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5. [O. V. Aptekman], “Iz istorii osvoboditel’nogo dvizhenia v Rossi. Pavel Borisovich Aksel’rod. Ego zhizn’, literaturnaia i prakticheskaia deiatel’nost’” (typed MS), Russian Archive, Columbia University, p. 154. Aptekman’s point was that because of the restrictions placed on political activity in Russia by the tsarist regime, Europe became “by necessity” the only milieu where such political education could take place. The same argument has been advanced more recently by Alexander Solzhenitsyn to prove the opposite conclusion. Whereas Aptekman was trying to show the importance and relevance for Russia of these developments abroad, Solzhenitsyn now argues that the Russian revolution was prepared abroad by Lenin and his supporters according to a European ideology and in complete disregard for Russia’s own history. See, inter alia, Solzhenitsyn’s interview with C. L. Sulzberger, New York Times, 7 March 1976.
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2. *N. I. Turğenev: The First Political Emigré*


6. N. I. Turgenev, Opyt teorii nalogov (St. Petersburg, 1818).
9. Many of Turgenev’s letters, particularly those written prior to his emigration, have been published in Arkhiv brat’ev Turgenevykh, ed. E. I. Tarasov, vols. 1–2 (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademiia nauk, 1911–13) and vol. 3 (Petrograd: Gosudarstvennaya tipografia, 1921). V. M. Tarasova, in her articles on Turgenev’s émigré years, was the first to make extensive use of the huge unpublished Turgenev correspondence for the years after 1824.
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14. See especially Tarasova’s articles and Oksmans article (“Pis’ma”) on the relationship between Herzen and Turgenev. Tarasova, who pays more attention to Turgenev’s articles than to his book La Russie, points to Turgenev’s criticism of the English political system and concentrates on his militant concern for the liberation of the Russian peasantry not as an isolated period of his activity but rather as the defining feature of his career.


16. Ibid., p. 61. Bakunin is, of course, referring here to the 1848 revolution.


18. Herzen, Sobranie sochinenii, 14:328–29; the article originally appeared in Kolokol, 15 October 1860.
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21. For the published letters, see Arkhiv brat’ev Turgeneyvykh; the archival location of the unpublished letters can be found in Tarasova’s articles.


23. The book quickly sold out and a second printing was ordered in May 1819. In 1826, as a consequence of the government’s decision to prosecute Turgenev for his Decembrist involvement, all remaining copies of his book were confiscated and publication of further editions was forbidden. As a result, the book has become a bibliographic rarity. Since the revolution, it has been republished only once, in 1937, and has never been translated.
25. Ibid.
28. See Kuklin, p. 351.
29. One of his children, Petr Nikolaevich, became a well-known sculptor who, upon his death in 1913, bequeathed the enormous archive of his father to the Russian Academy of Sciences.
30. See Tarasova, "K voprosu," pp. 284–87. Tarasova sees these visits to Russia as crucial in revising earlier views on Turgenev as moderate politically and isolated from Russian reality. Her argument is that Turgenev turned toward a "moderate liberal position" only after 1864, i.e., after he ceased his active contacts with Russia (ibid., p. 294).
31. Miliukov, p. 78.
33. Ibid., p. 51.
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36. Ibid., pp. 57–58.
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39. Ibid., p. 70. Nikolai Turgenev was concerned about his brother Alexander, who had left London for Paris at this time, where he remained for several months before returning to Russia in September.
40. Ibid., pp. 70, 71.
41. Orlik, 1968, p. 86. A number of other Russians in Paris participated in the July Revolution, including S. D. Poltaratskii, M. M. Kiriakov, and M. A. Kologrivov, all of whom are discussed by Orlik.
42. Ibid., p. 88.
44. Oksman, p. 583.
46. "Viola en realite Jes seules victims qui sernot offertes en holocauste a la reforme!" (ibid., p. 242).
47. Ibid., p. 245.
48. Ibid., p. 248.
49. Ibid., p. 24.
50. Semevskii, p. 111.
51. The letter, written in 1843, is quoted by Semevskii (ibid.).
52. The article, "Pora!", appeared in *Russkii zagranichnyi sbornik*, 1858, pt. 2, bk. 1; quoted in Kuklin, p. 353.


54. For these criticisms and for material on Turgenev's own emancipation experiments on his family estates, which he arranged during his trips to Russia in the late 1850s, see N. I. Turgenev, "Economic Results of the Emancipation of Serfs in Russia," *Journal of Social Science*, no. 1 (1869): 147-49; and Tarasova, "N. I. Turgenev v 1861," pp. 432-34.

55. The exact number remains a matter of some dispute. See Hollingsworth, "N. I. Turgenev"; and Tarasova, "Dekabrist N. I. Turgenev."


57. Letter dated 20 March 1861; see Oksman, p. 587.

58. Oksman, p. 586. This letter was also published in Fetisov's article in *Pamiati dekabristov*, 3:99-100.

59. See Fetisov's article in *Pamiati dekabristov*, 3:95. The letter is dated 1856, at the time of Alexander II's coronation.


3. I. G. Golovin: Emigré Individualism


7. TsGAOR, Otchet o deistviakh III Otdeleniia sobstvennoi ego imperatorskogo Velichestva kantseliarii i korpusa zhandarmov. These reports, compiled annually by the Third Section, include data on Russians going abroad. Virtually all are listed under "reasons of health."
12. See TsGAOR, fond 109, opis’ 1, ed. khran. 50, chast’ 1/1843, listy 1–4; and Lemke, pt. 1, p. 27. All the materials from the police files used but not identified in citations by Lemke are in the TsGAOR dossier. Tolstoy managed to see parts of Golovin’s manuscript before publication through literary acquaintances who had been asked to read it for evaluative purposes.
15. Golovin, *Russia under the Autocrat*, p. 27.
18. Ibid., p. v.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., pp. 42–43.
21. Ibid., p. 75.
22. Ibid., p. 136.
23. Ibid., p. 138.
25. Ibid., p. 87.
27. Ibid., 2:320. Golovin’s vivid and realistic descriptions of the Russian military campaigns against the Circassians in the Caucasus resemble a sketch of modern guerilla warfare.
29. Ibid., p. 99.
30. Some of the positive notices Golovin received in the French press are mentioned in his *Zapiski*, pp. 90–91.
31. Lemke, pt. 1, p. 33. Golovin inherited the equivalent of 40,000
francs at the time of the publication of his book on Nicholas I; the money came from his brothers in Russia as a result of a settlement on the family estate.


33. Golovin, Zapiski, chaps. 15–16, pp. 106–29. Lemke interprets this material to show Golovin as frivolous; see Lemke, pt. 1, pp. 33–35.

34. See Orlik, 1973, p. 263.


36. Bakalov, p. 195. Bakalov seems to have been unaware that Golovin’s “Catechism” had been previously published as he erroneously indicates he is publishing it for the first time. For the earlier publication, see Kuklin, pp. 369–80.


38. Ibid., pp. 216–17.

39. Ibid., p. 217.

40. For the police and diplomatic documents, see ibid., pp. 197–203. Golovin admitted his authorship of the “Catechism” thirty years later in his Russische Nihilismus (Leipzig, 1880), p. 73. See also the discussion in Sliwowska, “Un émigré russe,” p. 235, n. 1.


43. TsGAOR, III otdelenie, I ekspeditsia, no. 15 (1851), list 30.


47. Sliwowska writes of this brochure the following: “The tone of this brochure is without doubt in harmony with that of Herzen’s book, From the Other Shore. It is easy to see the common features, not only in their critique of bourgeois France of that time, but also in their method of arguing their cases. Of course, Herzen’s literary talent is in no way to be compared with that of Golovin, who lacks both fervor and authentic emotion” (Sliwowska, “Un émigré russe,” p. 236).

48. Ibid., p. 237.


52. Ibid., pt. 1, p. 40.

53. Ibid., p. 41.

54. Ibid., pp. 43–44.

55. Ibid., p. 45.


58. Ibid., pt. 1, pp. 48, 49.


60. Ibid., p. 278.


63. See, for example, Golovin’s letter to *L’Opinion nationale*, 26 July 1866, where he strongly criticizes the tsar’s policies of driving Russians into exile merely because they express dissenting opinions. He hoped for a response, but none was forthcoming.


67. Sliwowska, “Un émigré russe,” p. 239.

4. N. I. Sazonov: Marx’s First Russian Follower


4. D. I. Riazanov (pseud. for D. I. Gol’dendakh), *Karl Marks i russkie liudi sorokovykh godov* (Petrograd: Izdanie Petrogradskogo Soveta, 1918). Riazanov discovered the correspondence between Sazonov and Marx and published the letters in his book. The letters have recently been republished in *K. Marks, F. Engel’s i revoliutsionnaia Rossiia* (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1967), pp. 146–55. The only other scholarly article on Sazonov prior to Riazanov’s book is B. Modzalevskii’s entry “N. I. Sazonov” in
Sazonov appears in the recent works by Cadot and Sliwowska in a more positive light, but he remains entirely unstudied in the United States.


12. See Zastenker, pp. 530–32.


15. V. P. Botkin to P. V. Annenkov, 26 November 1846, in *P. V. Annenkov i ego druž’ia* (St. Petersburg, 1892), p. 525.


18. Ibid., p. 81.


20. Ibid., pp. 349–50.

21. Ibid., p. 351.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 352.

24. Ibid. The quote is from *Henry VI*, pt. 2, act 4, sc. 2.


26. Riazanov (pp. 21–28) discusses Sazonov’s radical journalism and activities during the 1848 revolution. See also Zastenker, p. 538.

27. Riazanov (pp. 28–29) suggests this, and also two possible later meetings between Marx and Sazonov in 1848 and 1849.
29. Ibid., p. 148.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., p. 149.
32. Ibid., p. 150.
33. Ibid., p. 151.
34. Ibid., p. 152. Sazonov also included details on printing expenses, honoraria for contributors, and the potential readership for the journal.
35. Ibid., p. 153.
36. Ibid., p. 154.
37. Ibid., p. 155. This last letter from Sazonov to Marx was included in Marx's pamphlet *Herr Vogt* (London, 1860), in which Marx rebutted Carl Vogt's criticism of his work. Vogt's attack on Marx was the "polemic" referred to by Sazonov in his letter.
38. Koz'min, p. 183. Zastenker (p. 527) takes a similar position. Interestingly, neither of these historians even mentions Riazanov's book, where the claim of Sazonov's Marxism was first made. They cite instead P. N. Sakulin, *Russkaia literatura i sotsializm* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1922), p. 253, in which Riazanov's thesis is repeated.
40. See Zastenker, pp. 532–39, for the letters of Sazonov to Herzen written in 1849.
41. Herzen to M. K. Reikhel', 20 June 1852, in "Pis'ma k M. K. Reikhel', 1850–52 gg.," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 61 (1953): 339. See also Herzen's letter to M. Hess, 29 May 1843, in which he explains his break with Sazonov in severe terms. He speaks of how Sazonov "wounded" him and of Sazonov's tendency to "spend a lot and work little" (Riazanov, pp. 43–44). On the affair between Herzen's wife and Herwegh, see Carr, pp. 47–121.
42. Sazonov to Herzen, 24 March 1852, quoted in Zastenker, pp. 540–41.
43. Sazonov to Herzen, 6 September 1852, ibid., p. 541.
45. Riazanov, pp. 45–46.
46. Ibid., pp. 46–47.
47. Ibid., p. 49.
48. Ibid., pp 49–50.
49. Ibid., p. 50.
50. See Sazonov's letter to Herzen, 20 August 1855, quoted in Zastenker, pp. 542–43.

52. Koz'min, p. 238.

53. Ibid., p. 225.

54. Ibid., p. 244.

55. Articles signed by Sazonov appeared in the following issues of *L'Athenaeum français* during 1855: no. 8 (24 February), pp. 145–46; no. 26 (30 June), pp. 544–46; no. 31 (4 August), pp. 648–51; no. 32 (11 August), pp. 685–87. There are, in addition, many other essays and reviews by Sazonov, but since they are signed with pseudonyms, it is more difficult to establish authorship for them. According to a recent study, Sazonov also knew Baudelaire at this time, who mentions him approvingly in his correspondence; see Cadot, p. 34.

56. Modzalevskii, p. 58.

57. Zastenker, p. 527.


60. Ibid., no. 4 (28 January 1860).

61. Ibid., no. 16 (21 April 1860).

62. See Riaznov, p. 52.

63. See Sazonov's articles on Russia, "De l'émancipation des serfs en Russie," in *Gazette du Nord*, no. 13 (31 December 1859), no. 1 (7 January 1860), no. 3 (21 January 1860), no. 4 (28 January 1860), no. 7 (18 February 1860), and no. 9 (3 March 1860).

64. Ibid., no. 9.


67. Published as *La Revolution et le monde russe* in 1860 in Paris.


69. Ibid., pp. 197, 200.

70. See Zastenker, pp. 544–45, n. 6. Sazonov responded angrily to this scandal in his article "A propos d'une soirée russe à Paris."


72. Sazonov's review of Dolgorukov's *La Vérité sur la Russie* was published in *Gazette du Nord*, no. 16 (21 April 1860).
73. Letter dated 16 September 1855 from Hamburg, TsGALI, fond 1283, opis' 1, ed. khran. 1, list 1.
74. For the remainder of this correspondence, see ibid., listy 3–47.
75. TsGAOR, III otdel., III eksped., ed. khran. 425/1849, list 1.
76. Ibid., list 14.
78. Ibid., listy 50–51.
79. Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Chief of III Section, 27 September 1858, ibid., list 57.
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81. Ministry of Foreign Affairs to III Section, 8 March 1861, ibid., list 60.
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83. Riazanov, p. 55.
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85. Herzen, My Past and Thoughts, 2:968.

5. P. V. Dolgorukov: The Republican Prince

3. The Dolgorukov family occupies over eighty pages in the Russkii biografi.cheskii slovar’ (St. Petersburg, 1905), 6:494–577. For the article on P. V. Dolgorukov, see pp. 554–55. The article on his father was written by Grand Prince Nikolai Mikhailovich.
4. Carr speculates that Dolgorukov was probably involved in homosexual relations at the time and that this may have been the cause of his demotion. See The Romantic Exiles, p. 276.
5. Hollingsworth, p. 449; Carr, p. 276; Bakhrushin, pp. 8–9.
6. In 1863 a pamphlet was published which claimed to have irrefutable evidence indicating Dolgorukov as the author of the lampoon. See A. Ammosov, *Poslednye dni i konchina A. S. Pushkina* (St. Petersburg, 1863). A Soviet scholar who subjected the original document to handwriting analysis concluded that Dolgorukov did indeed write the damaging lampoon. See P. E. Shchegolev, *Duel i smert’ Pushkina* (Moscow: Zhurnal’nogo-gazetnoe ob’edinenie, 1936). See also M. I. Barsukov, “P. V. Dolgorukov o tsarskoi Rossii i o duele A. S. Pushkina s Dantesom,” *Zven’ia* 1 (1932): 77–85.


8. Paris: Didot Frères, 1843. The title page indicates that proceeds from the sale of the book are “au profit des pauvres.”

9. Iakov Tolstoi to Count Benckendorff, 22 January (3 February) 1843, TsGAOR, fond 109, opis’ 1, delo 50, chast’ 1/1843, listy 1–4.

10. Ibid., list 22 (Lemke, pt. 1, pp. 146–48).


12. Ibid., listy 46–51, 69–70, 94–95.

13. Ibid., listy 146–47. The letter is dated 4 April 1844.


15. Ibid., listy 295–295 verso. The letter, dated 2 February 1857, is to Prince Vasilii Andreevich Dolgorukov, a cousin, who had succeeded Benckendorff as chief of the Third Section.


18. Field, p. 262. On the prohibited Russian-language publications that were appearing in Europe at this time, see the excellent bibliography, S. N. Valk and B. P. Koz’min, *Russkaia podpol’naia i zarubezhnaia pechat’* (Moscow: Politkatorzhan, 1935).


23. Field, p. 264.


29. Ibid., listy 7–8. The letter is dated 3 (15) April 1860. Amplifying
this point elsewhere, Dolgorukov wrote: "Publicity is the médecine for Russia. . . . Publicity is the most efficacious remedy to extirpate the old abuses and to prevent the formation of new ones" (La Vérité sur la Russie [Paris, 1860], p. 2). Golovin, as we have seen, argued a similar position.
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39. Dolgorukov to J. G. V. de Persigny, 31 July 1862, TsGALI, fond 1245, opis’ 1, ed. khran. 7, list 1.
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42. On Gagarin, see Sliwowska, pp. 301–37.
43. Dolgorukov to I. Gagarin, 10 September 1860, TsGALI, fond 1245, opis’ 1, ed. khran. 3, listy 29–30. In this letter, Dolgorukov also repeated his intention to publish in the coming year biographies of individuals in Russia “occupying important positions or having influence on affairs.” He intended to keep his “political biographies” above the level of matters dealing merely with “private life.” Ibid., list 30.
44. Dolgorukov to Gagarin, 4 June 1862, ibid., list 38.
45. Ibid., listy 41–43.
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47. Dolgorukov to Gagarin, 18 (6) January 1863, ibid., list 46.
49. Bakhrushin, p. 33. See also the critical evaluation of Dolgorukov at this time in G. N. Vyrubov, "Revoliutsionnyia vospominaniia (Gertsen, Bakunin, Lavrov)," Vestnik Evropy, 1913, no. 1:57–58.
52. Bakhrushin, p. 36; Carr, p. 288.
54. Dolgorukov, La Vérité, p. 7.
57. Bakhrushin, pp. 53–54.
58. Dolgorukov, La Vérité, p. 32.
62. Dolgorukov, Des reformes, pp. 50–51.
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65. Rosental', p. 57.
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68. La Vérité, p. 5.
70. Dolgorukov, Des reformes, p. 70.
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75. P. V. Dolgorukov to V. A. Dolgorukov, chief of the Third Section, 14 February 1867, quoted in Lemke, pt. 2, p. 191.
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22. Utin to Herzen, 16 December 1864, ibid., p. 676.

23. Ibid., p. 675.
24. Ibid., p. 676.
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32. Khudiakov's formative years are discussed in Venturi, Roots of Revolution, pp. 338–42. See also Gleason, Young Russia, pp. 311–32.
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8. A. A. Serno-Solov'evich: Beyond Herzen


2. Ibid., p. 237.


5. Ibid., p. 264.


7. Serno reflected on these feverish days and nights of rebellious activity in a letter to Natalia Tuchkova-Ogareva (1865). See Koz'min, "Aleksandr Serno-Solov'evich: Materialy dlia biografii," p. 739.
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19. (Vevey, 1867).
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22. All quotations in this section are from portions of Serno's essay as reproduced in Lemke, "A. A. Serno-Solov'evich," p. 270.

23. Ibid. p. 271.

24. Koz'min, "Aleksandr Serno-Solov'evich," p. 702. Not all émigrés were in agreement with Serno's critique (Gulevich, Merchinskii, and Mechnikov, among others), but they were in a dwindling minority. See Koz'min, *Iz istorii*, pp. 548–49.
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44. See Koz'min, "A. A. Serno-Solov'evich i I Internatsionale," pp. 114–17.
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49. Ibid., pp. 701, 703–4.
50. Korchkin, p. 80.
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5. This discussion is based on the portion of Sokolov's autobiography which is included in Kuznetsov, pp. 250–59. This portion was not part of the previously published section of Sokolov's memoir, “Avtobiografiia.”


7. Some of Sokolov's best pieces in Russkoe slovo were published in his Ekonomicheskie voprosy i zhurnal'noe delo (St. Petersburg: Golovin, 1866). See also the discussion in Kuznetsov, pp. 259–70.


10. Leikina-Svirskaya, 146.
12. Ibid., p. 274.
13. Ibid.
15. Leikina-Svirskaya, p. 146. These terms were first discussed in this context by O. V. Aptekman in his memoir-history, Obshchestvo "Zemlia i Volia" 70-kh godov, 2nd ed. (Moscow-Petrograd: Gosizdat, 1924), pp. 90–91. The book was originally written in 1882.
17. St. Petersburg: Golovin, 1866.
18. The connection of this book to Les Refractaires (Paris, 1866), by Jules Valles, and the question of Sokolov's joint authorship with Zaitsev, are discussed in Leikina-Svirskaya, p. 151, and in Kuznetsov, pp. 287–89.
20. See Rudnitskaya, Nikolai Nozhin, pp. 124–26, 163–66. On Nozhin, see the discussion in chapter 7 of the present volume.
22. In addition to the materials cited below, upon which this discussion is based, there are some scattered Mechnikov materials listed in the text and notes in A. K. Lishina, “Russkii garibal'diets L. I. Mechnikov,” in Rossiia i Italiia, ed. S. D. Skazkin (Moscow: Nauka, 1968), pp. 167–73. Lenin seems not to have ever noticed Mechnikov's activities, even though Plekhanov praised him. In the absence of any biography or bibliography by either Soviet or Western scholars, Mechnikov's place in Russian revolutionary history has yet to be established.
25. For a more detailed discussion of Mechnikov's Italian campaign, see ibid., pp. 177–85.
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62. The full title of Zaitsev and Iakobi's article is "O polozhenii rabochikh v zapadnoi evrope s obschestvenno-gigienicheskoi tochki zreniia." It was published in the September 1870 volume of the Arkhiv sudebnoi meditsiny i obschestvennoi gigieny, bk. 3, pp. 160–216. See the discussion of this project, which resulted in a

63. Very little is known about Zaitsev's role in forming the Italian section of the International, though mention of it appears in the relevant studies. See, e.g., S. D. Skazkin, ed., Rossiia i Italiia (Moscow: Nauka, 1968), pp. 218–19; and McClellan, Revolutionary Exiles, p. 198.

64. M.Z., “Zaitsev,” p. 89. Kuznetsov, following the interpretation of the leading historian of anarchism, Max Nettlau, argues that Zaitsev never was an anarchist revolutionary, in spite of his closeness to Bakunin at this time. See Kuznetsov, p. 221.

65. For a discussion of some of these articles, see Kuznetsov, pp. 227–37. On the journal and its editors, see B. P. Koz'min, “Iz istorii russkoi nelegal'noi pressy. Gazeta Obshchee delo (1877–1890),” Istoricheskii sbornik 3 (1934): 163–218. There is also an anonymous article on Herzen which one scholar has attributed to Zaitsev, but this is still undocumented. See B. P. Koz'min, “Anonimnaia broshiura o Gertsene 1870 g.,” Literaturnoe nasledstvo 41–42 (1941): 164–72.


10. N. I. Utin: Emigré Internationalism


2. McClellan, Revolutionary Exiles, p. 14. The same author states that Bakunin “considered [Utin] a mere annoyance easy to eliminate when the occasion demanded” (p. 248) and, also echoing Bakunin, calls Utin “an insignificant little man” (p. 85).

3. Ibid., p. 84.


6. L. F. Panteleev (Iz vospominanii proshlogo [Moscow: Academia, 1934], p. 281) mentions that Utin was twenty-one years old in the winter of 1861–62. The year 1845 is given as Utin's date of birth by Klevenskii (“Gertsen-izdatel' i ego sotrudniki,” Literaturnoe nasledstvo 41–42 [1941–42]: 612) and also by Koz'min (Deiateli revoliutsionnogo dvizheniia v Rossi, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 240), but clearly this is erroneous; we know that Utin was enrolled at St. Petersburg
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10. See Utin's somewhat romanticized account of this plunge into the world of student tovarishchestvo in Narodnoe delo (Geneva), nos. 2–3 (1868): 29. The facts of Utin's participation in these student organizations have been corroborated in Panteleev, Vospominaniiia, p. 180.
11. Panteleev, Iz vospominanii proshlogo, p. 74. The commission, chaired by K. D. Kavelin, was abolished by the government in the spring of 1861 before it could accomplish its purpose.
12. Ibid., pp. 102–3.
21. Utin to Ogarev, 22 June 1864, ibid., p. 657. Herzen had rejected an article by Utin for publication in Kolokol in November 1863, which stung Utin's pride, but this was certainly not the major cause of his break with Herzen. In fact, Herzen had already published an article by Utin on Chernyshevskii in Kolokol, no. 189 (15 September
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him. See Klevenskii, "Gertsen-izdatel'," pp. 612–13, for Utin’s other
writings in Kolokol.
22. Utin to Ogarev, 9 July 1864, in Koz'min, "N. I. Utin–Gertsenu i
24. Ibid., p. 58.
25. Utin wrote for Vestnik Evropy during the years 1867–71 under
various pseudonyms. It will be recalled that his brother-in-law,
Stasiulevich, was the editor at this time (see note 8 above).
26. Utin to Ogarev, 14 February 1867, in Koz'min "N. I. Utin–Gertsenu
27. See Utin's letter to A. Trusov (May–June 1869), ibid., pp. 687–90.
29. This claim is made by Korochkin, p. 62, although the published
correspondence between Utin and Marx does not begin until the
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30. B. S. Itenberg, Pervyi Internatsional i revoliutsionnaia Rossia
31. For a discussion of Utin’s ideas in Narodnoe delo during these years
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32. See I . S. Knizhnik-Vetrov, Russkie deiatel'nosti Pervoogo Internat-
sionala i parizhskoi kommuny (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), pp. 229–30;
Itenberg, Pervyi Internatsional, pp. 35–68; R. P. Koniushaia, Karl
Marks i revoliutsionnaia Rossia (Moscow: Polit. lit., 1975), pp. 411–
27; McClellan, passim; Korochkin, pp. 130–51.
33. K. Marks, F. Engel's i revoliutsionnaia Rossiia, pp. 168–70. One
may legitimately wonder why a Russian émigré in Geneva was
asking permission from a German émigré in London to be the
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few of these workers had as yet even heard of.
34. The letters are dated 24 July and 9 December 1870. See ibid., pp.
35. This letter is dated 17 April 1871. See ibid., p. 188.
37. Koniushaia, p. 417.
38. Utin to Marx, 28 October 1871, in K. Marks, pp. 219–24.
39. On these activities, see Koniushaia, pp. 418–26; and the Utin-Marx
40. Quoted in McClellan, p. 240.
41. Ibid.
42. Quoted from the minutes of the London conference by Venturi,
Roots of Revolution, p. 785, n. 45.
43. P. L. Lavrov, Narodniki-propagandistsy (St. Petersburg: Anderson,
1907), p. 28. Perhaps he recalled the examples of Kel'siev before and of Tikhomirov later.

11. The Russian Emigré Press: In the Shadows of Kolokol


3. Ibid., p. 130. According to James Billington’s recent study of revolutionary movements in Western Europe, Herzen was actively involved for a short time in October 1849 with Proudhon’s La Voix du peuple, an involvement that was mediated by Sazonov, who knew both Herzen and Proudhon. “And Herzen, baptized in revolutionary journalism on Proudhon’s publications of the revolutionary era [i.e., 1848–49], transferred this tradition to Russia, founding in 1857 in London the first illegal revolutionary periodical in Russian history: Kolokol” (Billington, Fire in the Minds of Men, pp. 320–21).

4. M. Klevenskii, “Gertsen-izdatel’ i ego sotrudniki,” Literaturnoe nasledstvo 41–42 (1941): 572. It is not certain who his “friends” were, but Herzen corresponded with M. K. Reikhel about these matters during the early 1850s, as Klevenskii points out.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 574.


8. For a detailed analysis of the impact of Poliarnaia zvezda as well as a listing of the large number of anonymous contributors and their publications in Herzen’s journal, see N. Ia. Eidel’man, Tainye korrespondentii “Poliarnoi zvezdy” (Moscow: Mysli’, 1966).


12. For an alphabetical listing of most of these contributors, see Klevenskii, “Gertsen-izdatel’,” pp. 581–617. See also N. Ia. Eidel’man, “Nachalo izdaniia Kolokola, i ego pervyie korrespondentii,” in Revolutsionnaiia situatsiia v Rossii v 1859–1861 gg., ed. M. V. Nechkina (Moscow: Nauka, 1970), pp. 173–95. At the height of its popularity, Herzen’s newspaper was printed in editions of between 2,000 and 3,000 copies. However, because the issues were
passed around from hand to hand, many thousands more people must be counted among the paper’s readership. See Gleason, Young Russia, pp. 83–98, for a recent discussion of the influence of Herzen’s paper in Russia.


14. Ibid., no. 2 (1859): 68–80. Because it is signed “L,” it is possible that Golovin did not write it, but he certainly would not have published it in his journal if he had not agreed with it.

15. Ibid., no. 6 (1860) and no. 7 (1860). To my knowledge, this essay is the first serious, detailed study of the French Revolution between 1789 and 1799 by a Russian émigré.


17. Ibid., no. 10 (1861): i–viii.

18. Ibid., no. 12 (1861).

19. After twenty-five issues with this title in 1861, Dolgorukov changed the journal’s name first to Prawdivyi (Le Véridique) and then to Listok, which lasted for twenty-two issues through 1864.

20. This discussion is based on the material in Budushchnost’, no. 1 (15 September 1860): 1–3. Some of Dolgorukov’s journal articles are reprinted in Dolgorukov, Peterburgskie ocherki.
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