne, Herzen perceived that the mood in Russia had switched dramatically from the fatalistic, albeit reluctant, acceptance of the oppressive existing order of things, to an emotionally charged optimism in which all manner of reform seemed possible. The arrival in London of Herzen’s oldest and most trusted friend, Nikolai Ogarev, also spurred Herzen to respond to
the challenge of the times by providing a new voice of change from abroad. The development that made the new organ a reality was Herzen’s success in negotiating with the Trubner publishing house in London, which granted him vastly improved conditions for printing abroad in Russian. The result was the appearance of the first issue of Kolokol on 1 July 1857.

The new publication resembled a newspaper more than a journal (to which Poliarnaia zvezda was more similar); it could appear more frequently and thus with more immediate information and opinion on the crucial questions of the day. Herzen announced that Kolokol would be dedicated to the same principles of freedom that had been proclaimed in Poliarnaia zvezda, but that the new publication would concentrate primarily on the problem of liberating the serfs with land, peacefully if possible. He warned his countrymen that unless emancipation was announced soon, with favorable conditions for the freed peasants, “the muzhiks will decide for themselves. Streams of blood will flow and who will be responsible for that? The government. Wake up. . . . Let us work while there is still time.”

Herzen’s achievement with the creation of Kolokol was supreme. He fused the tradition of Russian critical journalism as practiced by Belinskii in his very last years with the tradition of European radical journalism, which particularly influenced Herzen at the time of the 1848 revolutions. Through this synthesis, he created an entirely new journalistic genre in the Russian context with a distinctive and personal idiom for its expression. Herzen’s prose was elegant, complex, appropriately urgent in tone, and extremely relevant. In announcing his reform program—freedom of the word from censorship, freedom of the peasants with land from landlords, and the freedom of all Russians (not only the gentry) from corporal punishment—Herzen accelerated the emerging debate that was to lead to the Great Reforms of the early 1860s. In addition to printing his theoretical articles on the nature of the coming transformation in Russia, he devoted a good deal of space to the “unmasking” (as he called it) of official abuses in the government and the capricious everyday tyranny of landlords. He frequently included statistics and other forms of documentary evidence to illustrate forms of injustice. As Venturi has said, “The paper so widened its sources of information (which often included government offices) that it was able to publish secret documents of such importance that even today, after the archives have been opened, the Kolokol provides
information on Russian life of the period which is not obtainable elsewhere.”

Herzen rang his “bell” for Russian contributors, and they appeared in numbers that exceeded his wildest expectations. What he did not seem to anticipate at all, however, was that his publications would become an inspiring and competitive example to other émigrés. In this way, the concept of an opposition press, which Herzen had experienced firsthand during the 1848 revolution in Paris, was passed on to other Russian émigrés. The initial efforts that were made tended to be to Herzen’s right, politically, but by the end of the 1860s, as the emigration itself became increasingly critical of Herzen and also more radical in its political orientation, the émigré press began to produce publications far to Herzen’s left.

The first émigré periodical to appear after Kolokol was Blagonomerennyi, published in Leipzig in 1859 and edited by Ivan Golovin. Golovin camouflaged himself not only with a nom de plume but also with a title—Prince Khovry—in his capacity as editor and contributor. Some articles are signed with his real name, giving the impression that at least two people were responsible for the content of the journal. A total of twelve issues were published, each consisting of a lengthy essay by Golovin followed by five to ten pages of miscellany such as letters, book reviews, and brief notices about people or events. The themes of the lead essays are eclectic, ranging from trade and finance to European history and culture. Russia’s role is not placed in any clear focus, nor is any political program to be found in Golovin’s essays. Indeed, here he may have been reacting against Herzen’s explicitly political orientation in Kolokol. Nevertheless, a brief survey of these essays reveals Golovin’s concern for Russia and his own political ideas as well.

In the first issue of the journal, Golovin’s essay “Leadership in Trade” combined some of his economic ideas with instructions to Russians on how to improve their business skills in commercial relations. He argued strongly for the advantages of free trade and commercial legislation while criticizing governments like Russia, where there was less commercial law and greater restriction on trade than in England or America. Recognizing the gap in business expertise between Russia and Europe, Golovin included in his essay examples of properly written business letters, billing forms, and procedures for account-charging for purchased goods. He also discussed bankruptcy and guidelines for speculative investments.
In the second issue, Golovin shifted ground sharply in an essay called “On the Political Upbringing of the Russian People,” which was a response to a letter and an article in Herzen’s *Golosa iz Rossii* in which Russia’s development was interpreted in the context of Western Europe’s. Golovin argued against this, claiming that Russia had evolved historically in its own manner, quite distinct from the situation in the West. He wrote that Russia had first to solve the serf question and then could move on to the administrative and judicial transformation of the country. These were problems, he went on, that the West did not face; they were peculiar to Russia. The ultimate consequence of solving these issues would be a political change in Russia in which civil liberties and individual rights could be achieved as they had been in England and France. Only then, when the Russian people were ready—that is, properly educated and experienced in citizenship responsibilities—could political freedom be introduced. In calling upon the new tsar, Alexander II, to initiate these changes with appropriate legislation, Golovin was in fact agreeing with Herzen’s strategy and reflecting the similar mood that existed in Russia at that time in educated society.14

Golovin devoted several issues to an analysis of the French Revolution in a long essay that he dedicated to Alphonse Lamartine.15 He also devoted some of his essays to descriptions of both the history and the contemporary culture of Western Europe, with the intention of providing Russians with firsthand knowledge of Europe while convincing them that Russia’s past, present, and future were not similar to the Western pattern.16

In the last few issues before the journal ceased publication, Golovin became more overtly political. In the tenth issue, he included an editorial preface that is the closest he ever came to providing a programmatic statement. The journal, he wrote, desires for Russia “the general good, not merely the private good of individuals.” By this he meant the realization of “freedom in order and order in freedom, which resides in a harmonious government.” Viewing Russia from abroad, he continued, permitted a different perspective on the nation’s problems and prospects. As an émigré, Golovin claimed he could analyze Russian politics and society from a “humanitarian and humanistic” perspective, thereby escaping the narrower, “nationalistic” focus of viewing the nation’s problems from within. He believed that neither socialism nor autocracy offered real solutions to Russia’s problems. He also made it clear that he opposed both militaristic and aristocratic governments as well as at-
tempts at violence and conspiracies. What he proposed as an alternative was a monarchical government based on “popular representation.” His hope was that the tsar would recognize the need to bring the nation into the political process and issue appropriate legislation for the establishment of a government of law. He did not, however, have in mind a republic based on Western models such as England, France, or Switzerland. This would only create havoc in Russia. Russia must, Golovin concluded, find its own proper governing structure in accordance with its history, its people, and its existing institutions.17

Following this issue, Golovin wrote an essay on the relationship between the judiciary and the government in an effort to amplify his political statement, and he also managed to secure an article by M. N. Granovskii on the Eastern Question for publication in his journal. He also printed some anonymous poetry in the last issue of Blagonamerennyi, which was dedicated to Vissarion Belinskii.18 Clearly, Golovin was moving toward a more political orientation, but he closed the journal at this point because of the absence of any significant response to his ideas. This was the moment of Kolokol’s greatest influence, and Golovin was unable to offer coherent new perspectives that would attract a wide Russian readership in this situation.

At the same time that Golovin’s journal was floundering, P. V. Dolgorukov attempted to launch another alternative to Herzen’s press. Although he altered the name of his journal twice, the style and content of the successors did not change very much from the original numbers of his first title, Budushchnost’.19 Dolgorukov was quite conscious of the need to present a forum for Russian émigrés who did not agree with Herzen’s political orientations.

In September 1860, in the first issue of his journal, Dolgorukov set forth a political program. This program consisted of a critique of injustice in Russia and a proposal for reform. The critique centered on the problem of serfdom, the abuses of the autocrat, and the corruption of the bureaucracy. Dolgorukov made it clear that he was not seeking change from below but rather was pleading with Alexander II to initiate the necessary reforms himself. “We consider it the responsibility of all honest people,” he wrote, “of all true Russians, to try to open the eyes of Alexander II” to the critical problems surrounding him from which his officialdom shields him every day. Dolgorukov wanted his journal to reflect what he believed to be
a substantial body of opinion that favored "a constitutional monarchy" based on specific principles. These principles included the following: First, legislative power must be divided among the sovereign and two legislative bodies, which he called the Zemskai\textit{a Duma} and the Boiarskaia Duma. The former, or Council of the Land, was to be a purely elective body, with rotating, defined terms of office, while the latter, or Aristocratic Council, would consist of members selected by the sovereign and of elected constituents. Second, all government ministers must be responsible to the Council of the Land rather than exclusive appointees of the crown. The regulation of finances also was to be placed in the hands of the Council of the Land. Finally, there was to be a list of liberties that would be guaranteed regardless of the composition of the government. These liberties were equality before the law; freedom of worship; no arrests or detention without lawful trial, in which guilt was to be proven, not asserted; the abolition of corporal punishment; and freedom of the press without censorship.\textsuperscript{20}

Dolgorukov made his competitive relationship with \textit{Kolokol} explicit: "The political principles of the editors of \textit{Kolokol} are entirely separate from ours; they are socialists." While admitting his respect for the integrity of their search for the truth, Dolgorukov believed that the effort to move away from the structure of a constitutional monarchy was an error, and a potentially dangerous one. \textit{Budushchnost'} would monitor all known instances of abuses and illegalities in Russia, propose constitutional legislation for discussion, and promised to publish contributions from interested readers, particularly materials that could not be printed in the legal press in Russia.\textsuperscript{21}

Future issues of the journal did publish such contributions, but it soon became obvious to Dolgorukov that the large response he hoped for would never materialize. The great majority of the articles and news items during the journal's three years of existence were by Dolgorukov—his views on Russia's politics, its international relations, and its history. He repeatedly criticized the "Asiatic administration," the "Tarterization of our secret police," and the "abusive encroachments of the senior Petersburg bureaucracy."\textsuperscript{22} However, without a supporting readership for his moderate political program, he was forced, in 1864, to abandon his journal.

One of the most stimulating and original journals of the émigré press at this time was Leonid Blummer's \textit{Svobodnoe slovo}.\textsuperscript{23}
Blummer, a former law student at Moscow University, established his journal in 1862 with high hopes of providing a moderate alternative to Herzen's *Kolokol*. Blummer's effort is interesting not only because of the content of his journal but also because it reflects the general opinion among the Russian émigrés that individuals could compete successfully with Herzen. Blummer himself had become a disciple of John Stuart Mill's liberalism, and his journal thus represents one of the more unusual instances of European intellectual influences on members of the Russian émigré community. Blummer's articles are incisive and broad-ranging and certainly do not merit the complete neglect they have received from both Soviet and Western historians.

In his editorial introduction to the first issue of *Svobodnoe slovo*, Blummer indicated he was convinced that "not all shades of Russian thought, free of censorship, have as yet found independent expression." Although freedom of thought has been "ably served by *Kolokol* and *Budushchnost*," there is a certain kind of thinking, characterized by "deliberation and restraint," which is absent in the organs of Herzen and Dolgorukov. By this Blummer meant a profound sense of tolerance even of one's enemies, "whether he is a petty thief or a grand autocrat," a commitment to human dignity for all, and a compassionate recognition of the fact that Russia's difficulties are the fault not only of certain individuals' intentions but also of circumstances such as upbringing, education, and social values.

Guided by the philosophic principles of John Stuart Mill, Blummer continued, *Svobodnoe slovo* would seek to analyze Russia's critical problems. Blummer wanted to find a new path toward this end. He was trying to move beyond choosing between accepting the autocratic regime or rejecting it and then being compelled to embrace revolutionary strategies. This would be made clear, Blummer promised, in the journal's articles on international and domestic political problems.

Blummer also showed a great capacity to empathize with the psychological plight of the Russian émigré in Western Europe in a way displayed by no other editor, Herzen included. In a separate essay in the journal's first issue, Blummer explored the stages of adjustment for Russians abroad and the emotional difficulties that had to be experienced as part of the process of geographical transition. The initial phase is dominated by feelings of remorse as the homeland and loved ones are left behind, perhaps forever. This sadness is combined with a sense of guilt as the émigrés with politi-
cal commitments realize that those who are left behind must continue to function in circumstances of suffering and oppression. These feelings engender "a terrible despair, an agonizing, tormenting pain," which is rooted in the clash between the "pangs for a dead past" full of meaning, and the new life that had once been a dream and is now incomprehensible, mysterious, and somewhat frightening.²⁵

This is followed by a second stage, in which "life abroad begins." Life abroad, Bliummer continued, is characterized by inevitable comparisons. The former student from Moscow is overwhelmed by the wealth and variety of the curriculum in the West; the former official is astounded by the efficient methods and modes of specialization that exist in the bureaucracies of Europe. All Russians suddenly awake in a new way to the political horrors of the autocracy as they learn about the mechanics of parliaments and democratic institutions abroad, "and feel deeply ashamed" for having endured tsarist politics for so long.²⁶

Then, in the third stage, the émigré decides to cease observing and starts to act. Realistic goals, with appropriate strategies, must be formulated. A conscious plan is required to clarify the nature of the struggle against the autocracy, according to the demands of the times. The émigrés remorse and shame is at last overcome only with this phase of action. "We seek," Bliummer concluded, speaking in the context of this need for action, "full freedom of conscience and thought, political and civil security of the individual, equality of all before the law, and electoral rule; for this to be realized, the autocracy [in Russia] must be dismantled and transformed into a constitutional monarchy." He also stated that he intended, according to Mill's principles, to speak to his opponents as equals, and wished to be treated similarly by them.²⁷

In the political articles that he printed in Svobodnoe slovo, Bliummer tried to set a model for these principles and for the high degree of tolerance that he valued so strongly. On the Polish Question, he argued for independence. He believed that so long as Russia controlled Poland, neither country could be free. The same was true for the Ukraine, which he argued must be permitted to decide its own destiny.²⁸ In another article he took issue with Ogarev's celebrating the closing of Russian universities and calling Russian youth to go to the people to seek real knowledge and truth. Bliummer saw the shutting down of Russian higher education as a tragedy to mourn, not as an act to applaud. The universities should be re-
opened as soon as possible, since, in spite of the need for drastic reform, they were the only repositories of enlightenment and learning. Bliummer believed unequivocally in the progressive potential of higher education, attributing to it a kind of secular mission in bringing enlightenment to the illiterate lower orders of society.29

Bliummer was also a firm supporter of the need to develop a tradition of émigré Russian literature free of censorship. Citing Mill and Guizot on the definitions of individual liberty, Bliummer argued that the only result of literary censorship had been to drive Russian literature abroad, where it could be expressed freely. He cited figures on the growth of Russian books abroad as evidence of this trend. “Russia is spilling the blood of her own sons,” he wrote, who produce literature that the government deems distasteful and threatening. Interestingly, Bliummer did not approve of all émigré literature uncritically, and warned writers and publishers abroad that they had a special responsibility to assess what was publishable by virtue of its quality and usefulness. Printing what Bliummer called “indecent writings” solely because they were critical of Russia and could not be published there would only damage the whole arsenal of literary weapons in the battle against the autocracy.30

One of Bliummer’s most cherished projects was his proposal for a Russian constitution. In a series of articles in *Svobodnoe slovo,* he discussed both the specific terms of the proposal and its underlying philosophical justification. It is here that nineteenth-century Russian émigré liberalism may have received its classic formulation. Bliummer began by asserting that liberty was the highest political goal of the individual and that arbitrariness was liberty’s primary enemy. Thus, the most fundamental purpose of a constitution was to secure liberty in the face of this pervasive evil. Bliummer then asked the important question, Liberty for whom? In answering this question, he perceived Russian society as being divided between two conflicting interests—those of the great majority, the narod, whose concerns were “not only varied but in contradiction and opposition,” and those of a more homogeneous, educated minority. Citing Mill once again, Bliummer argued that freedom for the majority could become “slavery for the remainder” of society. Rather than compelling the minority to conform to the majority’s interests (the reverse was worse), Bliummer suggested a governing structure that would be “balanced” in satisfying the interests of both groups. This required a delicate and carefully conceived distribution of power which could be initiated by the formulation of a program of
basic freedoms that would be regulated by law to ensure justice. These guaranteed freedoms must include the categories of legal equality, religious worship, and expression of thought and opinion. Free elections were essential to a free citizenry, and a free citizenry was one in which no element was tyrannized.³¹

The growth of a free society would have to take place gradually in Russia, Bliummer wrote. He proposed voting qualifications based on age and a payment of minimal fees not so much as means of exclusion but rather because he assumed many people initially would either not understand or not be interested in the new governing forms. For those willing to participate from the start, an obligation was to be assumed—to ensure that political participation would be available to the entire population. Political development on a national scale in an autocracy, where it had never existed, would be the greatest challenge of the new regime.³²

Bliummer opened the pages of his journal to all political tendencies in this direction. For example, he published, with an enthusiastic introduction, the first Velikoruss proclamation. He underscored the commitment to balanced reform which he saw in the proclamation—particularly the proposal of balancing the freeing of peasants, with land, with adequate compensation for deprived landowners. No social group should be alienated in the new constitutional order, according to Bliummer. He also printed the Tver gubernia gentry reform proposals as well as a proposal submitted to the St. Petersburg gubernia gentry committee which suggested the need for an elected Assembly of the Land.³³

Revolution, for Bliummer, was another way out of the dilemma of misrule in Russia, but one that was to be avoided. Rarely in history has revolution produced a strong organization of civic and moral order, he noted. Revolution is a “tragic historical phenomenon, although sometimes an entirely legal one.” Nevertheless, because of the possibility of violence and of minorities seizing control amid the chaos of rapid upheaval, Bliummer warned against this alternative. He was even more opposed to the so-called revolution from above, in which a new order is imposed upon society by the rulers. This he considered “an entirely illegal phenomenon,” having nothing to do with popular sovereignty and dominated instead by court cliques and intrigue. Thus, while Alexander II could not himself create a constitutional order, he must, if violent upheaval was to be avoided, establish conditions for democratic elements in the society to do so. Only the people can act lawfully in
their own interests; the sovereign must cooperate with this expression of popular will.\textsuperscript{34}

In one of his last articles in \textit{Svobodnoe slovo}, Blummer analyzed the political situation in Russia in terms of political parties. Although he was perfectly aware that there were no "parties" as such under the autocratic regime, he deliberately used the term in order to delineate political tendencies and the constituents who comprised the existing Russian analogues of European political parties. He indicated four political parties: the state-bureaucratic, the aristocratic, the constitutional, and the republican-socialist or radical. Having designated the fatal schism in Russian history as state versus people (\textit{gosudarstvo protiv narod}), traceable to Peter the Great’s restructuring of Russian society, Blummer distinguished these four parties in terms of their connection to the general population. The first two, he concluded, could never be "parties for the people," that is, based on popular interests. The bureaucratic supporters of autocracy owed their existence to the current regime and had no reason to ally with the people. As for the gentry, Blummer acknowledged Kavelin’s position that the landed upper class would gradually lose its significance now that peasant emancipation was a reality. Although he predicted that eventually the gentry would be compelled to join a democratic polity in order to survive, Blummer saw the upper class in the immediate future as unyielding in its effort to retain the last vestiges of its authority and privileges. The radical party, on the other hand, was "a party for the people, but not of the people." Blummer described the radicals as a group wishing to grant economic equality and political liberty to the people, but noted that their understanding of the people’s needs was their own. Their ideas of change were in fact very different from the values and attitudes of the Russian peasantry on important questions such as the land, authority, the family, and religion.

Blummer’s choice was the constitutional party, represented abroad by Dolgorukov’s writings. His central argument was that only the constitutionalists refused to impose models of political change upon the Russian people; only they were willing to permit the free expression of needs from the whole population, exploiter and exploited alike, and to ultimately incorporate these needs into the new order. Constitutionalists, according to Blummer, would seek to establish an elected body to solve the complex problems of Russian society in a political framework acceptable to all concerned. The major unresolved conflict, however, was how to bring
such an institution into existence peacefully amid a polity that for­
bade it.35

In addition to its theoretical articles, Svobodnoe slovo also con­
tained reports on arrests in Russia, lists of Third Section agents
operating in Western Europe to monitor the activities of the émi­
grés, and reviews of leading books and articles appearing in the
Russian press. Blümmmer had no illusions about the role his journal
could play in the unfolding political conflict between the emigration
and the autocracy. The journal could never “assume the role of the
lightning rod of the revolution or even the mentor of society.” It
certainly did not aspire “to resolve the passionate needs of humanity
and turn men into angels.” Blümmmer sought the far more modest
task of providing a forum “for the expression of social opinion in
Russia,” which was denied within the country and discouraged by
the editors of the leading émigré organ, Kolokol.36 However, even
this proved impossible. Abruptly and without explanation, Svobod­
noe slovo ceased publication after the eighth issue, at the end of
1862. Another political voice fell silent in the emigration.

Of Blümmmer’s fate, we know very little. The son of a retired
captain from Voronezh, he originally went abroad on a legal pass­
port in November 1861. After spending 1862 devoted exclusively to
Svobodnoe slovo, he started another journal the following year,
Evropeets. He was in contact with Dolgorukov, who wrote to a friend
on one occasion that Blümmmer’s intelligence might make “a re­
markable writer” of him.37 The Third Section regarded him with
great mistrust, and those émigrés who met with him were consid­
ered political suspects by the Russian government.38

On 14 July 1865 Blümmmer was ordered to return to Russia,
and government reports indicate his intention to do so. The last item
on Blümmmer in the police files mentions that because of “the
harmful content of his two journals,” he was sentenced by the State
Council to “deprivation of all rights and property,” and was to be
“exiled for hard labor in prisons for twenty years.” Lastly, the report
states that in consideration of his age (twenty-three) and other fac­
tors, an appeal of the sentence was being studied.39

There were other journalistic ventures by Russian émigrés dur­
ing the 1860s, reflecting the changes in the political orientation of
the emigration. In 1862, Bakst and several of his comrades in the
Heidelberg colony published a volume called Letuchie listki. Al­
though they had hoped to establish a continuing series of listki, only
the first issue ever appeared, which was devoted largely to the three Velikoruss manifestoes.\textsuperscript{40}

In the summer of 1866, Mikhail Elpidin published the first issue of \emph{Podpol'noe slovo} in Geneva. Elpidin had fled from Russia after several arrests for his involvement in the 1861 student disorders, the Ishutin group, and the Kazan Cathedral demonstration.\textsuperscript{41} In his introduction to this issue, Elpidin indicated he intended to publish a series of brochures and small studies under the new journal's imprint dealing with the emergence of mass unrest in Russia. He also issued a public appeal "to all who sympathize with the development of the masses" to send him contributions as well as money to carry out this project.

The entire first issue of \emph{Podpol'noe slovo} was devoted to the significance of the Karakozov assassination attempt on the life of Alexander II. In what was clearly the most radical political orientation thus far in the Russian émigré press, Elpidin interpreted the Karakozov affair as the opening of a whole new epoch of upheaval directed against the autocracy. He related the Karakozov \textit{attentat} to the traditional peasant rebellions led by Razin and Pugachev, choosing to see this as a modern, urban version of the former rural rebellions.\textsuperscript{42}

In the second issue of his journal, Elpidin treated the Kazan demonstration, documenting the mass of arrests across the country and the closing of journals critical of the government. He continued to interpret these events as the start of a general civil war between society and state. However, the money and materials he had requested were not forthcoming, and the journal ceased publication after this issue.\textsuperscript{43}

After a decade of unparalleled success in pioneering the terrain of Russian émigré journalism, Herzen’s \emph{Kolokol} began to falter. Already in 1866, subscriptions began to drop and contributions from Russia declined. Early in 1867, Herzen reported in a letter that he was being told by Russians that "no one in St. Petersburg is reading \emph{Kolokol} any longer" and that booksellers who formerly stocked the journal and who always had it on hand, now no longer order it. When asked for current issues, "they shrug their shoulders and say: no one wants it."\textsuperscript{44}

For some years, Herzen had managed to steer an independent course as the tsarist government committed itself to a broad-ranging series of reforms. For that historical moment, on the eve of the 1861
Emancipation, Herzen was able to appeal to the tsar and his entourage in open letters, to engage in a lively debate with liberals such as Kavelin and Chicherin, and to attract the sympathies of a new generation of youth whom he referred to as “Chernyshevskii’s children.” During that time, he published some of his most memorable articles in Kolokol. However, in these very articles, the turning tide against Herzen also is quite visible. In the article “Very Dangerous!” in 1859, he attacked the editors of Sovremennik for their tendency to pronounce judgments on past and present literature on the basis of its political value to the overall process of social and political transformation in Russia. Further, he defended the idea of a broad coalition in society to work toward basic reforms, a policy which Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov were criticizing. This was followed by an article in the fall of 1860 in which Herzen analyzed the conflict of values between the “superfluous men” of the previous generation and the “jaundiced” youth of the current decade. Once again, he tried to defend the older generation for its historical significance while recognizing that it was being superseded by representatives of a new generation who had no understanding of culture, idealism, and the complexity of the transitions necessary for permanent, progressive, and just change. Limited by the difficult political circumstances of their functioning within the confines of autocracy, Herzen felt that the young generation was rushing headlong toward simplistic solutions with impatience and intolerance.

Then, after the Emancipation was a reality, Herzen issued his eloquent call to that very generation to “listen to the moan growing, the murmur rising, from every side of our enormous country, the first roar of the ocean’s waves . . . to the people! to the people!” He called them “warriors of the masses,” but he had no program to present to them. During the next few years, he found himself attacked by all sides, whether from Katkov’s pro-government press, the liberals, or the nihilists, those “children of Chernyshevskii” now being aggressively silenced by the tsar’s “White Terror.” No one was more aware of the problem of Herzen’s political eclipse than Herzen himself: “Like knight-errants in the stories who have lost their way, we were hesitating at a crossroads. Go to the right, and you will lose your horse, but you will be safe yourself; go to the left, and your horse will be safe but you will perish; go forward and everyone will abandon you; go back—that was impossible.”

Finally, after agonizing over the continuing declining fortunes of his journal, Herzen made a decision that was very difficult for
him. In issue number 244-45 of *Kolokol* (1 July 1867), in an essay celebrating the tenth anniversary of the journal, Herzen announced to his readers that *Kolokol* would soon cease publication. He phrased it in terms of an "interruption in publication" a "pause to see "how great or weak, living or dying, the interest in *Kolokol* really is." By November 1867 Herzen reluctantly admitted that "no one [was] shedding tears" over the demise of his journal.49 Many reasons have been cited by historians for the failure of *Kolokol* at this historical moment. According to one recent study, Herzen lost two of his most important and sustaining audiences beginning in 1863. First, because of his support for the Polish rebellion and for an independent Poland, Herzen angered the liberal reformers and bureaucratic officials who had previously been interested in *Kolokol*, particularly during the Emancipation discussions. Second, as we have seen, because he did not take a stronger revolutionary position in his journal, the more radical young generation became increasingly disillusioned with Herzen’s analysis of the rapidly changing events in Russia.50

At the moment when *Kolokol* was ending its existence, two émigré journals appeared which competed briefly with each other to take its place. In 1868 Lev Mechnikov and N. Ia. Nikoladze joined together to produce *Sovremennost*. Its purpose, according to the editors, was "to be both a review and a reflection of contemporary life, and to present to readers a portrait not merely of its aspirations and ideals, but the actual situation of things and the course of social action in Russia and Europe."51 This modest and somewhat vague statement, however, does not adequately indicate the real thrust of the journal’s content. In its pages, a wide range of theoretical and practical problems confronting the opposition movement were explored. These included the role of the revolutionary in contemporary society, "the heightening of social contradictions in Russia" as a result of the reform program of the 1860s, the place of the zemstvos in postreform Russia, the historical significance of revolutions and their impact on societies, the role of personality in the historical process, and the importance of "economic necessity" in the process of social transformation.52

One of the topics the journal treated frequently and extensively was that of the tasks facing Russian revolutionaries. The editors believed that all revolutionaries had to study and understand the needs of the popular masses before any appropriate strategy for change could be implemented successfully. This was particularly
important because it was the only way they could prepare for the historical moment when the “mechanisms of state control” would weaken and become vulnerable for “the seizure of power” by the revolutionary forces. Never before in an émigré periodical had such an open commitment been expressed in favor of the seizure of state power by the masses and the “authentic revolutionaries,” as the editors of Sovremennost’ referred to them.53

This distinction between what amounted to true and false revolutionaries lay at the heart of the article on the Russian emigration that had provoked Alexander Serno-Solov’evich to write his scathing attack on the Sovremennost’ editors.54 Actually, the article in question was not really a criticism of the Russian emigration but was a broader critique of ill-prepared, self-styled revolutionaries who were more likely to endanger the future revolution than to further it. The editors of Sovremennost’ analyzed the motives and activities of the young generation of revolutionaries abroad and lamented the absence of a serious, constructive program of action and goals, without which, they argued, no revolution could triumph. They also pointed to the lack of a general theory of social change in a broad historical context, within which the tactics of radical action should be planned out, and to the young émigrés’ seeming disregard of the significance of massive popular involvement in the revolutionary movement. Their article was not antirevolutionary or anti-émigré, as Serno interpreted it. Rather, it attempted to confront the country’s essential problems, which had to be resolved if a successful revolution was to be ensured.55

The editors of Sovremennost’ were as critical of the anarchist orientations of Proudhon and Bakunin as they were of liberal and reformist solutions. They spoke about the “processes of objective social development,” which these political figures ignored. Although they were not entirely clear about what these processes were, it is evident that Mechnikov and Nikoladze certainly had in mind an awareness of the interaction between economic relationships and political power. They also wrote about the determining influence of certain theories at any given time in history, and noted that these, too, were affected by this interrelationship.56 Until Russian revolutionaries turned their attention to these questions, their efforts to bring about political change were doomed to fail, the editors stated. In one of their most striking formulations, the editors wrote that at the foundation of the revolutionary movement lay not a struggle over principles but the simple fact of “the battle of people for their very existence.”57
With the appearance of *Narodnoe delo*, *Sovremennost*' directed its criticisms against this competing journal. In addition to attacking *Narodnoe delo*'s initial anarchist orientation, with which the *Sovremennost*' editors strongly disagreed, *Sovremennost* argued that *Narodnoe delo* had only the most superficial understanding of the larger philosophical and economic forces at work in their time. It charged that discussions about mass uprisings and social revolutions were isolated and distorted in the absence of consideration of these broader forces. Tactics that were blind to the main currents of economic and social development in Western Europe and Russia could not succeed, the editors concluded.\(^{58}\)

In spite of their intentions to move the thinking and planning of émigré revolutionaries a step beyond the political paradigm in which these facets had become encased, the editors of *Sovremennost* soon discovered that widespread support for their views did not exist. After seven issues—the last appearing in October 1867—*Sovremennost* came to an end.

The other competing journal, *Narodnoe delo*, survived, however, and continued the process of radicalizing the émigré press. With the appearance of *Narodnoe delo* in Geneva, we enter a new era, that of a strident, revolutionary vocabulary, the logic of polemics, and appeals to ideological justification. Instead of individual editors or a collaboration of editors (whose names had frequently been announced on the mastheads of many of the previous journals), we now witness the formation of the editorial collective, which while remaining publicly anonymous, claimed to speak in the name of a mass constituency in Russia. The journal was actually primarily run by Nikolai Zhukovskii and Nikolai Utin, with the support of Bakunin in its initial phase, though it would soon take a dramatic turn away from its original platform.

In the journal’s first issue, in September 1868, the editors published a statement indicating their political orientation. Their first point was that the journal was to be a Russian one, concerned with Russian problems. They would not be indifferent to the political and social questions of Western Europe, but treatment of those problems would essentially be part of an attempt to familiarize Russians with European social movements and their methods of struggle. Although the people of Europe and Russia were seeking a similar liberation “from the yoke of capital, private property, and the state,” important distinctions in the historical and contemporary peculiarities of these two areas of the modern world justified treating Russia separately.
A second point that was emphasized was the distinction between science and revolution. *Narodnoe delo* was to be a journal of active and committed revolutionaries, not of scholars or theorists interested in speculative thought. Indeed, the editors promised to engage in struggle against all who supported the contemporary political order. They categorized scientists, bureaucratic officials, artists, writers, and men of industry and commerce as “doctrinaires,” individuals with an unyielding loyalty to the existing order despite their attempts at affecting certain aspects of limited change. Similarly, the editors included among the philosophic enemies of the coming revolution the followers of positivism and utilitarianism, who also were interested in change but solely from within the framework of things as they were. As justifiers of the present, which they had a deep interest in preserving, they were scornfully dubbed “the aristocratic intelligentsia” by the editors.  

Third, the editors identified the state as the supreme institutional enemy, and its “jurists, economists, and political publicists” as ideological representatives of this “bourgeois-statist civilization,” which stands in the path of the masses as they strive to overthrow oppression and inaugurate the revolution.

What kind of a revolution was this to be? The editors provided the answer (despite their denunciation of solutions imposed “from on high”): “the full intellectual, socioeconomic, and political liberation of the people.” This meant, above all, that “all land must belong to those who work it with their tools in communes,” and that “all capital of the tools of labor must reside in the hands of workers’ associations.” Linked to this economic reorganization was the necessary restructuring of political power. All political institutions must exist in the form of free federations of voluntary workers, both industrial and agricultural. Finally, for full liberation to occur in the revolution, the state itself must be destroyed, along with all its attending institutions, from the government’s ministries to its churches, universities, and banks.

After publishing four issues of the journal during 1868–69, and discussing these principles in a variety of articles on strategy and tactics, the editors of *Narodnoe delo* began their second year by shifting completely from Bakuninism to Marxism. This change in political orientation resulted from the dispute over control of the journal, a dispute eventually won by Utin at the moment in which he himself became a disciple of Marx and a founder of the Marxist-oriented Russian section of the First International. Thus, the pro-
gram set forth in the first issue of the second volume of Narodnoe delo differed so strongly from its predecessor in the first volume as to represent a different journal in everything except name.

Utin and his collaborator Anton Trusov tried to explain the change in world view in their editorial introduction to this issue. They admitted that they were still committed to the general goal of a social revolution as it was formulated in the journal's first issue in 1868. However, they were now convinced that Russia's destiny was inextricably tied to the fate of the nations of Western Europe and could not be analyzed as a separate phenomenon. Furthermore, they continued, the success of the revolution depended on "the overall unity of action of the entire proletariat of Europe and America as well as of the Russian proletariat."63

The social revolution, according to the editors, had as its fundamental task "the transformation of all conditions of production and exchange" from their current forms. Rather than look to rural communes and land redistribution (as the Bakuninist program had urged earlier), the revolutionary process would instead center on the activities of the proletariat. Thus, revolutionaries must concentrate their tactics on "conscious elements" among the working masses to organize and direct the struggle against capital. This issue of Narodnoe delo also no longer referred to the state as the supreme enemy; the enemy now was the machinery of capitalism. With its destruction, the edifice of political authority would crumble automatically, the editors argued.64

The remainder of this issue was devoted to Marx and the International. The editors included a report of the 22 March 1870 meeting of the General Council of the International, the program of the Russian section of the International, and a letter from Marx to the members of the Russian section welcoming them to the fold and thanking them for their support.65

Narodnoe delo was published only briefly in its revamped format. Most of the articles concentrated on problems such as strikes, workers associations, and international political currents, all of which were interpreted in a Marxist framework. Each issue also included some message, report, or communiqué from the General Council of the International. In the fall of 1870, the journal ceased publication. Although there was no public explanation for this action, it was evident that there was little support for the journal's position. However, because it presaged the kind of émigré journalism that was to dominate the 1870s and the decades beyond,
Narodnoe delo may be regarded as a journal ahead of its time.

In general, the émigré periodical press of the next decade bore a far stronger resemblance to the style, format, and, in some instances, even the content of Narodnoe delo and Sovremennost' than it did to any of the earlier journalistic experiments we have investigated in this chapter. Furthermore, the situation that existed in the 1860s would reverse itself entirely in the coming decades. The effort of individuals to establish their own journalistic platforms in the hope of touching the critical mood of a larger sector of the Russian readership at home or abroad—the work of Golovin, Dolgorukov, and Blummer, for instance—was to be the minority current. The era of émigré individualism, so dear to Herzen as well, effectively came to an end in 1870, as new forces began to transform the émigré communities and the battle for an alternative to the Russian autocracy.