Bakunin's Anti-Jacobinism: 'Secret Societies' For Self-Emancipating Collectivist Social Revolution

Robert M. Cutler

The historiography of nearly the past century and a half may render surprising – if not, to some, jolting – the juxtaposition, in the title, of the noun 'anti-Jacobinism' to the possessive form of Bakunin's surname. This is the point. Bakunin's idea and practice of 'secret societies' was directed at reversing the Jacobin tradition in European socialism. To indicate and to sketch such a nucleus of the structure of his beliefs, as may be argued to have governed Bakunin's mature revolutionary practice, is the purpose of this short article. There is not enough space to review chronologically his various 'secret societies', but these have been treated in the literature.[1]

An introduction to the theme is provided by the perhaps provocative question: Was Bakunin even an 'anarchist'? The title of one of his principal programmatic tracts of the 1860s carries the term 'federalism' in its first place.[2] The complexity of his activity compelled me elsewhere to characterise him as a 'revolutionary socialist and collectivist anarcho-federalist'.[3] The question may be answered by recalling that Bakunin borrowed the term *anarchie* from his friend Proudhon, for whom the noun was his own attempt to translate the English word 'self-government'.[4] Etymologically the antonym to 'hierarchy', of which the Greek root signifies 'rule by a leader of the sacred rites' (i.e., by a priest), the ordinary-language confusion over 'anarchy' stems from the conflation of 'no-rule' with 'no rules'.

BAKUNIN AND THE SOCIALIST TRADITION OF HIS TIME: BAKUNIN, BABEUF AND BLANQUI

Bakunin's penchant for secret societies has played an inordinately large part in establishing the basis of his memory. In the historiography, this is often epito-

mised by the well-known Nechaev episode. Yet that operational preference, while also influenced by his personality, was at the same time significantly an artefact of the times. It was France during the 1840s that formed, so to speak, the milieu of his 'political socialisation'. In this last decade of the French Second Republic and in its revolutionary aftermath, Parisian political clubs were most prevalent, each organised around a meeting-place and sometimes a press organ loosely or closely associated with the group. This form of organisation, produced by the historical and social development of longer date,[5] was a characteristic political institution of the time and place.

Bakunin may be situated in this tradition by contrasting him with Babeuf and Blanqui, who in turn differed between themselves. Both the latter were revolutionaries, but Blanqui's spirit was that of a putschist whereas Babeuf's was not really, despite a superficial appearance of this, due in part to Buonarroti's legacy. Like Blanqui, Babeuf sought a *coup d'état*; however, Babeuf not only had a definite political programme, *viz.*, to re-establish the Constitution of 1793, but also sought to establish his *coup* upon a social basis and give it popular legitimacy from the bottom up.

Bakunin sought to reverse the intrinsic Jacobinism that Babeuf inherited from having had the lived experience of the political success of Robespierre, the fall of his Committee of Public Safety and the failure of the Directory to pursue his radical path. Bakunin's chief criticism of Babouvist practice was precisely the Jacobinism of the methods, which posited that only a small committed group should take power after the revolution. This was the aspect that Blanqui came to emphasise from his reading of Buonarroti's history of the Conspiracy of Equals. Blanqui focussed his own concept and practice exclusively upon the seizure of power by military means. Yet a close reading of Buonarroti reveals that Babeuf was aware of the need for practical social-organisational preparations amongst the social basis of the post-*coup* order that would assist in preparing the transfer of power and imprint its forms.[6]

Talmon's classic study set out the main philosophical and practical problem with the Jacobin-Blanquist inspiration. It established that Rousseau's superficially democratic notion of the 'general will', lying behind the theory of the social contract, contained the germ of authoritarianism and eventually totalitarianism and in practice opened the way towards the usurpation of state power by a restricted clique.[7] As Bakunin put it, 'In the past there has never been a free contract. … Man does not voluntarily create society, he is involuntarily born into it.'[8] The bourgeois State recognises only citizens as equal under the law, and not human beings as equal in society.

BAKUNIN: ANTI-BLANQUI, ANTI-BEBEL, ANTI-BERNSTEIN

Two basic tenets that gave content to the organisational forms that Bakunin sought to create, proceeding from his criticism of the Jacobin tradition ('anti-Blanqui'), were his opposition to participation in bourgeois politics and his opposition to any nationalist or ethno-racialist appeal to unity. Brevity encourages that these latter two tenets are denoted respectively as 'anti-Bebel' and 'anti-Bernstein', for the following reasons.

To begin at the beginning, *anti-Blanquism* becomes, in Bakunin's mature anarchist thought, an aspect of his atheism. That is because any theism will lead to the institutionalisation of theological doctrine through social structures characterised by privilege and oppression: i.e., it leads to rule by a priestly hierarchy, a system for which Bakunin invented 'theologism' as a denotation. 'One sole master in the heavens' was all that was necessary 'to create thousands of them on earth,' and this 'anti-doctrinaire stance applies equally to religious theology and political ideology.' One thus finds the seed of Talmon's critique of Rousseau in Bakunin's polemic against the 'political theology' of Mazzini,[9] who advocated an overtly religious concept of the (Italian) state in the form of a bourgeois republic, a theocracy supposedly democratised by the people's spiritual unity, itself in turn reified as a unitary mass consciousness.[10]

In addition to theism of any stripe, also to be avoided was *participation in bourgeois politics*, for this could only corrupt the workers' movement. As early as his sensational 1842 article 'The Reaction in Germany', which posited the Negative rather than the Positive as the driving force of Hegel's dialectic, Bakunin deduced a social-revolutionary philosophy based upon a principled refusal to compromise. It is therefore convenient to denote the Bakuninist refusal to participate in bourgeois politics as *anti-Bebelism*, after the German working-class leader August Bebel. Bebel was perhaps the first of such to insist that the self-emancipation of the working-class should not depend upon bourgeois liberalism. However, his compromising attitude was evident from his earliest political activity, when in 1869 at the age of 29, he co-founded with Wilhelm Liebknecht the Social Democratic Workers Party ('Eisenachers'), and then entered parliament on a party programme invoking the demand to establish a 'free people's State'.

Despite Bebel's abstention in a vote in 1870 over credits for the Franco-Prussian War in the North German Reichstag, where his very presence already signified participation in bourgeois politics, he made still greater compromises in the first years of the twentieth century as he tried to keep the revolutionary and reformist wings of Germany's Social Democratic Party (SPD) under one roof.

Indeed, the reformist Eduard Bernstein was one of those SPD socialists who took the next step after Bebel and, in his national parliament in 1914, voted in favour of war credits for his bourgeois state. Even though Bernstein was only a young bank clerk when Bakunin died in 1876, it is appropriate to use his name to represent *the appeal to unity on national or ethno-racial lines* (including the pan-Slavism that Bakunin himself overcame following the failure of the 1863 Polish insurrection and against which he inveighed during his mature anarchist period) and so to denote this component of Bakunin's belief-system as *anti-Bernsteinism*.

Thus, these three principles of Bakunin's revolutionary practice (against putschism, against participation in bourgeois politics and against national and ethno-racial appeals to unity) may be summarised as 'anti-Blanquism, anti-Bebelism and anti-Bernsteinism'.

TASKS OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN 'SECRET SOCIETY'

In consequence of the three just-enumerated axioms, Bakunin never believed that his small group would or should start a revolution. Indeed, he always affirmed that revolution emerges from circumstances and that such circumstances do not characterise every historical period. Revolution was impossible without violence, but Bakunin insisted that this violence should not be institutionalised. His small groups had for their chief aim and purpose merely to prepare for the revolution and to help to organise it. In preparing the revolution, participation in his small societies (schools for mediating between the revolutionary idea and the instinct of the people) could inculcate the morality to prevent the revolutionary movement, if successful, from degenerating into just another partisan force seeking to impose the mastership of the few upon the subjection of the many. Or so he hoped.

Upon landing back in Europe in the early 1860s, Bakunin looked forward to the fall of Napoleon III in France, after which he believed in a new 1848; and he thought that he should be prepared so that the Social Revolution might avoid the outcome of 1848-49. Bakunin continued to believe that the anticipated Revolution in France could reach across Europe to Russia, and he spent time finding revolutionaries with whom to work together towards that goal regardless of their geographic origin. Different groups in different cities at different times were all referred to as the 'Alliance' (or the 'Brotherhood'), complicating the tracing of their evolution. In interpreting Bakunin's various manifestoes and programmes, it is necessary to recall that they were always directed at the specific readerships intended, responding to the needs of the situation at hand, and therefore also integrated with his revolutionary practice.

Bakunin's international profile, far-reaching influence and multifarious activity make the case arguable that, for all his ultimate focus on Russia, he was the most cosmopolitan of all nineteenth-century revolutionaries. He exerted his greatest influence through his epistolary activity, aided by his wide fluency in languages. Despite the loss of the vast majority of his correspondence from 1864 until his death in 1876,[11] the fraction that remains gives us a sense of the breadth of his network of contacts: from Spain to the South Caucasus and from Sweden to Sicily, not to mention the Russian Empire from Vilnius to Vladivostok, plus the New World.

Bakunin knew that secrecy was necessary for any group aiming to uproot the established order, but the heterodoxy and counter-intuitive aspect of his ideas on secrecy have led to misunderstandings. The International Working-Men's Association (IWMA) did 'very useful [and] very necessary' work by spreading 'the theoretical propaganda of socialist ideas amongst the working masses' as well as by 'organising the public and legal fight of the united workers of all countries against the exploiters of labour, capitalists, property-owners, and entrepreneurs of industry'. In this manner, the International 'prepares the elements of the revolutionary organisation'; however, 'it never goes beyond this' and therefore does not fulfil the revolutionary role in practice.[12]

What was needed was that a secret revolutionary organisation, that in the midst of a popular upheaval 'firmly united and inspired with a single idea, a single aim, applicable everywhere in different ways according to the circumstances', should disperse its members 'in small groups throughout the empire', with the purpose of 'creat[ing] a powerful but always invisible revolutionary collectivity; a collectivity which must prepare the revolution and direct it, ... leaving its full development to the revolutionary movement of the masses and the most absolute liberty to their social organisation, ... but always seeing to it that this movement and this organisation should never be able to reconstitute any authorities, governments [or] States, and combating all ambitions.'[13]

For Bakunin, the reason the revolutionary organisation had to be secret was not only a tactical matter of survival. It was also for the strategic reason that if its existence was openly acknowledged, then it would become, like the State, 'an artificial force outside the people' – and so lose the ability to fulfil its sole aim, which was 'to arouse, unite and organise spontaneous popular forces.' This is the sense in which Bakunin averred that the secret organisation's chief aim and purpose were simply to 'help the people towards self-determination, without the least interference from any sort of domination even if it be temporary or transitional.'[14]

At the same time, preparing the revolution, the workers themselves also

had to create organisations, 'cooperatives for consumption, mutual credit, and production' so that they became 'accustomed to handling their own affairs' by 'prepar[ing] the precious seeds for the organisation of the future.' These organisations would replace the present political organisational form of productive forces and economic services, with a more just distribution of the same.[15] The future society would be organised 'from the bottom upwards, by the free association and federation of workers, firstly in their unions, then in their communes, regions, nations and finally in a great federation, international and worldwide.' Only on this basis could social equality become a reality after the political power of the State is destroyed; only on this basis could justice find its immanent expression in the world.[16]

The penultimate remark to be made here is that Bakunin's reading of the German philosopher Fichte in the mid-1830s may have prepared the ground for the emergence of some of his later ideas about the secret revolutionary organisation. Bakunin was the first translator of Fichte into Russian as he was later to become the first translator of Hegel into Russian. The work he translated was the philosopher's *Lectures on the Vocation of the Scholar*, in which Fichte emphasised the moral obligation of a university philosopher to put his specialised learning to practical use for the moralisation of society outside university walls. There is a resonance here with Bakunin's particular emphasis upon the secret organisation's moralisation of its own members before the revolution and of society during and after it. Bakunin's mature revolutionary practice specifically intended that the 'secret society' give its members the moral experience necessary to fulfil the meliorative role foreseen for it after the outbreak of the violent revolution.[17]

In addition, Fichte's *The Way to a Blessed Life*, which became Bakunin's favourite work, gave him the inspiration for the religious but extra-ecclesiastical immanentism that he developed in the mid-1830s before encountering Hegel.[18] It arguably shaped his view of 'Democracy [as] a religion' that 'is not only a particular constitutional or politico-economic change, but a total transformation of that world condition ... ' It followed in particular that 'We must not only act politically, but in our politics act religiously', meaning '*permeated* by its principle ... in real life down to life's smallest manifestations ... '[19]

In consequence, it is possible to suggest that the immanentism that Bakunin imbibed from *The Way to a Blessed Life* shaped his concept of the meaning and substance of 'democracy' and that the progressive social praxis taught in *Lectures on the Vocation of the Scholar* rough-hewed his ideas about the tasks to be accomplished *within* the 'secret society' even before 'democracy' was instantiated in society-at-large. Therefore, it is finally possible to suggest that here one finds the

earliest roots of Bakunin's conception respectively, first of the purpose, and second of the activity, of the 'secret society' in the revolution.

CONCLUSION

The three terms describing the goal of Bakunin's 'secret societies' in this article's subtitle ('self-emancipating', 'collectivist' and 'social revolution') correspond to the three 'antis' enumerated above. Anti-Blanquism corresponds to the self-emancipation that the secret society transmits throughout society (rather than being emancipation decreed and enacted from on high). Anti-Bebelism corresponds to its collectivist nature, in contrast with the authoritarian communist nature of such a decreed revolution, also following Bakunin's famous distinction between the two at the 1868 Geneva Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom.[20] Anti-Bernsteinism corresponds to the social revolution itself and particularly its internationalist nature. An understanding of how these strands are interwoven throughout the 'infrastructure' of Bakunin's mature anarchist thought and activity requires an awareness of the early and enduring influence upon him by Fichte as well as Hegel. At the convergence of these strands is his anarchist concept of the purpose and activity of the secret revolutionary organisation, or 'secret society'.

Dr. Robert M. Cutler is Adjunct Professor, Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, Carleton University, Canada. He is the editor and translator, with an 'Introduction', of *The Basic Bakunin: Writings, 1869-1871*, and has published new materials by and about Bakunin from public and private archives in the United States and the United Kingdom. His critical review article of the Kelly and Mendel biographies appeared in Russian translation, with the English original available on his website. He has also written on the roots and development of the clash of ideas with Marx inside the First International, and on Bakunin's relations with Proudhon.

Email: http://www.robertcutler.org

NOTES

1. A full article would be necessary to review this literature, but I wish to make special mention of Arthur Lehning, 'Bakunin's Conceptions of Revolution Organisations and Their Role: A Study of His "Secret Societies"', in C. Abramsky (ed.), *Essays in Honour of E.H. Carr* (London: Macmillan, 1974), pp 57–81. After writing the draft of this essay, I began to make bibliographic notes and discovered

so high a congruence between Lehning's interpretation and my own, that I am obliged to state that I arrived at mine without reference to his, which I am pleased to cite because it discusses the evolution over time of Bakunin's network from one 'secret society' to another, which editorial constraints prevent me from addressing. By contrast, the present essay's contribution is focussed on the intellectual history of the times and the distinguishing characteristics of Bakunin's revolutionary practice in that context. As such, it is an extension of some remarks first made in Robert M. Cutler, 'Introduction', in Cutler (trans. and ed.), *From Out of the Dustbin: Bakunin's Basic Writings, 1869-1871* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ardis Publishers, 1985), pp 27–29; now available and cited below as the reprint edition: Cutler (trans and ed.) *The Basic Bakunin: Writings, 1869–1871* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1992).

2. M. Bakounine, *Fédéralisme, socialisme et anti-théologisme: Proposition motivée au Comité Central de la Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté*, a brochure set in type in 1867, and of which the printers' proofs were corrected, but which was not published until after Bakunin's death, in Michel Bakounine, *Œuvres*, 6 vols (Paris: P.V. Stock, 1895–1913), vol. I edited by Max Nettlau and vols II–VI edited by James Guillaume, vol. I, pp 1–205. The principal passages are translated into English in Arthur Lehning (ed.), *Michael Bakunin: Selected Writings* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1974), and pp 94–110.

3. In Thomas Flynn (ed.), *The New Encyclopedia of Unbelief* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2007), *s.v.* 'Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich' (at p 103).

4. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *Du Principe fédératif et de la nécessité de reconstituer le Parti de la Révolution* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1863), p 25, defined '[le g]ouvernement de chacun par chacun' (the government of each by each) as '*An-archie* [*sic*] ou *Self-government*' (emphases in the original).

5. See Jaap Kloosterman, 'Secret Societies', and retrieved 27 July 2014 from <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/european-networks/secret-societies>. [Based on a paper presented to the Conference of the German Historical Institute 'Zentren und Peripherien der europäischen Wissensordnung vom 15. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert', Moscow, 24–26 September 2009.]

6. Philippe Buonarroti, *Gracchus Babeuf et la Conjuration des égaux* (Paris: Armand Le Chevalier, 1869), pp 89–102. Compare Arthur Lehning, 'Buonarroti's Ideas on Communism and Dictatorship', *International Review of Social History*, 2:2 (August 1957), pp 266–87; reprinted in Lehning, *From Buonarroti to Bakunin: Studies in International Socialism* (Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1970).

7. J.L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1952).

8. Bakunin, 'Three Lectures to Swiss Members of the International', in Cutler (ed.), *The Basic Bakunin*, p 47.

9. Bakounine, *La théologie politique de Mazzini et l'Internationale* (Neuchâtel: [G. Guillaume fils], 1871).

10. There are numerous references in the literature to Lawrence Peter King and Iván Szelényi, *Theories of the New Class: Intellectuals and Power* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), p xiii, as suggesting that Bakunin was the first to use the term 'new class' in the manner made famous by Milovan Djilas. Tracing the citation of Bakunin given originally by Ivan Szelenyi and Bill Martin in their unpublished 1987 conference paper 'Three Waves of New Class Theories' (Austrian Sociological Association, Graz) leads to an important correction of an error in Sam Dolgoff, 'Introduction', in Dolgoff (ed.), *Bakunin on Anarchy* (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1971), p 20, who relied upon Michel Collinet, 'L'Association Internationale des travailleurs', *Le Contrat social*, 8:1 (January–February 1964), pp 52–56, to assert that Cesar de Paepe used the 'new class' phrase at the 1867 Lausanne Congress of the IWMA. The interesting and significant details deserve separate treatment elsewhere, but consultation of *Procès-verbaux du Congrès de l'Association internationale des travailleurs réuni à Lausanne du 2 au 8 septembre 1867* (Chaux-de-Fonds: Imprimerie de la Voix de l'Avenir, 1867), pp 28–33, esp. pp 28–29, reveals the error. De Paepe only presented the report of the committee charged with preparing the third agenda point, and this did not use the term 'new class' in any sense.

    Further tracing of the citation identifies it as part of a fragment of *L'Empire Knouto-Germanique et la Révolution sociale*; but since this was not part of Bakounine, *La théologie politique de Mazzini*, it was not published until 1910. In this passage, Bakunin warns that in 'the People's State of Mr Marx' there would be 'the reign of scientific intelligence, the most aristocratic, the most despotic, the most arrogant and most contemptuous of all regimes. There will be a *new class*, a new hierarchy of real and fictive scholars, and the world will be divided into a minority ruling in the name of science, and an immense ignorant majority' (see 'Fragment formant une suite de *L'Empire Knouto-Germanique*', *Œuvres*, vol. IV, p 477; emphasis added).

    An 1869 usage by Bakunin antedates that one, but has a slightly different sense. Mentioning the IWMA's 1867 Lausanne Congress and alluding directly to the reso-lution prepared by the committee for which De Paepe acted as rapporteur, Bakunin recalls, in a 13 March 1869 newspaper article for *L'Égalité*, the 'sad consequences that the spirit of conciliation has had for the working class', and avers that 'the workers will never again concede anything', since 'the result of any concession would be to push away the complete emancipation of labour, producing only a partial enfranchisement of the proletariat, that is, the creation of a *new class* that would in its turn become oppressive' ('Madame André Leo et *L'Égalité*', *Œuvres*, vol. V, p 32; emphasis added).

The reference here would not be to the aforementioned 'scientific'-bureaucratic ruling elite but to the creation of a stratum of workers who are more privileged than the mass of workers and assist in the oppression of the latter.

In 1870 he explicitly accused 'the Marxians' (*sic*) of 'wish[ing] precisely to use [this elevated partial stratum of 'quasi-bourgeois workers'] in order to constitute [themselves as] their [own] *fourth governmental class*' ('Fragment formant une suite de *L'Empire Knouto-Germanique*', *Œuvres*, vol. IV, p 413; emphasis in the original). To explain why, this refers to the 'Marxians' seizing the bureaucratic apparatus of the state. It must be explained that Bakunin is not referring here to the aforementioned resolution of the 1867 IWMA Lausanne Congress (which identifies the danger that a privileged 'fourth estate' stratum of workers may turn out to oppress the mass of workers comprising a 'fifth estate'). As a result, the interpretation of the phrase by René Berthier, 'Éléments d'une analyse bakouninienne de la bureaucratie', *Informations et réflexions libertaires*, no. 73 (Summer 1987), is also incorrect. Rather, Bakunin clearly has in mind his own 1869 analysis of European political history, in which he identifies the three previous historical governmental classes, declaiming thus: 'The State has always been the patrimony of some privileged class: the priesthood, the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and finally, after every other class has been exhausted, the bureaucratic class, when the State falls or rises – whichever you wish – into the condition of a machine.' Bakunin, 'Open Letters to Swiss Comrades of the International', in Cutler (ed.), *The Basic Bakunin*, p 177. This could well be a sardonic allusion to Eccarius's amendment, which barely passed, to De Paepe's resolution, which was overwhelmingly approved. The amendment stated that the 'fifth estate' will be less of a problem, eventually disappearing, the more the productive forces of society are extended on an ever larger scale, becoming all-encompassing. See *Procès-verbaux du Congrès*, pp 29-30, for details.

In this connection, one may finally add that besides anticipating Djilas's idea of the 'new class', Bakunin also showed even more remarkable prescience of the 'iron law of oligarchy' set forth in the academic study of the organisation of the SPD by Robert Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie: Untersuchungen über die oligarchischen Tendenzen des Gruppenlebens* (Leipzig: Verlag Werner Klinkhardt, 1911), translated and many times reprinted in English under the title *Political Parties*.

11. See Jaap Kloosterman, 'Les papiers de Michel Bakounine à Amsterdam' ([Amsterdam]: n.p., [ca. 1985/2004]); retrieved 27 July 2014 from <http://www.iisg. nl/archives/docs/bakarch.pdf>. Kloosterman only discusses the fate of those papers of Bakunin after his death of which we are aware. He does not allude much to the need, during Bakunin's lifetime, to destroy much correspondence in order to avoid its falling into the hands of the police.

12. Bakunin, '[Lettre] à Pablo', dated 21 May 1872 from Locarno, in Max Nettlau, *The*

Life of Michael Bakounine: Michael Bakunin; Eine Biographie, 3 vols (London: By the Author, 1896–1900), vol. II, p 288. 'Pablo' has subsequently been identified as the Spanish IWMA member Tomás González Morago.

13. *Ibid.*, p 284.

14. Bakunin, 'Letter to Nečaev', in Lehning (ed.), *Michael Bakunin: Selected Writings*, p 191; emphasis added.

15. See Bakunin, 'Geneva's Double Strike', in Cutler (ed.), *The Basic Bakunin*, pp 148, 149; and p 212 n. 61.

16. Bakunin, 'The Paris Commune and the Idea of the State' in Lehning (ed.), *Michael Bakunin: Selected Writings*, p 206; translation slightly modified following the original at Bakounine, *Œuvres*, vol. IV, p 264.

17. Assessing Fichte's broader influence on Bakunin, beyond the narrower point made here, has been a contentious project, as it has lent itself to exaggerated and incorrect accusations of solipsism against him. For more on the subject, see Mark Leier, *Bakunin: The Creative Passion* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2006), pp 69–72; for a discussion of some earlier English-language literature on the topic, see also Paul McLaughlin, *Mikhail Bakunin: The Philosophical Basis of His Anarchism* (New York: Algora, 2002), pp 23–24, 63–67.

18. His Russian Orthodox upbringing provided the originally Christian terminology in which he expressed this, before he passed on to Hegel, whose system won him over. For extended discussion and citations, see V.V. Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy*, 2 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953), vol. I, pp 247-49.

19. Bakunin, 'Reaction in Germany', in Lehning (ed.), *Michael Bakunin: Selected Writings*, pp 39, 43.

20. For one of many versions of this story, including the key quotation from Bakunin's speech, see E.H. Carr, *Michael Bakunin* (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1961), p 356.