Russian Revolutionary Terrorism in Transnational Perspective: Representations and Networks, 1881-1926

L Green

PhD

2019

Russian Revolutionary Terrorism in Transnational Perspective: Representations and Networks, 1881-1926

Lara Green

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Northumbria at Newcastle for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Research undertaken in the Faculty of Arts, Design, and Social Sciences

April 2019

Abstract

Russian revolutionary terrorism was a transnational phenomenon in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This thesis explores how representations of terrorism were influenced by co-operation with foreign sympathisers and how transnational networks enabled Russian revolutionary émigrés to publish pro-terrorist materials. Due to restrictions on publishing activities in Russia and repression carried out by the tsarist secret police, many revolutionaries relocated their publishing operations abroad and founded new publications there. This thesis builds on the rich body of scholarship concerning Russian revolutionary émigrés, drawing out new transnational connections and tracing the networks of publishing activities.

This thesis uses new source bases to investigate these representations and networks in transnational perspective. Combining archival collections, it reassesses the political activism of members of the Russian Free Press Fund (RFPF) in this context. It examines how revolutionary terrorists represented terrorists of other nationalities in their writings through a case study using Russian and Irish revolutionary sources. It uses British government documents to explore this issue further. It surveys mainstream media representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism. It examines fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism as published in English or in English translation, offering new interpretations of the meanings and reception of these works.

Russian revolutionary émigrés preserved and perpetuated representations of terrorism from nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary culture by producing literature in emigration depicting terrorists as ethical actors and framing terrorism as liberation from tsarist despotism. In order to appeal to foreign sympathisers, they framed these representations in terms of the rule of law and humanitarian projects and denied the legitimacy of other foreign terrorisms, particularly Irish revolutionary terrorism. Their narratives of Russian revolutionary terrorism often contrasted with hostile representations in the international press, but through their active publishing and propaganda work they were able to establish powerful counter-narratives. The RFPF's activities in this respect formed the basis of later publishing for Russian audiences in collaboration with the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. Aligning with the themes and representations in their work, fiction by Russians about revolutionary terrorism produced responses which echoed in the early years of the twentieth century and, indeed, across the revolutionary divide.

Contents

Abbreviations 1
Organisations 1
Archives 1
Journals 2
Note on Transliteration 2
Note on Dates 2
Introduction 3
i Terrorism and the Russian Revolutionary Movement 4
ii The Russian Revolutionary Emigration as a Transnational Phenomenon 14
iii Historiography, Theory, and Russian Revolutionary Terrorism 23
iv The Russian Free Press Fund and its Members 29
iv.i Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinskii (1851-1895) 32
iv.ii Feliks Volkhovskii (1846-1914) 34
iv.iii Lazar Goldenberg (1846-1916) 35
iv.iv Egor Lazarev (1855-1937) 36
iv.v Leonid Shishko (1852-1910) 37
iv.vi Nikolai Chaikovskii (1850-1926) 38
iv.vii Associates of the RFPF in Britain: Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) and Vladimir Burtsev (1862-1942) 39
v Source Material 40
vi Thesis Structure 42
Chapter One: *Free Russia* and Transnational Terrorist Propaganda Networks, 1890-1915 44
1.1 Introduction 44
1.2 Building on pre-existing foundations 46
1.3 The Limits and Scope of Transnational Co-operation 65
1.4 Free Russia and Ethical Terrorism 73
1.5 Free Russia and SFRF after 1900 78
1.6 Revival of the SAFRF 80
1.7 Conclusion 82
Chapter Two: Russian and Irish Revolutionary Terrorists in the 1880s 83
2.1 Introduction 83
2.2 Evidence for Co-operation? 88
2.3 ‘Professor Mezzeroff’ 97
2.4 Representing the Other 102
2.5 Conclusion 112
Chapter Three: The Transnational Terrorist Publishing Work of Feliks Volkhovskii and Vladimir Burtsev, 1900-1914 114

3.1 Introduction 114
3.2 Volkhovskii, Burtsev, and the Periodical Legacy of the RFPF 116
3.3 Representing and Remembering Terrorism 125
3.3.1 Historical Consciousness 127
3.3.2 Tyrannicide and Revolutionary Justice 131
3.3.3 Real and Ideal Terrorists 137
3.4 Representing and Negotiating with the PSR 139
3.5 Conclusion 147
Chapter Four: Peter Kropotkin: The Terrorist Who was Not 149
4.1 Introduction 149
4.2 Becoming the 'Nihilist Prince' 153
4.3 Kropotkin's Voice and Terrorism 162
4.4 Kropotkin and the Russian Free Press Fund 168
4.5 Memoirs of a Revolutionist 170
4.6 Sofia Kropotkina 174
4.7 Kropotkin and the Parliamentary Russian Committee 175
4.8 War, Revolution, and Death 177
4.9 Conclusion 180
Chapter Five: Sergei Stepniak, Boris Savinkov, and Leonid Andreev and their English-speaking audiences, 1882-1926 181
5.1 Introduction 181
5.2 Sergei Stepniak 185
5.3 Boris Savinkov 185
5.4 Leonid Andreev 221
5.5 Conclusion 234
Conclusion 236
Bibliography 243
Archival Collections 243
Digital and Microfilm Collections 244
Newspapers and Periodicals 244
Articles, Books, Dissertations, and Reference Works 245

Acknowledgements

I owe a great deal to many people who have helped me on the way to completing this thesis. I would like to thank my principal supervisor, Professor Charlotte Alston, for her guidance and encouragement throughout this long process. I am also grateful for the advice of Dr Colin Reid and Dr Laura O'Brien, who both pushed me to develop this work in new directions. I would also like to add my thanks to the examiners, Professor Michael Hughes and Dr Daniel Laqua, for their generous advice and comments on my research.

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude for the generous funding I have received that made it possible for me to pursue this research. Northumbria University provided a studentship and grants for research travel and conference attendance. Funding from the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies gave me the opportunity to spend two months at the archives in Moscow. With funding from the Economic History Society and Society for the Study of Labour History, I was able to visit the Hoover Institution and the Houghton Library in the US. I would also like to thank the Royal Historical Society, whose support enabled me to attend the BASEES Annual Conference in Cambridge in April 2018.

I feel incredibly lucky to have been a part of an active postgraduate research community at Northumbria and in the North East. Thank you for your friendship and encouragement, particularly during the tough times.

My final thanks go to my parents, without whose encouragement and support I would never have set out on this journey, and to Matthew, who has been there every step of the way.

Declaration

I declare that the work contained in this thesis has not been submitted for any other award and that it is all my own work. I also confirm that this work fully acknowledges opinions, ideas, and contributions from others.

Any ethical clearance for the research presented in this thesis has been approved. Approval has been sought and granted by the Faculty Ethics Review Panel on 16 October 2015.

I declare that the word count of this thesis is 85,221 words.

Name: Lara Green

Signature:

Date:

Abbreviations

Organisations

ASL	*Agrarno-Sotsialisticheskaia Liga* (Agrarian-Socialist League)
BO	*Boevaia organizatsiia partii Sotsialistov-Revoliutsionerov* (Combat Organisation of the Socialist Revolutionary Party)
IAPA	International Arbitration and Peace Association
IPP	Irish Parliamentary Party
PSR	*Partiia Sotsialistov-Revoliutsionerov* (Socialist-Revolutionary Party)
RANL	Russian-American National League
RFPF	Russian Free Press Fund (*Fond volnoi russkoi pressy*)
RSDRP	*Rossiyskaia sotsial-demokraticheskaia rabochaia partiia* (Russian Social Democratic Labour Party)
RTAS	Russian Treaty Abrogation Society
SAFRF	Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom
SEHS	Siberian Exile Humane Society
SEPA	Siberian Exile Petition Association
SEPC	Siberian Exile Petition Committee
SFRF	Society of Friends of Russian Freedom (English)
SR	Socialist Revolutionary (*Sotsialist-Revoliutsioner*)

Archives

GARF	*Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv rossiyskoi federatsii* (State Archive of the Russian Federation)
HIA	Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University
Houghton	Houghton Library, Harvard University
IISH	International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam
LRA	Leeds Russian Archive, University of Leeds Special Collections
LSE	London School of Economics Special Collections
NCL	Newcastle University Special Collections
RGALI	*Rossiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i isskustva* (Russian State Archive of Literature and Art)
RGASPI	*Rossiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsialno-politicheskoi istorii* (Russian State Archive of Social-Political History)
Schlesinger	Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University
TNA	The National Archives, London
UKPA	Parliamentary Archives, London

Journals

CEH	*Contemporary European History*
EHQ	*European History Quarterly*
JGO	*Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*
JMEH	*The Journal of Modern European History*
JMH	*The Journal of Modern History*
SEER	*The Slavonic and East European Review*
TLS	*The Times Literary Supplement*

Note on Transliteration

The system of transliteration used in this thesis is based on the Library of Congress system without diacritical marks. Some alternative spellings are used where there are commonly-recognised Anglicised alternatives. For example: Alexander Herzen and not Aleksandr Gertsen, Peter Kropotkin and not Pëtr Kropotkin, and Stepniak and not Stepnyak. In quotations or when listed as authors of works published in English, the original spellings have been preserved.

Note on Dates

Prior to March 1918, Russia used the Julian calendar, as opposed to the Gregorian calendar which was used in Western Europe and the US. This made them approximately 12 days behind in the nineteenth century and 13 days in the twentieth century. The dates of events taking place in Russia are given using the Julian calendar (sometimes referred to as 'Old Style') and dates for events taking place elsewhere are given using the Gregorian calendar ('New Style'). Where the relation between dates of events in Russia and elsewhere is significant for the purposes of this research, both dates are given in the text.

Introduction

In 1910, the *New York Times* printed the Russian terrorist Boris Savinkov's memoirs of the assassination of the Minister of the Interior Viacheslav von Plehve in 1905.[1] The article was extensively illustrated and was accompanied by a photograph of the damage done by the bomb to von Plehve's carriage. Savinkov provided his readers with unique insights and details about the planning and carrying out of the assassination. This was just one example of many articles of the era which printed the details of Russian revolutionary terrorist activities. As an émigré, Savinkov would become a prominent symbol of Russian revolutionary terrorism abroad and his later novels would also be translated into English. The article reflects foreigners' interest in Russian literature and current affairs at the time as well as popular demand for authentic stories of revolutionary activity in Russia. Terrorism, as this thesis will demonstrate, while only representing a small sector of revolutionary and opposition activity in Russia in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, would capture foreigners' imaginations in such a way as to dominate representations and views of Russia, its people, and its rulers.

The roots of foreigners' interest in authentic and unique stories of terrorist activities lay in earlier transnational social and political activism, an interest which would endure beyond the Revolution of 1917. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including beyond the Revolution, revolutionaries, persecuted minorities, and intellectuals left Russia and settled in the West. Those involved in revolutionary activities were able publish more freely and a wide variety of émigrés became the channels through which English-speaking readers learned about Russian literature, culture, society, and politics.

Between 1881 and 1926, émigré terrorists and terrorist propagandists performed similar roles and as a result of their work, terrorism became a prominent theme in Russian literary, propagandistic, social, and economic texts which were translated from Russian into English, or from the other foreign languages they were originally written in. These texts in translation influenced foreigners' understandings of Russia. Terrorists and their supporters participated in and established transnational networks for the financing, publication, and distribution of such materials and cross-cultural connections enabled wider translation and publishing activities. Terrorism became an important symbol of the Russian revolutionary

[1] B. Savinkov, Assassin's own Story of the Death of von Plehve: Remarkable Document Giving Every Detail of the Attempts of the Life of the Russian's Police System, the Second of Which was Successful, *New York Times*, 10 July 1910

movement, despite not being universally accepted, and representations of terrorism took on new meanings in transnational contexts, which will be explored in this thesis. This introduction will examine the scholarly literature on terrorism in this period, in order to demonstrate the significance of the new questions being explored.

i Terrorism and the Russian Revolutionary Movement

The issue of terrorism produced some of the fiercest debates among Russian revolutionaries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite this lack of consensus, however, the image of the terrorist dominated representations of the Russian revolutionary movement abroad. While revolutionaries may have disagreed over whether terrorism was a legitimate tool of revolution, there is no doubt that acts of terrorism marked important developments and junctures in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement. Terrorism should also not be seen as entirely distinct from other forms of political activism in this period. It was also employed by revolutionaries with varying political beliefs. In order to explore arguments Russian revolutionaries used to legitimise terrorism, it is first important to understand how historians have explained its use.

Tyrannicide has been seen as one of the oldest grounds for terrorism.[2] It permeated Russian revolutionary thought and activism throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Ludmilla Trigos has identified the Decembrist Revolt at the accession to the throne of Tsar Nicholas I in 1825 as terrorism motivated to challenge despotism. Trigos argues that the Decembrists echoed both ancient and more recent Russian traditions of deposing unfit rulers.[3] In this explanation, historical knowledge of the Russian state shaped revolutionary activity.[4]

In the nineteenth century, the characteristics, values, and goals of terrorism changed. Martin Miller suggests that, intellectually, the boundary of modernity in terrorism lies at the publication of the work of Karl Heinzen, a German revolutionary whose work 'Mord und Freiheit' ('Murder and Liberty'). Miller suggests that Heinzen understood the limitations of an act of tyrannicide as only leading to further tyranny, whereas it could also be attached to a sense of revolutionary progress, though Heinzen neglected to provide a model for this type of terrorism.[5]

---

[2] Walter Laqueur, *Terrorism* (London, 1977), p. 21

[3] Ludmilla A. Trigos, 'Historical Models of Terror in Decembrist Literature', in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), p. 26

[4] Ibid., p. 31

[5] Martin A. Miller, *The Foundations of Modern Terrorism: State, Society and the Dynamics of Political Violence* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 56-7

Historians have debated the identification of the point at which terrorism in Russia in the nineteenth century became infused with broader ideas of revolutionary justice and the potential to generate change. They disagree over the moment at which terrorism became more than a reactive and limited act of revenge against a tyrant and when it became particularly 'modern'. Dmitrii Karakozov's attempt to assassinate Tsar Alexander II in 1866, Vera Zasulich's attempt to assassinate the governor of St Petersburg, General Trepov, in 1878, and Sergei Stepniak's assassination of the head of the tsarist secret police, General Mezentsev, in 1878 have all been seen to be inspired by this new conception of terrorism.[6] However, historians have also identified the merging of old and new ideas in each of these acts. Adam Ulam argued that Karakozov's act contained elements of an older tradition of tyrannicide, as the revolutionaries had passed a 'death sentence', but that it also represented a new kind of political murder as an 'advertisement' for the revolutionaries and their political programme.[7] Oleg Budnitskii has contrasted Zasulich's act with an earlier incident in 1869 where Sergei Nechaev had murdered a fellow revolutionary he believed to be a spy. Older forms of terrorism such as Nechaev's might in this sense be seen to have co-existed with newer forms, such as Karakozov's act. Budnitskii argues that Zasulich's motivations were to ensure the rights of the individual and, thereby, democratic freedoms.[8] Claudia Verhoeven located this shift in Karakozov's actions, whereas Anna Siljak identified it in revolutionaries' responses to Zasulich's attempted shooting of Trepov.[9] However, Susan Morrissey has questioned Verhoeven's disqualification of Zasulich's actions as the first act of modern terrorism based on her motives to avenge the flogging of a political prisoner, instead suggesting Zasulich's actions might be interpreted as reflecting 'modern ideas about human dignity, bodily inviolability, and self-sovereignty.'[10] Lynn Ellen Patyk has also suggested that Stepniak's choice of a knife

---

[6] Claudia Verhoeven, *The Odd Man Karakozov* (Ithaca NY, 2009), pp. 174-6 and John Elliot Bachman's 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii: A Biography from the Russian Revolutionary Movement on Native and Foreign Soil' (PhD dissertation, The American University, 1971), p. 122-3. Tatiana Borisova's recent article on Vera Zasulich's trial has illustrated the transformational effect her actions and behaviour had on public conceptions of justice and power in Russia. Tatiana Borisova, 'Public Meaning of the Zasulich Trial 1878: Law, Politics and Gender', *Russian History*, vol. 43, nos. 3-4 (2016), pp. 72-4

[7] Adam B. Ulam, *Prophets and Conspirators in Prerevolutionary Russia* (New Brunswick NJ, 1998), pp. 293-4

[8] Oleg Budnitskii, *Terrorizm v rossiiskom osvoboditelnom dvizhenii: ideologiia, etika, psikhologiia (vtoraia polovina XIX-nachalo XX v.)* (Moscow, 2000), p. 46

[9] Verhoeven, *Odd Man Karakozov*, p. 6 and Ana Siljak, *Angel of Vengeance: The Girl who Shot the Governor of St Petersburg and Sparked the Age of Assassinations* (New York, 2008), pp. 262-3 and pp. 272-4

[10] Susan K. Morrissey, 'Terrorism, Modernity, and the Question of Origins', *Kritika,* vol. 12, no. 1 (2011), p. 222

was one element of his elaborate staging of the assassination of Mezentsev, invoking the older symbolism of literary Romanticism.[11] The fusion of traditional and modernity which can be identified in Russian revolutionary terrorism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries illustrates that these actions were inspired by a complex collision of ideas. The question of modernity and the values embedded in acts of Russian revolutionary terrorism remains an active debate.

Another important question, which historians have also begun to investigate in greater depth, is how layers of meaning became attached to terrorism. Historians have begun to explore the question of how writers and publicists approached their practice. Lynn Patyk has illustrated how Boris Savinkov manipulated readers' responses to his novels; they read them as reflecting reality, whereas he understood terrorism to be a literary construct.[12] Both Patyk and Peter Scotto, reading Sergei Stepniak's *Underground Russia*, have suggested that his work provided idealised examples of revolutionaries' lives, with Scotto arguing that 'the net effect is rather like that of a collection of saints' legends – and no doubt intentionally so. Those familiar with Old Russian literature may be reminded of a *Paterikon*, a record of incidents form the lives of saints connected with a particular monastic community and any miracles performed.'[13] The question of how terrorists and terrorist propagandists created narratives around Russian revolutionary terrorism is central to this thesis.

This is an important question because scholarship on contemporary terrorisms of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries has highlighted the extent to which terrorism is a phenomenon that exists beyond the boundaries of the act itself. Brigitte Nacos' argument that communication is a central tenet of terrorism, enabled by media reporting is a useful way of understanding Russian revolutionary terrorism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[14] Historians such as Morrissey have recognised the importance of media technology in interpreting Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period.[15] Exploring late nineteenth and early twentieth century terrorism, Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid has shown how cheap printing and shortened production times enabled terrorists to harness new media technologies to

[11] Lynn Ellen Patyk, '"The Double-Edged Sword of Word and Deed": Revolutionary Terrorism and Russian Literary Culture', (PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 2005), pp. 117-8
[12] Lynn Ellen Patyk, 'The Byronic Terrorist: Boris Savinkov's Literary Self-Mythologization', in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), p. 182
[13] Peter Scotto, 'The Terrorist as Novelist: Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinsky', in Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins*, p. 112
[14] Brigitte L. Nacos, *Mass-Mediated Terrorism: The Central Role of the Media in Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism* (Lanham MD/Oxford, 2002), pp. 10-1
[15] Morrissey, 'Terrorism, Modernity, and the Question of Origins', p. 220

promote their ideas and actions.[16] While observing that the media is not a passive participant in this process, Nacos suggested that the process of transmission reproduces terrorists' messages by creating a sense of vulnerability.[17] Modern media technologies, newspapers and the global telegraph network enabled the spread of information and misinformation about terrorism beyond national boundaries and across oceans. Susan Moeller concluded that reports of terrorism in the news media reflect journalists' and editors' considerations of how reading audiences conceive of the threat to themselves.[18] News reports on terrorism thus signify something about readers' relationships with terrorism and their own fears. News reporting also reflects what media thinks will keep consumers engaged and returning to their media outlet.[19] As a result, the form and content of the communication reproduces terrorists' intended meanings. Moeller posits that governments frame discussions of terrorism in the media.[20] But it seems that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the relationships between these two processes was more complex. Social norms were reflected in media coverage of terrorism, but the case of Russian revolutionary terrorism examined in this thesis reflects a counter-argument to Moeller's. In a similar case, John Merriman's study of the bombing of the Café Terminus in Paris in 1894 has shown that although the conservative press generally criticised the bomber Émile Henry and acclaimed his execution, the 'cult' of Henry was cultivated not only by anarchists, but also in the mainstream press.[21]

Nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary terrorists made use of modern technologies. Additionally, Frithjof Benjamin Schenk has argued that nineteenth-century Russian terrorists exploited concerns about the empire's vulnerabilities by attacking its railways, a key element of its modern infrastructure and technology.[22] Employing modern bomb technology, nineteenth-century Russian terrorists exploited contemporary concerns about the dangers modern technologies posed to civilisation. Lindsay Clutterbuck considered the use of advances in bomb technology and the organisation of terrorist acts into campaigns as signifiers of modernity when

[16] Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid, *Terrorist Histories: Individuals and Political Violence since the 19th Century* (Abingdon, 2017), p. 252
[17] Nic Dháibhéid, *Terrorist Histories*, pp. 11-13
[18] Susan D. Moeller, *Packaging Terrorism: Co-opting the News for Politics and Profit* (Chichester, 2009), p. 182
[19] Ibid., p. 51
[20] Ibid., p. 183
[21] John Merriman, *The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror* (London, 2009), p. 204
[22] Frithjof Benjamin Schenk, 'Attacking the Empire's Achilles Heels: Railroads and Terrorism in Tsarist Russia', *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 232-233

comparing Russian and Irish revolutionary terrorism in the late nineteenth century.[23] It is clear that terrorists' observations of other terrorists' activities in this period were important and this thesis will explore this issue in greater depth. However, modern explosive technologies, tactics, and symbolic targets of modernity were not the only modern aspects of Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period and, as historians have shown, Russian revolutionary terrorists fused these modern technologies with older ideas about the state and tyranny in their actions and justifications.

The most infamous act of terrorism in Russian revolutionary history was the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881. After several failed attempts, on 1 March of that year, the terrorist group *Narodnaia volia* (usually translated as 'The People's Will') were finally successful, killing the tsar with a bomb thrown under his carriage. Historians have often seen this event as the culmination of decades of growing political awareness and revolutionary activity, which had been met by harsh repression and censorship. In his book *Roots of Revolution*, first published in 1952, Franco Venturi traced the roots of attempts to assassinate the tsar to the Decembrist Revolt. Venturi believed this event had a profound impact upon mid-nineteenth-century Russian writers and thinkers, echoing in their thought and political activism over a long period as a symbol of resistance to the regime.[24] As Venturi suggested, both the history and living heritage of revolutionary acts influenced Russian revolutionary activism long after the acts themselves. These acts retained cultural relevance particularly in stagnating social and political conditions.

1881 marked an important juncture in the history of Russian revolutionary terrorism for a number of reasons, not least that it led to the decimation of *Narodnaia volia*. Indeed, Venturi concludes his expansive history of populist and socialist movements in the nineteenth century with the execution of the conspirators and Derek Offord passes over this period quickly in his study of the nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary movement, positioning the tsar's assassination as the high point of revolutionary activity.[25] Most of the organisation's Executive Committee were arrested shortly after the assassination. Sofia Perovskaia, Andrei Zheliabov, Nikolai Kibalchich, Nikolai Rysakov, and Timofey Mikhailov were all found guilty and hanged on 3 April 1881, and Gessia Gelfman had her sentence commuted to life

[23] Lindsay Clutterbuck, 'The Progenitors of Terrorism: Russian Revolutionaries or Extreme Irish Republicans', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2004), pp. 154-81

[24] Franco Venturi, *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in 19th century Russia*, trans. Francis Haskell. With a revised introduction by the author. (London, 2001), p. 7

[25] Derek Offord *Nineteenth-Century Russia: Opposition to Autocracy* (Harlow, 1999)

imprisonment because she was pregnant at the time.[26] Vera Figner was arrested in 1883, imprisoned in the Shlisselburg fortress, sent into internal exile in 1904, and exiled from Russia in 1906.[27] Increased repression under Tsar Alexander III, who was more conservative than his father and relied on reactionary advisors such as the Procurator of the Holy Synod Konstantin Pobedonostsev, thwarted many efforts at revolutionary activism.[28] Derek Offord suggests that 'despair' led to ideological and strategic change among revolutionaries and notes that many revolutionaries abandoned their activism in the 1880s or turned to ideas such as the pacifist Christian anarchism of the writer Lev Tolstoy.[29] However, to neglect this period after 1881 is to misrepresent the importance of revolutionary activism in the last two decades of the nineteenth century in Russia.

The idea that revolutionaries after 1881 borrowed heavily from the heritage of populism is an old one.[30] Attempting to understand the revolutionary movement in the 1880s, Offord suggested that revolutionaries in the 1880s struggled to make sense of this heritage, lacking ideological 'clarity' and acting out of 'desperation'.[31] High-profile acts of terrorism in Russia largely ceased after 1881 until the beginning of the twentieth century, except the attempt by remaining members of *Narodnaia volia* to assassinate Tsar Alexander III in 1887. However, Anna Geifman has shown that terrorists and terrorist propagandists of the early years of the twentieth century shared their emphasis on individual heroism and martyrdom with those of *Narodnaia volia*.[32] In addition to sharing values with their predecessors and revolutionaries' understanding of their own history and heritage, the actual continuities of personnel remained significant across the period between the 1880s and 1917, as well as beyond in some cases. Recent biographies of important figures within the Russian revolutionary movement, including terrorists and terrorist propagandists, have illustrated how tracing an individual's revolutionary career in long-term perspective can illustrate the links between different phases of revolutionary history. Lynn Harnett's biography of the *Narodnaia volia* member Vera Figner, who was arrested and imprisoned for her political activism in 1883, has shown how continuities in both

[26] Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, pp. 2-4, p. 93, and p. 96
[27] Ibid., p. 720
[28] Norman M. Naimark, *Terrorists and Social Democrats: The Russian Revolutionary Movement under Alexander III* (Cambridge MA, 1983), p. 15
[29] Derek Offord, *The Russian Revolutionary Movement in the 1880s* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 78-9
[30] For example: Donald W. Treadgold, 'The Populists Refurbished', *Russian Review*, vol. 10, no. 3 (1951), pp. 185-96
[31] Offord, *Russian Revolutionary Movement in the 1880s*, p. 1, p. 82, and p. 38
[32] Anna Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1894-1917* (Princeton NJ, 1993), p. 46

ideas and practices characterised her political activities in different periods of her life. Hartnett linked Figner's belief in the limited justifications of terrorism and a feeling of responsibility for the increase in terrorism in the early years of the twentieth century to her desire to leave Russia after her release from imprisonment.[33] Robert Henderson has also shown that Vladimir Burtsev, while not officially a member of *Narodnaia volia*, identified strongly with their beliefs in the early-1880s and his biography of the writer and publicist similarly illustrates how Burtsev's beliefs, values, and practices retained constant characteristics across his life.[34] Revolutionaries from this generation continued to play important roles in the Russian revolutionary movement and its debates on terrorism well into the twentieth century, despite the fact that the actual practice of terrorism had been passed on to a new generation.

Many scholars have sought to understand why nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary terrorism elected to carry out acts of terrorism instead of pursuing other types of political or social activism. Understanding who the revolutionaries were and what they hoped to achieve by their activism is crucial to understanding this process. The historian Marc Raeff located the origins of the *intelligentsia*, the loosely- and variously-defined social group to which many revolutionaries might be said to have belonged, and its desire to change Russian society in the state service reforms of Tsar Peter III in 1762, which left nobles without a guarantee of employment in the state apparatus. Raeff claimed that some nobles looked to Western philosophy for new ideas about how to live, which only exacerbated their alienation from the tsarist regime and later fed into revolutionary movements in the nineteenth century.[35] At a time of strict censorship, many writers used literature and literary criticism to circumvent prohibitions against the discussion of social and political issues in the press. Ivan Goncharov's novel *Oblomov* (1859) depicted the feeling of purposeless paralysing nobles in the mid nineteenth century, finding themselves 'superfluous men' in a changing society. The novel's protagonist rarely left his room, if indeed he had even left his bed. Nikolai Dobroliubov's famous essay '*Chto takoe oblomovshchina?'* ('What is Oblomovism?'), published in the journal *Otechestvennye zapiski* (*Notes of the Fatherland*) in 1859, described Oblomov as suffering from '[u]tter inertness resulting from apathy towards everything that goes on in the world. The cause of this apathy lies partly in Oblomov's external position…that he is a

[33] Lynn Ann Hartnett, *The Defiant Life of Vera Figner: Surviving the Russian Revolution* (Bloomington IN, 2014), pp. 189-90
[34] Robert Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev and the Struggle for a Free Russia: A Revolutionary in the Time of Tsarism and Bolshevism* (London, 2017), p. 14
[35] Marc Raeff, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-century Nobility* (New York, 1966), pp. 167-71

gentleman'.[36] Dobroliubov's essay, like many other, formed a part of important discourses of social criticism in Russian among members of the *intelligentsia* and despite dying at a young age, Dobroliubov wrote about many political issues framed as literary criticism, including many articles for the popular journal *Sovremennik* (*The Contemporary*).[37]

The reign of Alexander II (1855-1881) introduced some social, political, and economic reforms to the Russian Empire, including some expanded freedoms for the press, reforms to the judicial system, the easing of some regulations at the universities, and the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861, in which the serfs were freed from the land but forced to pay reparations for their freedom.[38] Whether or not these reforms reflected genuine liberalising tendencies or were merely attempts to prop up the ailing social, political, and economic systems, some young radicals reacted to them with the anticipation of further reform.[39] Some relaxation to censorship laws expanded opportunities for publishing activities, however, the emigration became an important source of social and political criticism, such as in the case of Herzen and Nikolai Ogarëv, who edited the famous émigré journal *Kolokol* (*The Bell*) from abroad.

Central to many radicals' and revolutionaries' visions for revolution were the *narod* (the people). Theorists generally agreed that peasants, who were usually seen to be the *narod*, held revolutionary potential, however some theorists believed their inherent conservatism needed to be overcome to realise this.[40] Utopian visions often incorporated idealised visions of the *obshchina* (peasant commune), seeing it as a proto-socialist unit of organisation, though some observers noted that the *obshchina* was problematic, not least because some peasants hated it, but also because many communes did not live up to their ideal nature.[41] In the debate over the nature of revolution, the anarchist Mikhail Bakunin argued that peasants did not need to be taught socialist ideas as they already possessed a pure ideology, whereas the socialist Peter Lavrov, editor of the journal *Vpered!* (*Forward!*), instead argued that

[36] Nikolai Dobroliubov, 'What is Oblomovism?', in Thomas Riha (ed), *Reading Russian Civilization: Vol. 2 Imperial Russia, 1700-1917* (Chicago IL, 1964), p. 344
[37] Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, p. 189
[38] Catherine Evtuhov et al., *A History of Russia: Peoples, Legends, Events, Forces* (Boston MA, 2004), pp. 412-20
[39] Abbott Gleason, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (Chicago IL, 1983), p. 52
[40] Offord, *Nineteenth-Century* Russia, p. 74
[41] Alan Kimball, 'The First International and the Russian *Obshchina*', *Slavic Review*, vol. vol. 32, no. 3 (1973), pp. 507-8

peasants needed education in broad concepts of socialism in order to understand its relevance beyond their locality.[42]

As a result of their belief in the centrality of the *narod*, an important episode in the history of the political activism of those who took up terrorism was the *khozhdenie v narod* (movement to the people) of the 1870s, a loose but widespread and decentralised response to a desire to act. Small groups of students, numbering several thousand in total, travelled into the countryside in the summer of 1874 to live and work among the peasants and spread ideas about socialism and revolution.[43] 1874 was the most important year in this activism, but similar activities had also taken place the previous year. These young activists were known as *narodniki*, from the Russian word *narod* meaning people, usually in the sense of the peasantry, and usually translated as 'populists' by historians. Some *narodniki* also carried out agitation and education among factory workers, incorporating workers into their broad definition of the *narod*.[44] The movement failed for several reasons. The peasants were not responsive to their activities, being either uninterested or fearful of police reprisals. Daniel Field has cautioned historians not to overemphasise the naivety of the *narodniki*, arguing that peasants did not seek out opportunities to denounce propagandists or always co-operate with police. He argued that external pressures on peasants made it impossible for them to engage with revolutionary propaganda and that the underlying naivety which caused their failure was the fact that they set themselves an impossible task.[45] The *narodniki* were not prepared for hard work, so some went home, and they were not able to disguise themselves as real peasants or workers because of their bizarre living arrangements, fictitious family groups, behaviour, and appearance, often dressing inappropriately poorly. This made it easy for the police to prevent their activities and eventually arrest many of them.[46]

While propaganda activities remained important to these revolutionaries, many former propagandists added terrorism to their revolutionary activism as a result of the failure of this activism. Deborah Hardy has argued that the psychological need for revolutionaries to validate their existence in the wake of this, and not ideological priorities, caused them to embrace terrorism.[47] Hardy suggested they were

---

[42] Offord, *Russian Revolutionary Movement in the 1880s*, p. 12 and pp. 1-2
[43] Daniel Field, 'Peasants and Propagandists in the Russian Movement to the People of 1874', *JMH*, vol. 59, no. 3 (1987), p. 415
[44] Pamela Sears McKinsey, 'From City Workers to Peasantry: The Beginning of the Russian Movement "To the People"', *Slavic Review*, vol. 38, no. 4 (1979), pp. 629-649
[45] Field, 'Peasants and Propagandists', p. 416
[46] Siljak, *Angel of Vengeance*, pp. 85-6
[47] Deborah Hardy, *Land and Freedom: The Origins of Russian Terrorism, 1876-1879* (New York, 1987), p. 129

particularly drawn to messianism, obsessed with heroism, and attracted by the 'close-knit' community terrorist activities offered, identifying repeated references in these terrorists' memoirs to an 'irresistible force' drawing them to terrorism.[48] Individual action and a belief in the necessity of immediate action came to characterise their terrorism. Claudia Verhoeven has suggested that their terrorism reflected their impatience, believing revolution was needed urgently in order to prevent further capitalist development which would prevent revolution.[49] Other Russian revolutionary contemporaries opposed the use of terrorism on the grounds that they precluded mass revolutionary participation.[50] Morrissey, however, has argued that the 1905 Revolution marked a change in students' enthusiasm for individual actions in the revolutionary process.[51] Prior to 1917, Russian Marxists had become an important force in the Russian revolutionary movement and their leaders were usually opposed to terrorism on ideological grounds. Changing attitudes towards individual action in the form of terrorism, therefore, invite further analysis.

Building on existing scholarship in the field of Russian revolutionary history and the history of terrorism, this thesis will examine the writing and publishing work of Russian revolutionary terrorists and their close colleagues after 1881 as rooted in the political ideas and modern terrorist practices of the preceding period. While historians have seen the influence of this heritage on later forms of revolutionary terrorism, it will explore in greater depth how these different periods or spheres of terrorist activity were linked through personnel. Seeking to deconstruct the barrier of 1881, a juncture formed by the assassination of the tsar and his replacement by a more conservative and reactionary ruler, this thesis will consider the emigration as a site of the continuation of practices of writing and representing Russian revolutionary terrorism. Drawing on historians' arguments that modern forms of terrorism had been established among Russian revolutionaries prior to 1881, it will suggest their use of modern media technologies, mass production, and transport networks meant that Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period was a transnational phenomenon.

---

[48] Hardy, *Land and Freedom*, xiii and p. 157

[49] Claudia Verhoeven, 'Time of Terror, Terror of Time: On the Impatience of Russian Revolutionary Terrorism (Early 1860s-Early 1880s)', *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 254-5 and p. 260

[50] James Ryan, *Lenin's Terror: The Ideological Origins of Early Soviet State Violence* (Abingdon, 2012), p. 15

[51] Susan K. Morrissey, *Heralds of Revolution: Russian Students and the Mythologies of Radicalism* (Oxford, 1998), p. 123

ii The Russian Revolutionary Emigration as a Transnational Phenomenon

Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the emigration was a significant element of the Russian revolutionary movement. As a result of tsarist oppression, individuals who opposed the regime had long emigrated, whether temporarily or permanently, for a variety of reasons. Communities of émigrés formed across Europe and the US. Switzerland was a popular destination for émigrés and in the 1870s hosted the most significant community of Russians abroad. J.M. Meijer collated data from a number of sources on the Russian community in Zurich between 1870 and 1873 and combined it with anecdotal evidence from Russian émigrés' diaries and memoirs, finding that by 1873, around 300 Russians lived in Zurich, of whom around 250 were students.[52] Medicine was a popular subject of study, especially among women who were not permitted to study it in Russia. However, the composition of this community changed when the Russian government declared all degrees awarded there to be invalid in Russia.[53] Despite this, Russian revolutionaries continued to settle in Swiss cities such as Geneva and Zurich in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including individuals discussed in this thesis. Paris was another important centre of the revolutionary emigration and in the twentieth century hosted the Central Committee of the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party. Historians have shown that the Russian government continued to harass revolutionaries in emigration through surveillance and attempted to work with foreign governments to persecute them, demonstrated by the records of the Paris *Préfecture de police* although the Russian secret police abroad worked with other foreign police forces.[54]

Communities of revolutionary émigrés had a different socio-economic makeup to the largest communities of émigrés from the Russian Empire, who were largely poor. Jews made up a large proportion of Eastern European emigrants in the late nineteenth century as a result of pogroms and anti-Semitic state policies, though there were also many Jewish revolutionaries.[55] New York became home to a large Jewish community in the nineteenth century.[56] Similarly, Gerry Black has estimated that there were about 35,000 Jews living in London's East End in 1880, a number

[52] J.M. Meijer, *Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zuerich (1870-1873). A Contribution to the Study of Russian Populism* (Assen, 1955), p. 1
[53] Ibid., p. 1
[54] For example, see: Robert Henderson, 'International Collaboration in the Persecution of Russian Political Émigrés: The European Pursuit of Vladimir Burtsev', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 22, no. 1 (2009), p. 21-36 and Woodford McClellan, *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (London, 1979)
[55] Hasia Diner, *The Jews of the United States: 1654 to 2000* (Berkeley CA, 2004), p. 89 and p. 96
[56] Ibid., p. 105

which grew to about 120,000 thirty years later with the arrival of mostly poor Eastern European Jews.[57] Alongside their large populations of emigrants from the Russian Empire, London and New York hosted important communities of Russian revolutionary émigrés, such as the Russian Free Press Fund, whose members feature prominently in this thesis.

Revolutionaries, including terrorists and their supporters, settled in countries and cities with more broadly tolerant attitudes towards their political beliefs. Bernard Porter described British policy towards political refugees in this period as broadly sympathetic and 'entirely undiscriminating'.[58] Anti-immigration policy in this period primarily targeted poor migrants and even the 1905 Aliens Act did not really restrict émigré political activity. Revolutionary émigrés tended to come from wealthier backgrounds and could support themselves by writing, lecturing, and offering private tuition.[59] The revolutionary emigration in London was not a uniquely Russian phenomenon and in England there were also revolutionaries from other European countries. Some incidents did occur between the British government and political émigrés, but these only seem to have occurred where the content of revolutionary publications seemed particularly offensive or dangerous. For example, in 1881 the German socialist advocate of terrorism as 'propaganda by the deed' as a catalyst for revolution, Johann Most, was arrested and imprisoned for writing an article in his newspaper *Freiheit* in which he praised those who had assassinated the tsar. Similarly, in 1898 the Russian writer and publicist Vladimir Burtsev was sentenced to hard labour for calling for the assassination of Tsar Nicholas II. As Britain was an important centre of pro-terrorist publishing, the activities of revolutionary émigrés who settled there will be the primary focus of this thesis. This thesis will also explore the extent to which British society tolerated Russian pro-terrorist publishing in this period.

The very existence of large communities of émigrés of all backgrounds from the Russian Empire abroad and their local and national influences means that the experience of revolution in transitional space did not conform to usual chronologies. This thesis, therefore, will explore the impact of Russian revolutionary terrorism abroad after the Revolutions of 1917 up to 1926, guided by the publication of novels and stories about terrorism and the members and associates of the RFPF who lived through and beyond the Revolutions of 1917.

---

[57] Gerry Black, 'Health and Medical Care of the Jewish Poor in the East End of London, 1880-1914', *Jewish Historical Studies*, vol. 36 (1999/2000), pp. 93-111

[58] Bernard Porter, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 2

[59] For example, Nikolai Chaikovskii, a member of the RFPF, taught languages. Middlesex City and County Directory, 1894. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 13 July 2018]

Transnational approaches are useful in the study of the Russian revolutionary emigration, including terrorist networks, for several reasons. Historians have already illustrated how Russian revolutionary terrorist activities crossed borders in this period. Groups planning terrorism from abroad in the early years of the twentieth century included the Socialist Revolutionary Party's Combat Organisation, the *Boevaia organizatsiia*, and the *Chernoe znamia* (Black Banner) anarchist-communist group.[60] Transnational approaches offer the opportunity to re-evaluate historical phenomena using alternative spatial analyses, the effect of which can highlight the importance of the local, reveal alternative globalising forces operating outside of state control, which Constance Bantman has described as 'alter-globalisation', and provide useful alternatives to entrenched narratives, by providing alternative spatial and temporal reference points.[61] Fredric S. Zuckerman and Pietro Di Paola have illustrated the transnational scope of political policing and transnational political action against terrorism in this period and this thesis will aim to build on research complementing examinations of state-sponsored transnationalism.[62] As illustrated by Alex Butterworth, the histories of fin de siècle radicalism and revolutionary movements across Europe were interlinked at numerous moments throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[63] Transnational approaches are therefore useful in order to re-orient understanding of national revolutionary movements as well as draw broader conclusions.

Following Patricia Clavin's argument that people must remain central to transnational history, even where the topic is the transfer of money or goods, this study will attempt to show how people interacted with publications by reading or distributing them where possible.[64] It will use an actor centred approach, tracing individuals' careers and networks in order to uncover new connections and re-evaluate the significance of transnational networks to publishing activities. Constance Bantman and Bert Altena suggest that taking an approach centred on the individual is particularly well-suited to study transnational anarchist movements as the individuals within these networks, and not institutions, were the nodes at which

---

[60] Paul Avrich, *The Russian Anarchists* (Princeton NJ, 1967), p. 286. For a short time in 1905, *Chernoe znamia* were based in Geneva and published an issue of their newspaper there.

[61] Constance Bantman, *The French Anarchists in London, 1880-1914: Exile and Transnationalism in the First Globalisation* (Liverpool, 2013), p. 189

[62] Fredric S. Zuckerman, *The Tsarist Secret Police Abroad: Policing Europe in a Modernising World* (Basingstoke, 2002); Pietro Di Paola, 'The Spies Who Came in from the Heat: The International Surveillance of the Anarchists in London', *EHQ*, vol. 37, no. 2 (2007), pp. 189-215

[63] Alex Butterworth, *The World that Never Was: A True Story of Dreamers, Schemers, Anarchists and Secret Agents* (London, 2010)

[64] Patricia Clavin, 'Defining Transnationalism', *CEH*, vol. 14, no. 4 (2005), p. 422

transnational connections were made.[65] This approach is usefully applied to the networks of the RFPF, which were informal and constantly changing similar to the case of Italian anarchists, examined by Pietro Di Paola, who has argued that their activities were strongest in cultural activities such as myth-making, martyrology, theatre, and education.[66] Tracing individuals' connections rather than institutional activities or links is more suitable for the analysis of revolutionary, and particularly terrorist, networks.

Also important to this research is the idea of imagined transnationalism, linked to what Akira Iriye has called 'global consciousness', a mentality fostered by international organisations, but a phenomenon distinct from globalisation.[67] The work of Davide Turcato and Ruth Kinna illustrates that both national identity and the transnational contexts in which revolutionary political ideas were formed shaped late-nineteenth century anarchism.[68] Di Paola has argued that in the case of Italian émigré anarchists, their primary concern remained Italy.[69] Robert Gerwarth and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt have also argued that most terrorist groups throughout the twentieth century conceptualised their own activities in a transnational context.[70] This thesis will develop this idea by looking at how Russian revolutionary terrorists and terrorist propagandists imagined their activities to be transnational and how this shaped their publishing activities. Foreign observers also viewed the threat of the methods and ideas of terrorism spreading transnationally in this period, which shaped their responses to émigré revolutionaries.[71] Many Russian revolutionaries of this era imagined their activities to be transnational and ascribed to revolutionary political ideologies which were internationalist in scope. This thesis will also examine the tensions between national causes and transnational ideologies from the

---

[65] Constance Bantman and Bert Altena, 'Introduction: Problematising Scales of Analysis in Network-Based Social Movements', in Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (Abingdon, 2015), p. 9

[66] Pietro Di Paola, *The Knights Errant of Anarchy: London and the Italian Anarchist Diaspora (1880-1917)* (Liverpool, 2013), p. 9

[67] Akira Iriye, *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World* (Berkeley CA, 2002), p. 197

[68] Davide Turcato, 'Nations without Borders: Anarchists and National Identity', in Bantman and Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn*, pp. 25-42; Ruth Kinna, 'Kropotkin's Theory of the State: A Transnational Approach', in Bantman and Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn*, pp. 43-61

[69] Di Paola, *Knights Errant of Anarchy*, p. 207

[70] Robert Gerwarth and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, 'Internationalising Historical Research on Terrorist Movements in Twentieth-century Europe', *European Review of History*, vol. 14, no. 3 (2007), p. 275

[71] Butterworth, *The World that Never Was*, p. 156

perspective of both émigré Russian revolutionary terrorists and their foreign sympathisers.

Further aligning with Pierre Yves-Saunier's argument that transnational history must always refer to the nation state in some form, this thesis will also investigate how Russian revolutionary terrorists in emigration were forced to confront the national identities of their foreign sympathisers.[72] The study of organisations which crossed national boundaries but whose activities were shaped by political and social interactions within particular nation states is key to this research. The search for new audiences and sympathisers in different countries was another important aspect of revolutionary political activism in the late nineteenth century and Alexander Sedlmaier also argued that individuals such as Johann Most, who published his newspaper *Freiheit* in London, turned to transnational propaganda because their own experiences of state repression and exile made them look for different audiences.[73] Thinking transnationally and responding to the challenges of living transnationally, were therefore both tactical and ideological in this period.

Patricia Clavin has observed that transnational history has generally been written about co-operation but has also demonstrated that transnationalism can also be defined by compromise.[74] As has been highlighted by Daniel Laqua in a study of German émigré socialist and anarchist publishing operations in London in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, tensions emerged between émigrés and British labour activists alongside efforts towards unity.[75] As this thesis will explore, competing interests can be seen in correspondence relating to Russian émigré terrorist publishing and had an effect on the production of these publications and their content. Transnational activities in all forms invite conflict from those of different nationalities and with different interests.

As Davide Turcato has shown in his work on Italian anarchist publishing, taking a transnational approach to revolutionary activities can help illustrate long-term continuities in personnel and publishing operations that is obscured when the focus is placed on activities within one nation state or émigré community as revolutionary

---

[72] Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History* (New York, 2013), p. 8

[73] Alexander Sedlmaier, 'The Consuming Visions of Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-century Anarchists: Actualising Political Violence Transnationally', *European Review of History*, vol. 14, no. 3 (2007), p. 283

[74] Clavin, 'Defining Transnationalism', p. 424; Patricia Clavin, *Securing the World Economy: The Reinvention of the League of Nations, 1920-1946* (Oxford, 2013)

[75] Daniel Laqua, 'Political Contestation and Internal Strife: Socialist and Anarchist German Newspapers in London, 1878-1910', in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), pp. 146-7

publications were often ephemeral due to shortages of funds. [76] Bantman, showing that French anarchist émigré networks were much larger than previously recognised, has argued that émigré communities were important to the survival of radical and revolutionary ideas, particularly during periods when political activities were suppressed in émigrés' home countries, such as by laws and circumstances in France.[77] Turcato argued that émigré networks were not just a method of survival, but a central component of anarchist activities and Carl Levy has suggested that nineteenth-century anarchism drew on heritages of cosmopolitan radicalism.[78] The publications produced by transnational actors reflected long-term trends in the movements and mindsets of radicals and revolutionaries.

As Helen Williams has shown, Russian revolutionary émigré publications were equally as short-lived as those of the Italian anarchist émigrés, suggesting a transnational approach may be relevant.[79] Williams similarly argued that émigré publishing activities were important components of transnational revolutionary activities, publishing abroad being attractive as a result of harsh penalties threatened by the tsarist regime.[80] For Williams, the appearance of news reports in émigré journals shows émigrés maintained links with activists in Russia, despite the obvious problems of verifying these reports, as they discussed events banned from the legal press.[81] Gary Michael Hamburg has also argued that there is evidence that contacts in Russia sent articles, information, and money, though the veracity of these sources is not always clear.[82] Bantman has examined publications as sites of interactions, looking at a number of publications resulting from collaborations from radical political thinkers of different national origins and political standpoints.[83] Though Williams, using evidence from memoirs suggests very little revolutionary material published abroad in this period reached Russia, émigré publications were important in ensuring the survival of ideas among revolutionary thinkers.[84]

As highlighted by Bantman in the introduction to a volume on the foreign political press in London, publishing activities carried out by political activists abroad

---

[76] Davide Turcato, 'Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement, 1885-1915', *International Review of Social History*, vol. 52, no. 3 (2007), p. 443, and p. 442
[77] Bantman, *French Anarchists in London*, p. 44
[78] Turcato, 'Italian Anarchism', p. 436; Carl Levy, 'Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 16, no. 3 (2011), pp. 269-70
[79] Helen Williams, '"Vesti i slukhi": The Russian Émigré press to 1905', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 13, no. 2 (2000), p. 48
[80] Ibid., pp. 46-7
[81] Ibid., pp. 58-9
[82] Gary Michael Hamburg, 'The London Emigration and the Russian Liberation Movement: The Problem of Unity, 1889-1897', *JGO*, vol. 25, no. 3 (1977), p. 324
[83] Bantman, *French Anarchists in London*, p. 79
[84] Williams, '"Vesti i slukhi"', p. 56

also created new spaces in which ideas could be shared. Not only were these publications a key component of cross-border discussions, but they also involved people from different nationalities as editors and contributors.[85] However, as Charlotte Alston points out in a study of the Russian émigré press in this volume, some Russian émigrés did not wish to become involved in discussions about British politics through their publications.[86] Although Thomas C. Jones and Bantman, highlight that engagement with issues affecting the host society was driven by a sense that French exiles might be forced to reside in Britain indefinitely, this thesis will primarily explore Russian émigrés core focus on events in Russia.[87]

Studies such as Barry Hollingsworth's of Russian revolutionary émigrés have illustrated how their links with foreign sympathisers enabled them to continue their revolutionary activism through publishing abroad.[88] James Hulse and Slatter have demonstrated that Russian revolutionary émigrés were well-connected in intellectual and radical political life in London in the 1880s and 1890s.[89] Like the majority of existing scholarship, these works have tended to focus on the relationships between important and influential individuals.[90] Scholarship exploring terrorism and the Russian revolutionary emigration has overwhelmingly focused on the work of one individual, the terrorist Sergei Stepniak. Both Donald Senese and John Slatter placed Stepniak at the centre of a wide network of Russian émigrés, English literary figures and political activists.[91] Though highly visible, terrorists and supporters of terrorism comprised only a small fraction of the Russian revolutionary emigration in the late

---

[85] Constance Bantman, 'Introduction: The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Local and Transnational Contexts', in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), pp. 10-1

[86] Charlotte Alston, 'News of the Struggle: The Russian Political Press in London, 1853-1921', in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), p. 165

[87] Thomas C. Jones and Constance Bantman, 'From Republicanism to Anarchism: 50 Years of French Exilic Newspaper Publishing', in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), pp. 91-111

[88] Barry Hollingsworth, 'The Society of Friends of Russian Freedom: English Liberals and Russian Socialists, 1890-1917', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. 3 (1970), pp. 45-64

[89] James W. Hulse, *Revolutionists in London: A Study of Five Unorthodox Socialists* (Oxford, 1970) and John Slatter, 'Stepniak and the Friends of Russia', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1983), p. 45

[90] James Smyth and Murdoch Rogers, 'Peter Petroff and the socialist movement in Britain, 1907–18', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), pp. 100-116; Jane E. Good, 'America and the Russian Revolutionary Movement, 1888-1905', *Russian Review*, vol. 41, no. 3 (1982), pp. 273-287;

[91] Donald Senese, 'S. M. Kravchinskii and the National Front Against Autocracy', *Slavic Review*, vol. 34, no. 3 (1975), pp. 506-22; John Slatter, 'Bears in the Lion's Den: The Figure of the Russian Revolutionary Emigrant in English Fiction, 1880-1914', *SEER*, vol. 77, no. 1 (1999), pp. 30-55

nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Regular disagreements occurred between Russian émigrés in this period. Iakov Priluker, a Russian Jewish supporter of reform who arrived in England in the summer of 1891, accused the RFPF and *Free Russia* of not campaigning for Jewish emancipation in Russia, to which they responded that they had always fairly covered the issue of religious freedom.[92] John Slatter argued that Priluker was unusual in emigrant politics because he did not identify with any particular party.[93] Partisanship was a problem in the emigration and Hamburg has argued that RFPF efforts to unite émigrés around liberalism failed as socialists felt they did not reflect the emerging mass politics.[94]

In contrast, recent research has shown that support for Russian revolutionaries extended much further than previously recognised. Surveying the reporting of Russian terrorism in the English press, Michael Hughes concluded that the English public were broadly sympathetic towards the Russian terrorists' cause, agreeing that terrorism in Russia was a direct result of the regime's reluctance to enact reform, encouraged by journalism such as commentary accompanying reports of the letter from *Narodnaia volia* to Tsar Alexander III.[95] Hughes also argued that any remaining support for the tsarist regime dissolved as levels of anti-Semitic violence increased in Russia during the 1880s.[96] Henderson also discovered that between four and five thousand people attended a rally in Hyde Park on 9 March 1890, including Russian emigrants and foreign sympathisers.[97] Henderson similarly found that the Free Russian Library, set up in Whitechapel in 1898, revealed the aims of its founder A.L. Teplov to improve living conditions and literacy among Russian and Polish immigrants living in Whitechapel, also attracted English readers such as Constance Garnett.[98]

The establishment of colonies practising utopian experimental communal living is one area of research that has illustrated the importance of the exchange of new social, economic, and political ideas in this period. Charlotte Alston's research into the impact of the ideas of the Russian writer Lev Tolstoy, who promoted a form

---

[92] John Slatter, 'Jaakoff Prelooker and The Anglo-Russian', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), p. 54
[93] Slatter, 'Jaakoff Prelooker', p. 56
[94] Hamburg, 'London Emigration', p. 337
[95] Michael J. Hughes, 'British Opinion and Russian Terrorism in the 1880s', *EHQ*, vol. 41, no. 2 (2011), p. 261
[96] Ibid., p. 264
[97] Robert Henderson, 'The Hyde Park Rally of 9 March 1890: A British Response to Russian Atrocities', *European Review of History*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2014), pp. 457-8
[98] Robert Henderson, ''For the Cause of Education': A History of the Free Russian Library in Whitechapel, 1898-1917', in Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (Oxford, 2013), p. 73 and pp. 78-9

of Christian anarchism, in Britain in this period has shown that some of these communities were important conduits for the transfer of ideas across national borders through publications and personal networks.[99] Members of the RFPF and their associates were often part of efforts to establish these utopian communities. Vasilii Zhuk (the pseudonym of the revolutionary Maslov-Stokoz) lived with the Tolstoyan community at Purleigh in Essex. Nikolai Chaikovskii had also helped to establish a utopian colony in Kansas in 1875, which survived until 1877. By his own admission, the hardship of the climate and living conditions played a role in the end of the colony, but Chaikovskii also blamed its failure on participants' lack of 'religious feeling'.[100]

Historians have illustrated that Russian revolutionaries operated within transnational networks, although they may not have used such terminology in their scholarship. Michael Futrell has shown that Russian émigrés established networks for smuggling and printing propaganda materials into Russia via Scandinavia and Finland from the 1860s onwards, also noting links between Russians producing terrorist propaganda in London and Swedish political activists in the 1890s.[101] David Burke has also shown that Russian revolutionary émigrés addressed a variety of audiences through very different publications. For example, Theodore Rothstein wrote both for mass-circulation newspapers as well as the *Social-Democrat*, the organ of the British Social Democratic Federation. Burke believed Rothstein was influential because he addressed many of the ideological problems experienced by British Marxists.[102] However, as Laqua has noted, while some British socialist organisations and publications may have aligned their work with that of radical émigrés, other members of the British left often avoided or excluded them.[103]

It is widely accepted that revolutionary movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries can be understood as transnational phenomena. This thesis will explore several different ways in which Russian revolutionary political activism centred on terrorism can be considered to have been transnational in the period

---

[99] Charlotte Alston, *Tolstoy and his Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement* (London, 2014)

[100] David Hecht, *Russian Radicals Look to America, 1825-1894* (Cambridge MA, 1947), pp. 202-6. Hecht use of Chaikovskii's own reflections on his trip to the US, published in Paris in 1929.

[101] Michael Futrell, *Northern Underground: Episodes of Russian Revolutionary Transport and Communications through Scandinavia and Finland, 1863-1917* (London, 1963), pp. 30-1. The earliest instance Futrell described was Herzen's son's activities in Stockholm in the 1860s.

[102] David Burke, 'Theodore Rothstein, Russian Emigré and British Socialist', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), p. 97

[103] Daniel Laqua, 'Political Contestation and Internal Strife', pp. 135-54

between 1881 and 1926. It will consider different types of transnational space. In terms of networks, this thesis will explore links between Russian émigrés as well as their links with foreigners. It will also examine transnational publishing about revolutionary terrorism by Russian revolutionary terrorists and their close colleagues in both Russian as well as in other languages. It will also consider different genres of writing about terrorism as a means by which representations Russian revolutionary terrorism spread transnationally. Though principally focusing on journalistic and propagandistic representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism, it will also incorporate analysis of fictional and literary representations, examining the blurred boundaries between the reception of works overtly claiming to depict real events and those which did not. Finally, it will also consider how Russian revolutionary terrorists and their close colleagues considered themselves to be part of a transnational revolutionary phenomenon or as operating in transnational contexts which required delineation. Transnational mentalities and imagined transnational spaces were at least as important as actual transnational political activism, networks, and operations.

Despite the transnational aims and operations of the Russian revolutionary movement, however, Bruno Naarden has argued that Western perceptions of Russia as backward and barbaric shaped transnational activism and ideas within networks of revolutionary socialists.[104] Naarden has also suggested that Russian revolutionaries were celebrated by revolutionary movements in Western Europe as representing the epitome of self-sacrifice and revolutionary heroism.[105] This thesis will explore this theme in a broader perspective, illustrating how it can be applied to Russian revolutionaries' other interactions in emigration. Despite this admiration of Russian revolutionaries, Naarden suggests that terrorism was seen as a characteristic of the Russian revolutionary movement which could not be transferred to Western European contexts.[106] Therefore, the tensions in transnational political activism remain an important subject of study.

iii Historiography, Theory, and Russian Revolutionary Terrorism

Though this thesis explores in part Russian revolutionaries' own attempts to historicise their terrorism, serious scholarly study of Russian revolutionary terrorism has taken place since the 1940s.[107] Until recently, historical studies of Russian

[104] Bruno Naarden, *Socialist Europe and Revolutionary Russia: Perception and Prejudice, 1848-1923* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 38 and p. 520
[105] Ibid., p. 38
[106] Ibid., p. 71
[107] Historian Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid has recognised the importance of historical consciousness in a much broader selection of case studies of individual terrorists across

revolutionary terrorism were dominated by biographies. An early example from Western historiography was David Footman's biography of the *Narodnaia volia* terrorist Andrei Zheliabov, first published in 1944. Footman used available published source materials such as memoirs and newspapers, but these materials do not easily facilitate in-depth research into terrorism beyond the actions of a few important individuals.[108] While Zheliabov did not leave a large body of published writings, other revolutionaries did, and this memoir literature has enabled historians to write biographies of other influential revolutionary theorists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century with links to revolutionary terrorists. Numerous political biographies of prominent Russian revolutionary theorists of the late nineteenth century such as Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Lavrov, and Peter Kropotkin have been written by both Russian and Soviet as well as Western scholars since the 1930s.[109] A small boom in writing such biographies occurred in the 1970s, new published collections of revolutionaries' writings and access to previously-closed archives in the Soviet Union permitting new research, for example with Evgeniia Taratuta and John Bachman producing new biographies of Stepniak.[110] Footman also produced a new edition of his biography of Zheliabov.[111] Until recently, biographies of Russian revolutionary women involved in terrorism were remarkably absent. Jay Bergman's biography of Vera Zasulich was one notable exception.[112] However, despite women such as Sofia Perovskaia appearing prominently in news reporting and memoir literature, as used by Footman, there remains no historical biography of this leading figure of *Narodnaia volia*. While non-Bolshevik revolutionaries were a politically sensitive topic in the Soviet Union, publishers in the 1970s began to reclaim revolutionary biography, as illustrated by Polly Jones in her study of the 'Fiery Revolutionaries' book series.[113] Taratuta had also published a biography of Ethel Lillian Voinich, the author of *The*

---

the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries. Nic Dháibhéid, *Terrorist Histories*, p. 249

[108] David Footman, *Red Prelude: A Life of A.I. Zhelyabov* (London, 1944)

[109] For example: N. Pirumova, *Mikhail Bakunin: Zhizn i deiatelnost* (Moscow, 1966), E.H. Carr, *Michael Bakunin* (London, 1937), Philip Pomper, *Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement* (Chicago, 1972), N.M. Pirumova, *Petr Alekseevich Kropotkin* (Moscow, 1972), and Martin A. Miller, *Kropotkin*, (Chicago, 1976). Pirumova's works made use of rich archival collections as well as the extensive published archival works published in the Soviet Union. Western historians such as Carr also benefitted from valuable published archival documents.

[110] Evgeniia Taratuta, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii: revoliutsioner i pisatel* (Moscow, 1973) and John Elliot Bachman, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii'.

[111] David Footman, *The Alexander Conspiracy: A Life of A.I. Zhelyabov* (LaSalle IL, 1974)

[112] Jay Bergman, *Vera Zasulich: A Biography* (Stanford CA, 1983)

[113] Polly Jones, 'The Fire Burns On? The "Fiery Revolutionaries" Biographical Series and the Rethinking of Propaganda in the Brezhnev Era', *Slavic Review*, vol. 74, no. 1 (2015), pp. 32-56

Gadfly, a popular book in the Soviet Union taught in schools.[114] This made it possible to publish on a more controversial political figure. The 1970s represent a period of expansion in the field of Russian revolutionary terrorist biography, reflecting broader expansion in revolutionary biography, in both the Soviet Union and the West. Further biographies appeared in the 1980s: Donald Senese's study of Stepniak's life in emigration and Richard Spence's biography of the terrorist Boris Savinkov.[115]

The broader surge in interest in the 1970s in Russian revolutionary history was accompanied by greater interest in women, who were previously absent from the historical record. Historians have shown that women participated in revolutionary activities.[116] As a result of more recent research, Katy Turton has argued that although revolutionary women's activism was held back by domestic tasks or childcare these roles were politicised and that without their work in correspondence and smuggling, among other roles, 'the movement would have ceased to function.'[117] Studies of Russian revolutionary terrorists abroad have, in the past, neglected women. This thesis will consider foreign women's roles in supporting Russian revolutionary terrorist publishing activities, one aspect of women's activism in this field that is little investigated. Shannon Smith has shown that American women played important roles in supporting Russian revolutionary émigrés and their political activism and this thesis will expand on this, considering British women's work and the work of American women in more detail.[118]

In this period, the Socialist Revolutionary Party's BO was the most visible terrorist organisation in Russia, carrying out assassinations of high-profile individuals, including Minister of the Interior Dmitrii Sipiagin in 1902, Minister of the Interior Viacheslav von Plehve in 1904, and the tsar's uncle, Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, in 1905 alongside numerous other attempts on high-profile individuals. BO members also killed Georgii Gapon, the priest and police agent who had played an important role in the 1905 Revolution as a catalyst for workers' demands in St Petersburg. Anna Geifman has revealed that SR conceptions of

---

[114] Evgeniya Alexandrovna Taratuta, *Etel Lilian Voinich* (Moscow, 1960)

[115] Donald Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii: The London Years* (Newtonville MA, 1987) and Richard B. Spence, *Boris Savinkov: Renegade on the Left* (New York, 1991)

[116] Ground-breaking works focusing on Russian revolutionary women included: Barbara Alpern Engel, *Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, 1983) and Richard Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism 1860-1930* (Princeton NJ, 1978)

[117] Katy Turton, *Family Networks and the Russian Revolutionary Movement, 1870–1940* (Basingstoke, 2018), p. 194

[118] Shannon Smith, 'From Relief to Revolution: American Women and the Russian-American Relationship, 1890-1917', *Diplomatic History*, vol. 19, no. 4 (1995), pp. 601-16

terrorism encompassed a wide range of activities, including bank robberies.[119] This approach incorporates activities which acquired terrorist significance through political associations and media representations. Geifman also highlighted the importance of studying terrorism as a strategy or ideology in itself, showing that much terrorist activity in Russia in this period was decentralised, not all local groups carrying out terrorist activities in small towns or rural areas had much, if any, ideological commitment, and that even the politically moderate Kadets (the *Konstitutsionno-demokraticheskaia partiia,* or the Constitutional Democrats) embraced terrorism in some forms.[120] Despite Lenin's support for robberies as a form of terror, Geifman discovered Bolshevik or Bolshevik-affiliated groups were behind much of this type of activity.[121] Taking a wide view on what could be considered terrorism, Geifman categorised more than 21,000 acts in Russia from 1900 and 1910.[122]

Recent historical biographies have shown how it is possible to use individuals' lives to explore the wider history of Russian revolutionary terrorism. Ana Siljak's biography of Zasulich explored the impact of previous arrests and imprisonment and exposure to political ideas through self-education circles and the terrorist advocate Sergei Nechaev on the development of Zasulich's justifications for her attempt to assassinate the governor of St Petersburg.[123] Claudia Verhoeven's biography of Dmitrii Karakozov similarly placed his attempt to assassinate the tsar in 1866 in the context of Karakozov's life and revolutionary circle.[124] Sally Boniece's work on women terrorists in the early twentieth century and the construction of memory and martyrdom has also shown how the study of individual terrorists and acts and their echoes can tell us about justifications for revolutionary activity.[125]

Historians have shown that terrorists and propagandists consciously framed their acts in terms of the individual carrying them out for public consumption. Karakozov wore a peasant coat when he tried to assassinate the tsar so as to appear

---

[119] Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, pp. 21-2

[120] Anna Geifman, 'The Anarchists and the "Obscure Extremists', in Anna Geifman, *Russia Under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion, 1894-1917* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 93-110; 'The Social Democrats and Terror', in Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, pp.84-122 ; 'The Kadets and Terrorism, 1905-1907', *JGO*, vol. 36, no. 2 (1988), pp. 248-267; Anna Geifman, 'The "Seamy Side" of the Revolution: The Criminal Element, the Psychologically Unbalanced, and Juveniles', in Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, pp. 154-180

[121] Geifman, 'The Social Democrats and Terror', p. 113

[122] Anna Geifman, 'The Liberal Left Opts for Terror', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 25, no. 4 (2013), p. 550

[123] Siljak, *Angel of Vengeance*

[124] Verhoeven, *Odd Man Karakozov*

[125] Sally Boniece, 'The Spiridonova Case: 1906: Terror, Myth, and Martyrdom', in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), pp. 127-62 and 'The Shesterka of 1905-06: Terrorist Heroines of Revolutionary', *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 172-91

more threatening as he was disguised.[126] Lynn Patyk has argued that female terrorists' actions were 'more transgressive' because they contravened social norms and that they were particularly threatening because they were disguised as 'themselves', having renounced the social norms of dress but using them as a disguise.[127] One example of this was Zasulich who disguised herself as a petitioner visiting General Trepov at his home in order to shoot him at close range using a pistol hidden in her cloak. Patyk's assessment fits within broader accepted views that women radicals and revolutionaries in this period rebelled through their refusal to conform to dress norms.[128] Having disguised herself in her outfit when she shot Trepov, Zasulich then rejected the efforts of her lawyer to dress her as a romantic heroine for the courtroom. She rejected her lawyer's suggestion that she wear a cloak but agreed not to bite her nails in the courtroom as a concession to her appearance to the jury.[129] She did not agree to his efforts to influence her public image, although she recognised the effects these decisions might have. Dress was, therefore, an important consideration for a terrorist.

Examining terrorists' self-fashioning and propaganda images, Susan Morrissey and Daniel Beer have both illustrated how discourses of morality were central to this process and determined the targets and forms of actual terrorist acts. Morrissey argued that 'innocence', encompassing both the opposite of guilt and purity, determined the sphere of terrorist action in Russia in the early years of the twentieth century, legitimating terrorists' actions and changing the definition of who was a legitimate target of terrorism.[130] However, Beer argued that this discourse of legitimate terrorism was beginning to break down in this period because the image of the moral terrorist was being eroded.[131] Later terrorists such as the Red Brigades in 1970s Italy, a left-wing revolutionary group, also justified their terrorism in terms of their own oppression and violence enacted upon them and positioned themselves as the saviours of the people.[132] Alessandro Orsini argued that the Red Brigades'

---

[126] Verhoeven, *Odd Man Karakozov*, pp. 106-7
[127] Lynn Ellen Patyk, 'Dressed to Kill and Die: Russian Revolutionary Terrorism, Gender, and Dress', *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), p. 195
[128] Morrissey, *Heralds of Revolution*, p. 19
[129] Richard Pipes, 'Trepov Shot', *Russian History*, Special Issue: The Trial of Vera Z., vol. 37, no. 1 (2010), p. 48
[130] Susan K. Morrissey, 'The "Apparel of Innocence": Toward a Moral Economy of Terrorism in Late Imperial Russia', *JMH*, vol. 84, no. 3 (2012), pp. 610-1
[131] Daniel Beer, 'The Morality of Terror: Contemporary Responses to Political Violence in Boris Savinkov's The Pale Horse (1909) and What Never Happened (1912)', *SEER*, vol. 85, no. 1 (2007), p. 45
[132] Alessandro Orsini, *Anatomy of the Red Brigades*, trans. Sarah J. Nodes (Ithaca NY, 2011), p. 14 and p. 30

experience of social dislocation amid post-war modernisation in Italy, creating the feeling of injustice that led to their terrorism.[133]

Links have been drawn between revolutionary terrorism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and state terror in the Soviet Union. Historians have often sited the origins of modern terrorism or terror in the French Revolution. Walter Laqueur argued that 'it also influenced latter-day terrorist though through its advocacy of violence, its scant regard for human life, and its belief that a few determined people could make a revolution; what did the fate of a few individuals matter if the future of twenty-five millions was at stake?'[134] All forms of terror and terrorism share in characteristics of symbolic power, which might be linked to the use of terror and violence by revolutionary governments. Philip Pomper saw the origins of Lenin's use of terror in his brother's involvement in the attempt to assassinate the tsar in 1887, which denied him access to education, brought him under police surveillance, and encouraged him to become a revolutionary. Pomper, a specialist in psychohistory, argued that Lenin 'imitated' his elder brother, though he did not follow his ideological legacy, founding his revolutionary programme on emotion and the desire for revenge against the tsarist regime.[135] While psychohistorical conclusions might be questioned, Pomper also emphasised the important link between personal experiences of revolutionary events and future activism. James Ryan, however, has suggested that violence was an important component of Lenin's ideology. His political programme could be adapted, but ideological and not pragmatic concerns directed any changes. Ryan argued that violence was a significant element of Lenin's counter-revolutionary programme, inspired by state terror in the French Revolution.[136] Ryan's research has illustrated that continuities of terror were complex and ideological transfer not straightforward. This is important as Lenin opposed the use of individual terrorism as a method of revolution but embraced the use of terror by the revolutionary state and specifically criticised Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries who encouraged its use.[137] However, this research illustrates the value of looking at terrorism as a category separate from political beliefs.

This thesis, particularly in its study of the RFPF and its work, will seek to move beyond the traditional biographies of well-known individuals in the Russian

---

[133] Orsini, *Anatomy of the Red Brigades*, pp. 117-8
[134] Laqueur, *Terrorism*, p. 23
[135] Philip Pomper, *Lenin's Brother: The Origins of the October Revolution* (New York, 2010), p. 201 and p. 204
[136] Ryan, *Lenin's Terror*, p. 6, p. 13, and p. 192
[137] V.I. Lenin, 'Revolutionary Adventurism', *Iskra*, no. 23, 1 August 1902. Marxists Internet Archive. https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1902/sep/01.htm [accessed 21 November 2018]

revolutionary movement. Historians have recognised the important role played by the RFPF and its members in establishing links between Russian revolutionary émigrés and their foreign sympathisers. This thesis will explore in more detail the activities of the RFPF in working with foreign sympathisers and publishing materials for them and in collaboration with them. However, it will also seek to place these activities within a wider context of transnational political activism using a case study approach. It will also seek to understand how activities abroad, supported by foreign sympathisers, supported or were connected to those aimed at audiences inside the Russian Empire or within the revolutionary emigration. It will attempt to illustrate the multi-faceted and complex nature of political activism, which relied on the personal relationships and contacts of various individuals whose stories have often been overlooked. This thesis will make some attempt to reincorporate women's activism into this narrative and understand their work and the importance of their networks and personal connections, though it makes no claim to have achieved a complete analysis of this area.

Additionally, this thesis will be inspired by scholarship drawing links across the revolutionary divide to explore the issue of writing and publishing works about Russian revolutionary terrorism in English before and after 1917. Like 1881, 1917 has often been portrayed as an impenetrable barrier, though in recent years scholars have begun to deconstruct this assumption. In its study of this literature, this thesis again will attempt to expand on knowledge of the interactions between different works by different authors, published at different times, linked by a publication context which was extremely receptive to fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism.

iv The Russian Free Press Fund and its Members

Members of the Russian Free Press Fund played important roles in transnational discourse of Russian revolutionary terrorism throughout the period covered by this thesis. Formed in London in the autumn of 1891, members of the RFPF wrote, published, and lectured on Russian revolutionary terrorism for a variety of audiences.[138] They worked closely with foreigners in the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and the Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom, forming one significant element of their transnational political activism. Members of the RFPF worked with foreign sympathisers on many different elements of their programme of activism, producing produced books, newspapers, and pamphlets in English,

[138] Vl. Burtsev, *Za sto let (1800-1896)*. *Sbornik po istorii politicheskikh i obshchestvennykh dvizhenii v Rossii* (London, 1897), p. 139

Russian, and other languages and organised public meetings and rallies to campaign against the brutalities of tsarist rule. Attempting to appeal to a variety of audiences, with a variety of aims in mind, the content of their propaganda has been well-explored by historians such as Charlotte Alston, Robert Henderson, and Luke Kelly, whose research has illustrated the power and appeal of humanitarian messages among British audiences in this period.[139]

Members of the RFPF and their close revolutionary colleagues shared generational experiences which shaped their political activism and revolutionary publishing work. They began their political activism in the 1860s and early 1870s, often first becoming aware of radical and revolutionary ideas while at school. Prior to establishing the RFPF, most already knew each other through their previous political activism, having been members of the Chaikovskii circle of revolutionaries in the early 1870s. Historians of generations in other revolutionary contexts have identified shared experiences and values, including Gordon Wood who showed that the founders of the USA believed in the value of civilised and 'enlightened' social manners, in liberal arts education, and in serving the people, despite its difficulties.[140] In the Russian revolutionary context, Morrissey has illustrated how the student experience in late nineteenth-century Russia fostered political consciousness and models of self-representation.[141] Daniel Brower has shown that many radicals in this period had experience of higher education, either in universities or professional, technical, or military institutes, and associated radicalism with the highly educated.[142] As Tatiana Saburova and Ben Eklof have also demonstrated, many of these revolutionaries experienced Siberian exile, which shaped their later activism as a revolutionary generation.[143] Shared experiences in education and exile and the political identities and activism they fostered shaped the lives and revolutionary careers of activists such as the members of the RFPF.

Contemporaries often represented this revolutionary generation as unstable and irrational, such as In Ivan Turgenev's novel *Fathers and Sons* (1862). The 'sons',

---

[139] Charlotte Alston, '"A Great Host of Sympathisers": The Doukhobor Emigration and its International Supporters, 1895–1905', *JMEH*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2014), pp. 200-215, Henderson, 'Hyde Park Rally', pp. 451-66, and Luke Kelly, *British Humanitarian Activity in Russia, 1890-1923* (London, 2018)

[140] Gordon S. Wood, *Revolutionary Characters: What Made the Founders Different* (New York, 2006), pp. 12-6 and pp. 246-7

[141] Morrissey, *Heralds of Revolution*, p.228

[142] Daniel Brower, *Training the Nihilists: Education and Radicalism in Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca NY, 1978), pp. 37-8. Brower obtained data from early Soviet-era biographical dictionaries of revolutionaries.

[143] Tatiana Saburova and Ben Eklof, *Druzhba, semia, revoliutsiia: Nikolai Charushin i pokolenie narodnikov 1870-x godov* (Moscow, 2016)

or the 'nihilists' as Turgenev named them, rejected the style of political activism of the 'fathers' who had become politically aware during the reign of Nicholas I, when dissent was heavily suppressed.[144] Roy Foster has similarly identified Irish revolutionaries rejecting the constitutional and parliamentary approaches of previous generations hoping to gain greater autonomy for Ireland under British rule.[145] Richard Wortmann identified the theme of 'fatherlessness' and rejecting the older generation as tied to the old order in memoirs and diaries from this younger generation.[146] Fyodor Dostoevskii depicted their profound sense of social dislocation and their self-destructive and dangerous behaviours, for example in his novel *Besy* (*Demons*, also commonly *Devils* or *The Possessed*). Dostoevskii's novella *Notes from the Underground* also satirised Chernyshevskii's *What is to be Done?*. [147]

Reading cultures shaped the experiences of this revolutionary generation. Martin Miller described 'nihilism', their political ideas and activism, as combining 'a search for truth through intensive reading with an ostentatious attire, all of which had a rigidly oppositionist morality at its root'.[148] Historical biographies, such as Miller's study of Kropotkin's life, illustrate the importance of literature in encouraging future revolutionaries to question the regime's values.[149] Revolutionaries frequently testified to the power of reading in their memoirs and autobiographies.[150] Chernyshevskii's novel *What is to be Done?* offered utopian visions and blueprints for lifestyles and activism to revolutionaries, including the central character Vera Pavlovna's marriage of convenience, arranged in order to escape her family.[151] Zasulich was among those who attempted to mimic the lives of the book's characters, setting up a communal sewing shop modelled after Vera Pavlovna's venture in the novel.[152] The character Rakhmetov inspired some to adopt extreme ascetic lifestyles.[153] In the novel, Rakhmetov slept on a bed of nails and denied himself certain foods.[154] Historians have also referred to the novel as the 'bible' of the revolutionary movement in this

[144] Gleason, *Young Russia,* p. 80
[145] R.F. Foster, *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland, 1890-1923* (London, 2015), p. 2
[146] Richard Wortmann, *The Crisis of Russian Populism* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 4-6
[147] Derek Offord, 'Dostoevsky and Chernyshevsky', *SEER*, vol. 57, no. 4, p. 509
[148] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 87
[149] Ibid., p. 25 and pp. 28-9. Family members supplied the young Kropotkin with books.
[150] For example, in Goldenberg's 'Reminiscences' referenced in this chapter and held at the Leeds Russian Archive.
[151] Nikolai G. Chernyshevsky, *What is to be Done?*, trans. Michael R. Katz. Annotated by William G. Wagner. (Ithaca NY, 1989), pp. 143-5 and pp. 170-2
[152] Siljak, *Angel of Vengeance*, pp. 85-6
[153] Ibid., pp. 56-7
[154] Michael R. Katz and William G. Wagner, 'Introduction', in Nikolai G. Chernyshevsky, *What is to be Done?*, p. 28

period.[155] The types of representations of revolutionaries RFPF used in their later propaganda work reflected those in the literature they had read and discussed in the revolutionary circles of their youth.

While the members of the RFPF shared common experiences and revolutionary values, within their new community they forged new connections and established new revolutionary practices. In addition to their continuing revolutionary activism, RFPF members were a living link with the revolutionary past, having been a part of the revolutionary movement prior to 1881. This became especially important with the revival of terrorist activities in Russia under the auspices of the Socialist Revolutionary Party. Foster has argued that the revolutionary generation in Ireland 'lived on their memories' in the years afterwards.[156] This thesis will explore how RFPF members and associates used their influence in changed revolutionary contexts.

As previously mentioned, members of the RFPF have been the subject of historical scholarship, but the legacies of their community have received little attention. After Stepniak and Volkhovskii, the roles of the remaining members of the RFPF have frequently been overlooked and some details of their lives and revolutionary careers are relatively unknown but important to understanding the context of the activism and publishing work of the RFPF.

iv.i Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinskii (1851-1895)[157]

Sergei Kravchinskii was known by Russians and foreigners during his life in emigration by his pseudonym Stepniak (meaning 'man of the steppes'). A prolific writer, Stepniak's output included numerous books, articles, pamphlets, and a novel setting out his political programme, campaigning against tsarist rule, and depicting ethical terrorists and their activities. Many of his revolutionary colleagues memorialised him in biographical sketches, therefore much is known about his life and revolutionary career.[158] Stepniak's life and revolutionary career have proved to

[155] For example: Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia*, p. 89 and Ulam, *Prophets and Conspirators*, p. 135. Stites refers specifically to the novel's significance for women.

[156] Foster, *Vivid Faces*, p. 289

[157] Stepniak's biographer Evgeniia Taratuta noted that British encyclopaedias often cited his birth year as 1852, whereas Russian encyclopaedias used 1851. Taratuta also pointed out that there were disagreements over where he was born. These differences illustrate the difficulties in confirming some details of revolutionaries' early lives and the problems with trying to draw conclusions about their experiences. Taratuta, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, pp. 11-12

[158] Examples include a biography by RFPF member Leonid Shishko, published in Geneva in 1903, and a biography by *Chernyi peredel* member Lev Deich, published in Petrograd in 1919, which also included a short piece by Vera Zasulich.

be of great interest to historians, providing insights into émigré publishing activities in Geneva and London, the history of revolutionary terrorism, and foreigners' campaigns on behalf of the Russian revolutionary cause.[159]

Early in his revolutionary career, Stepniak took part in the Chaikovskii circle and edited the eponymous journal of the *Zemlia i volia* (Land and Freedom) group. Both of these groups were significant in the growth of widespread revolutionary activism in the 1870s.[160] He was then one of the first to set out in the *khozhdenie v narod* in August 1873 and was among those who left Russia as large numbers of the activists were arrested.[161] During his first emigration, Stepniak participated in an anarchist uprising in Italy led by Errico Malatesta and was sent to prison, though he was released in a general amnesty. While in prison, Stepniak became fluent in Italian, perhaps explaining why he later chose to live in Italy, having been forced to leave Geneva under police pressure.[162] When Zasulich shot the governor of St Petersburg in 1878, Stepniak wrote a pamphlet about it titled *Smert za smert* (*A Death for a Death*), depicting it as an act of self-defence. Then, Stepniak assassinated the head of the Third Section, the tsarist secret police, General Mezentsev by stabbing him in broad daylight in a park. His colleague Lev Deich supposedly persuaded him to do it outdoors, instead of at Mezentsev's office, the latter location would have made the act more similar to Zasulich's. Deich's plan made it less likely he would be caught immediately as he did not intend to be arrested, as Zasulich had planned. Stepniak's comrades continued to protest that he would almost certainly be caught, but he went ahead with his plan anyway.[163] Among some revolutionaries, Stepniak's decision to assassinate Mezentsev was unpopular; because they felt it was vengeance and did not reflect their policy of acting only on behalf of the *narod*, based on their own beliefs about what the masses wanted.[164] After assassinating Mezentsev, Stepniak published his pamphlet in St Petersburg, but left under pressure of the police searching for him.

---

[159] Evgeniia Taratuta's *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii* is the most complete and detailed biography of Stepniak, making use of archival resources in Moscow. John Elliot Bachman's PhD thesis 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', made use of archival resources in the US and published letters from Stepniak's archive. Focusing on Stepniak's work in London, there is also Donald Senese book *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*.

[160] Bachmann, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', p. 146, Bachman believed Stepniak 'helped set the tone of the paper', despite leaving Russia after the publication of the first issue.

[161] Bachman, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', p. 29

[162] Ibid., pp. 93-5. Bachman suggested Stepniak's knowledge of Italian would have helped him to evade police. (p. 174)

[163] Ibid., p. 120 and p. 124

[164] Ibid., pp. 122-3. Bachman cited a letter by Sergei Sinegub, one of the revolutionaries sentenced to hard labour at the famous Trial of the 193 of 1877-8 in response to the *khozhdenie v narod*, as evidence for opposition to Stepniak's intentions.

After spending time in Geneva and Milan, he arrived in London on 15 July 1884.[165] Though acknowledging that life in emigration shaped Stepniak's views, Donald Senese, author of a book about Stepniak's life in London, argued that his English associates only helped to consolidate and strengthen the views he already held before his move to London.[166] Members of *Chernii peredel* accused him of Jacobinism, arguing that even a constitution would simply be a new form of oppression for the peasantry.[167] Zasulich criticised Stepniak's political views, though they remained in contact and he passed on funds to the Red Cross of *Narodnaia volia*, which she administered alongside the Russian émigré revolutionary theorist Peter Lavrov.[168] Though Senese has argued that Stepniak's continued emphasis on the central role for individuals in revolution conflicted with other areas of his thought, this thesis will show that this was not entirely incompatible with his calls for propaganda work and the widespread distribution of revolutionary literature.[169]

Stepniak died in a railway accident in 1895 near his home in West London when he was hit by a train at a railway crossing on the way to visit his colleague Feliks Volkhovskii at home.[170] Despite the clear visibility down the line at the crossing, the inquest held a few days later found no evidence for murder or for suicide.[171] Members of the RFPF took the opportunity to memorialise Stepniak in their *Letuchie listki* and in *Free Russia* and his views on terrorism played an important role in this.

iv.ii Feliks Volkhovskii (1846-1914)

Feliks Volkhovskii's political activism began while he was a student in Moscow. There he had helped found the 'Society of the Ruble' with German Lopatin to distribute revolutionary propaganda among peasants.[172] In this respect, his early revolutionary career had been similar to those of several other members of the RFPF, focusing on propaganda work among the people. Volkhovskii was prosecuted in the famous Trial of the 193 of revolutionary propagandists in 1877-8 and sentenced to exile in

---

[165] Bachman, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', p. 249

[166] Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 14. Senese believed that English supporters would have looked for evidence of their civilising influence and Stepniak's critics among Russian socialists would have looked for English influence to explain the parts of his programme that they did not agree with, including his emphasis on unity across the political spectrum among revolutionaries and his programme, which he defined as purely political action.

[167] Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, p. 663; Ulam *Prophets and Conspirators*, p. 325

[168] Edward Pease to Sergei Stepniak, 23 December 1884. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 1

[169] Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 2

[170] Helen Smith, *The Uncommon Reader: A Life of Edward Garnett* (London, 2017), p. 70

[171] Smith, *Uncommon Reader*, pp. 70-1 and 'The Fatal Accident to M. Stepniak: Inquest and Verdict', *Daily News*, 27 December 1895

[172] Donald Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky in London, 1890–1914', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), p. 68

Siberia.[173] While in Siberia, he worked on the *Sibirskaia Gazeta* (*Siberian Gazette*) in Tomsk, where he first met George Kennan, the American journalist and writer on Russian (and particularly Siberian) geography, society, and culture. He suffered several family tragedies while in exile when his second wife shot herself, his first wife having died while he was in preliminary detention, his younger daughter died, and he was moved further east to Irkutsk when the *Sibirskaia Gazeta* was closed. In 1889, following these events, he escaped via the eastern route to Canada and eventually made his way to London to join his daughter, whom Kennan had arranged to be smuggled out of Russia.[174] Though he continued to travel around Europe campaigning and spent time in hospital in Switzerland, Volkhovskii lived primarily in London until his death in 1914.

iv.iii Lazar Goldenberg (1846-1916)

Lazar Goldenberg's memoirs, held at the Leeds Russian Archive, give some insight into his relatively unknown life, though it appears Goldenberg wrote himself into history and exaggerated his interactions with famous figures. For example, he claimed he discovered Stepniak's body on his way to the meeting at Volkhovskii's, but this seems unlikely as the railway crossing was out of his way.[175] It seems an unknown individual typed the typescript papers as Goldenberg's spelling and use of grammar in English were never quite as fluent. Following a handful of handwritten sheets, the memoir resumes with some overlap, written in the third person. Despite questions of authorship and accuracy these texts do illuminate aspects of Goldenberg's life.

Like others of his generation, Goldenberg located the origins of his activism in literature, including Chernyshevskii's *What is to be Done?,* the journals *Delo* and *Sovremennik*, and German works such as *Wilhelm Tell* and *Jungfrau von Orleans* he read while at the gymnasium. [176] He joined a revolutionary circle at the University of Kharkov before entering the St Petersburg Technological Institute, describing meeting associates of Karakozov, where he led a student protest against the arrest and imprisonment of student radicals for which he was exiled.[177] Countering claims Jewish activists held secondary technical roles in revolutionary organisations, Erich

[173] Chernov, *Pered burei*, p. 126
[174] Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky', pp. 69-70 and Chernov, *Pered burei*, pp. 126-7
[175] 'Goldenberg's Reminiscences', Tuckton House Papers, LRA MS1381/2962. Helen Smith has also found evidence suggesting this was not true and that Fanni Stepniak called Lazarev to go to the scene. Smith, *Uncommon Reader*, p. 70
[176] L.B. Goldenberg, 'Reminiscences'. Tuckton House Papers, LRA MS1381/18, pp. 10-1
[177] Goldenberg, 'Reminiscences', p. 12; Erich E. Haberer, *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 30

Haberer noted that Goldenberg participated in propaganda work, persuaded other revolutionaries of the need to distribute more socialist literature, and later selected materials for this purpose in emigration.[178] In exile, Goldenberg found work as a tutor, earning enough to 'live comfortably'.[179] After leaving Russia, he was expelled from France for appealing to the president on behalf of the *Narodnaia volia* terrorist Gartman and arrested in Romania for organising a celebration of the anniversary of the Paris Commune only shortly after the assassination of the tsar. Escaping extradition, he travelled to London, with financial assistance from a Jewish organisation in Constantinople.[180] For several years, he then worked for an electrical company.[181]

Goldenberg moved to the US in 1885, becoming a citizen in 1895 shortly before leaving for London.[182] Goldenberg's memoirs suggest he helped *Free Russia* with his earnings, which was not the case, as this thesis will demonstrate.[183] Goldenberg also claimed he travelled to meet Volkhovskii at Toronto after the latter's arrival in Canada.[184] Goldenberg's work for the RFPF in New York and London is examined in detail in this thesis. He was certainly an interesting character. He illegally registered to vote and was removed from the register when he was opposed as a jury member, being a foreign subject.[185] Goldenberg travelled to Russia after the 1905 Revolution and returned in 1907. He retired in 1909, married Cecily Kaye, and moved to Bournemouth, where he died in 1916.[186]

iv.iv Egor Lazarev (1855-1937)

Like Goldenberg, Egor Lazarev was another RFPF member whose international mobility and networks helped grow support for Russian revolutionary terrorism abroad, though more is known about his life and work as a result of research carried out by Evgeniia Frolova. Born a serf, Lazarev was six years old when serfdom was abolished, though his father had already been freed. He attended primary school and the gymnasium in Samara, where he joined a self-education circle with another future *narodovolets*, Iurii Bogdanovich, and together they joined a revolutionary circle in

[178] Haberer, *Jews and Revolution*, p. 96
[179] Goldenberg, 'Reminiscences', p. 24
[180] 'Goldenberg's Reminiscences', Tuckton House Papers, LRA MS1381/29, pp. 37-45
[181] Ibid., pp. 46-50
[182] U.S Naturalization Record Indexes, 1791-1992. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 18 July 2018]
[183] 'Goldenberg's Reminiscences', p. 51
[184] Ibid., p. 53
[185] Ibid., p. 68
[186] Ibid., p. 90

Samara.[187] Lazarev was arrested in 1874 for propaganda work, but as one of those not convicted at the Trial of the 193 he went home, only to be conscripted into the army for the Russo-Turkish War.[188] He was arrested again in 1884, sent to Siberia, returned, and was arrested and exiled again, before escaping to America in July 1890.[189] Lazarev spent some time in Milwaukee and Denver working with the RFPF before travelling to New York, from where he left for London in March 1894.[190] Lazarev became the RFPF's secretary in London, but according to Goldenberg who replaced him, he was a terrible businessman and almost bankrupted them.[191] Lazarev then moved to France and later to Switzerland. In this period, he was also involved in smuggling revolutionary publications into Russia.[192] Like Volkhovskii, Goldenberg, and Chaikovskii, Lazarev also joined the ASL and PSR. He also returned briefly to Russia after the 1905 Revolution.[193] During the period of revolution and civil war, Lazarev was active in Russian political life as a junior minister for education in the Provisional Government and in the anti-Bolshevik government in Samara during the Civil War, before emigrating again in 1919 to Prague where he continued his writing and political careers among the émigré community there.

iv.v Leonid Shishko (1852-1910)

Leonid Shishko is another member of the RFPF whose life and work is often overlooked by historians, despite his published writings and work with the PSR. He was a well-respected member of the revolutionary emigration and, writing about him in his memoir, Chernov described a 'stamp of selfless idealism' that shaped Shishko's life.[194] Shishko abandoned a prospective military career, began studying at the St Petersburg Technological Institute, but left his studies in the winter of 1871-2.[195] Having travelled to Moscow, he rushed back to St Petersburg on Stepniak's invitation to join the *chaikovtsy* in 1873.[196] Like Volkhovskii, Shishko was a defendant in the Trial of the 193 and sentenced to hard labour in Siberia (*katorga*).[197] In 1890 he

[187] Evgeniia Frolova, '"Esli liubish Rossiiu": Egor Egorovich Lazarev (1855-1937)', in Evgeniia Frolova (ed), *Osmyslenie sudby: Istoriko-biograficheskie ocherki, publitsistika* (St Petersburg, 2011), pp. 55-6
[188] Ibid., pp. 58-9
[189] Ibid., p. 59
[190] Ibid., pp. 60-1. Frolova overlooked the time Lazarev spent in Denver.
[191] 'Goldenberg's Reminiscences', pp. 54-5
[192] Frolova, '"Esli liubish Rossiiu"', pp.62-3
[193] Ibid., p. 67
[194] Chernov, *Pered burei*, p. 126
[195] Ibid., p. 125
[196] F. Volkhovskii, 'Vechnaia pamiat!', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 5, (1910), p. 23; Burtsev, *Za sto let*, p. 77
[197] Ibid., p. 91

escaped and travelled to London, where he also helped found the RFPF.[198] In the early years of the twentieth century, Shishko settled in the town of Clarens in Switzerland, where Volkhovskii would join him for an extended period for medical treatment. His death in 1910 offered his colleagues an opportunity to reflect on his life and revolutionary career, as explored in Chapter Four.

iv.vi Nikolai Chaikovskii (1850-1926)

Nikolai Chaikovskii was a key individual in the formation of the revolutionary community whose networks enabled the later establishment of the RFPF. The eponymous circle of *chaikovtsy* was where many of these individuals' ideas about involving the *narod* in the revolutionary process and the *khozhdenie v narod* were formed, before many of these same revolutionaries embraced terrorism as a method of revolution. Venturi suggested that the ideas which coalesced among these revolutionaries might be called a 'religion'.[199] In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Chaikovskii lived in Harrow and was officially a member of the RFPF. His presence in London was significant for the émigré revolutionary community, however, he seems to have played a lesser role in its publishing activities than Stepniak, Volkhovskii, Goldenberg, and Shishko, as suggested by the archival sources consulted for this research. Like the other members of the RFPF, he was among the founding members of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

Like Lazarev, Chaikovskii lived through the Revolution. Despite his long commitment to the revolutionary cause, Chaikovskii rejected the label given to him during the February Revolution of 1917 as the 'grandfather of the Russian Revolution', but nevertheless embraced the changes taking place in Russia.[200] When the October Revolution then moved away from his ideals, he became an ardent anti-Bolshevik, eventually becoming a member of several White governments during the Civil War years.[201] After the Civil War, Chaikovskii spent time in Paris and became involved in several émigré organisations, before returning to Harrow in 1925 before his death the following year.[202]

[198] 'Leonid Emmanuilovich Shishko', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 5 (1910), p. 18
[199] Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, p. 472
[200] V.I. Goldin, 'Nikolai Chaikovskii in Revolution and Counter Revolution', *Revolutionary Russia*, vo. 14, no. 1 (2001), p. 25
[201] Golodin, 'Nikolai Chaikovskii', pp. 26-34
[202] Ibid., p. 39

iv.vii Associates of the RFPF in Britain: Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) and Vladimir Burtsev (1862-1942)

While Peter Kropotkin and Vladimir Burtsev were not officially members of the RFPF, their activities, writing, and publishing activities were important to transnational exchanges of ideas and representations of terrorism among both Russians and foreigners. They maintained important personal networks among revolutionaries of various political leanings and foreigners and their activities were also important factors in shaping foreigners' views of Russian revolutionary terrorism. Their examples allow broader exploration of transnational networks and images and representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism.

Kropotkin shared many experiences with members of the RFPF in his revolutionary career. Martin Miller located the origins of his activism in his youth, which he characterised as a juxtaposition of 'state service and personal rebellion' also experienced by other members of Kropotkin's family and his ancestors, who were princes of an old noble dynasty.[203] Not wanting to pursue a military career, Kropotkin isolated himself at military school and turned to literature. His sister's husband, an uncle, and his elder brother supplied him with works by writers such as Alexander Herzen.[204] Miller identified two key influences that caused Kropotkin to become critical of the regime. As the top student in his class, Kropotkin was given the honour of becoming the tsar's *page de chambre*, but through personal observations of the tsar, he disagreed with his judgements. Then, on graduating, Kropotkin selected an undesirable commission in the Amur region in the east where he observed the brutal conditions at mines in the Lena Goldfields and the uprising by exiled Polish political prisoners in 1866 working on the *Krugobaikalskii* road in Siberia.[205] Like Shishko, he left the military and began writing and publishing his critical observations more broadly. He joined the Chaikovskii circle when he returned to Russia in 1872 from a first period of emigration.[206] Kropotkin also established a favourable public image as a geographer and scientist and for this reason was even allowed to write and read scientific books while later in prison in France.[207]

Burtsev was arrested twice in the 1880s for revolutionary activities and was sent to prison and into exile in Siberia, from where he escaped to Switzerland in 1888.[208] Burtsev's writing and publishing work was wide-ranging and prior to arriving

[203] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 4
[204] Miller, *Kropotkin*, pp. 24-5, p. 37, p. 51, and pp. 58-9
[205] Ibid., p. 57 and p. 69
[206] Ibid., pp. 90-1
[207] Ibid., p. 164
[208] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, pp. 14-8

in London and beginning work on the publications examined in Chapter Four of this thesis, he wrote for and edited several titles. On arriving in Geneva, he became editor of the third and fourth issues of the revolutionary journal *Samoupravlenie* (*Self-government*), journal that appeared in four issues between 1887 and 1889. Henderson has argued that Burtsev's views on revolutionary terrorism shaped these issues of *Samoupravlenie*.[209] In 1889 he also founded his own periodical titled *Svobodnaia Rossiia* (*Free Russia*), which appeared in three issues that year, assisted by other former members of the *Zemlia i volia* movement, and its content was shaped by his views on terrorism.[210]

Burtsev continued to write and publish about terrorism and the revolutionary movement during the years he spent in London, where he founded the journal *Narodovolets* (*Member of Narodnaia volia*) and *Byloe* (*The Past*) in 1897 and 1900 respectively. He was arrested and sentenced to prison in Britain because of an article he published in *Narodovolets* calling for the assassination of Tsar Nicholas II. He committed himself to unmasking police spies in the revolutionary movement and was responsible for the revelation that one of the leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party's terrorist wing was a spy. Burtsev's *Byloe* is of particular interest to this study because it historicised and memorialised acts of terrorism and terrorists. Like Lazarev, Chaikovskii, and Kropotkin, Burtsev too lived through the revolution and remained active in the anti-Bolshevik emigration until his death in 1942.

v Source Material

A number of the individuals, organisations, questions, and issues discussed in this thesis have received significant scholarly attention. However, by using new combinations of well-used archival collections, incorporating less well-used collections, and identifying new sets of primary sources for this research, this thesis broadens our understanding of Russian revolutionary terrorism as a transnational phenomenon in this period.

Chapters one and three, focusing on the RFPF, its transnational networks, and its legacies make use of archival collections held in institutions across Russia, the UK, and US. Principal collections for this research are Stepniak's personal archive held at the *Rossiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatura i isskustva* (RGALI) in Moscow, Feliks Volkhovskii's personal archive, the main body of which is divided between the Hoover Institution archives at Stanford University and the Houghton Library at Harvard University, and the archive of the RFPF, the majority of which

[209] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, p. 19
[210] Ibid., p. 19

comprises Goldenberg's correspondence, held at the *Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii* (GARF) in Moscow. The fragmented, shifting, and ephemeral natures of terrorism, revolutionary activism, and transnational political activism mean that these collections when used together reveal a much more complete view of the activities of the RFPF, its members, and transnational networks. While financial documents relating to the RFPF and SFRF's activities were not created or have not survived in large numbers, correspondence combined with fragmented records reveals much about their financial situation. Volkhovskii's personal archive is particularly useful as he collected many financial and business documents. Other collections such as a smaller part of Volkhovskii's personal archive held at the LSE and the correspondence archive of Robert Spence Watson held at Newcastle University also hold important documents for this research.

The UK Foreign Office correspondence files relating to Irish revolutionary activities in the US and Irish revolutionary newspapers linked to individuals promoting or funding terrorism are used in Chapter Three. Looking specifically for representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism and evidence for links between Russian and Irish terrorists in this period illuminates further this important aspect of Russian terrorists' transnational activism.

Chapter Four also uses newspapers, taking a very broad and transnational approach to studying image of Kropotkin. Using these newspapers as sources of Kropotkin's views or comment on terrorism as well as sites where his public image was established increases our understanding of Kropotkin's political views in transnational perspective. Using local newspapers from Britain and the US in addition to major national publications over a longer period helps reveal the extent to which journalists believed their readers were interested in Russian revolutionary terrorism and how representations of terrorists changed over time in response to international factors.

The works and writers examined in Chapter Five have all received significant scholarly attention. However, studying these works together enables broader conclusions to be drawn about representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism in English-language forums and responses to them over a longer period as well as across different genres. Exploring the publication process of English-language editions, this chapter also focuses on some previously-unused collections for researching representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism.

vi Thesis Structure

Each chapter of this thesis approaches Russian revolutionary terrorism in the period between 1881 and 1926 from a different transnational perspective, broadening understanding of how it can be considered to have been a transnational phenomenon in this period. Using each of these transnational perspectives, new aspects of the activities of Russian revolutionary terrorists, terrorist propagandists, and their sympathisers will be revealed. This case study structure enables broader analysis of Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period, with each chapter extending the boundaries of scholarship in a different direction. The RFPF is one organisation which links many aspects of these case studies, but this thesis also consciously seeks to incorporate less widely-considered individuals and their work.

Chapter One re-evaluates the activities of the RFPF and its sister English and American Societies of Friends of Russian Freedom in transnational perspective. Combining scattered source collections also reveals hidden aspects of the activities within their networks, particularly the work of lesser-known members of the RFPF, challenging the dominance of Stepniak in historical studies, and foreign women working with them. This chapter also explored the work of the SFRF after 1900 and the revival of the SAFRF in 1905, in order to understand the long-term dynamics of foreign support for Russian revolutionary terrorists.

Chapter Two explores in detail a key context for these activities: contemporaneous Irish revolutionary terrorism. Using this as a case study for examining the impact of contemporary international terrorisms on RFPF propaganda and popular support, this chapter also explores how Russian revolutionary terrorism in the 1880s influenced other terrorists.

Chapter Three then moves on to explore the neglected legacies of the RFPF and its Russian-language activities and networks in the careers and revolutionary activities of Volkhovskii and Vladimir Burtsev, who was associated with the RFPF. The English-language activities of these émigrés has been well-studied but their Russian-language activities less so. This chapter addresses questions of continuities between the RFPF's ideas and publishing operations and those of the PSR's publishing operations in emigration in the early years of the twentieth century. It adds to understanding of the geographical and ideological peripheries of the PSR and how they interacted with the centre as well as the pre-existing foundations that enabled its operations. Focusing on the issue of terrorism also illustrates how these peripheral figures participated in heated debates within the party.

Chapter Four then explores the making of transnational terrorist identities by exploring how Peter Kropotkin gained and lost the public image of being a dangerous

terrorist throughout his life from 1881 until his death in 1921. Complementing the subject of Chapter Two, it explores how negative images of Russian revolutionary terrorism in the mainstream media were influenced by other contemporary terrorisms and perceptions of the threat of an international terrorist conspiracy. Exploring the media image of an individual who was not a terrorist and is not recognised by scholars to have widely advocated terrorism as a method of revolution illustrates the difficulties faced by actual terrorists and terrorist propagandists in attracting foreign sympathisers to their cause.

The final chapter then explores the reading of Russian fiction about terrorism in English in long-term perspective across the period 1882-1926. After the revolutions of 1917, foreign sympathisers' activism against tsarist rule naturally ended. However, English-speaking audiences remained interested in Russian issues, consuming journalism and novels about revolutionaries. Stepniak's novel of 1889 established tropes of heroic and self-sacrificing terrorists that readers later found in fiction about terrorism by Leonid Andreev and Boris Savinkov which began to appear in English translation in 1917. Reading these novels in translation, foreigners found evidence for ongoing events in Russia and, as in Stepniak's novel, saw in them a reflection of a chaotic Russian mentality. Repetition of these representations meant the image of the ethical terrorist remained relevant to English readers long after Russian revolutionaries had abandoned it and it was only discredited in the mid-1920s.

Together these chapters contribute to our understanding of the foundations, operations, and legacies of revolutionary propaganda publishing networks in this period. They help us to reconsider 1881 as an endpoint in the history of Russian revolutionary terrorism and the links between the terrorists of the pre-1881 period with those in the PSR after 1900. Chapter Five and, to a lesser extent, Chapter Four also look beyond 1917, illustrating that transnational perspectives require new chronologies of Russian revolutionary history.

Chapter One: *Free Russia* and Transnational Terrorist Propaganda Networks, 1890-1915

1.1 Introduction

Collaboration between Russian émigrés and their foreign sympathisers in the campaign for social and political reform in Russia generated the transnational network, formed in the 1890s, to produce and distribute revolutionary propaganda. At the centre of this network were the émigrés who formed the Russian Free Press Fund (RFPF), which had offices in London and New York. Other revolutionaries and Russian political figures of all political backgrounds published newspapers, journals, and pamphlets abroad in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the 1870s, the Russian revolutionary movement *Zemlia i volia* produced its eponymous revolutionary organ in Switzerland. Russian liberals produced the journal *Osvobozhdenie* (*Liberation*) abroad between 1902 and 1905. The production of *Iskra* (*The Spark*), the organ of the *Rossiyskaia sotsial-demokraticheskaia rabochaia partiia* (Russian Social Democratic Labour Party) moved between cities as its editor Vladimir Lenin moved around Europe between 1900 and 1903. All of these publications were smuggled into Russia. However, what marked out the RFPF was that its publishing work was consciously transnational, conceived of as part of a transnational campaign against tsarism involving the co-operation of foreign sympathisers and based in different locations in Europe and the US.

The RFPF worked closely with foreign sympathisers in the English Society of Friends of Russian Freedom (SFRF) and the Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom (SAFRF).[1] Their core collaborative project was the newspaper *Free Russia*, the main instrument of their campaigns, with its English, American, and German-language editions. For foreigners, the societies and *Free Russia* became important channels for transmitting information about humanitarian crises in Russia and presented opportunities for campaigning and fundraising.[2] Both societies were formed by foreigners working closely with Sergei Stepniak who arrived in London in 1883 and travelled to the US in the winter of 1890-1. Stepniak believed, referring to the SFRF: 'the affair must be started by english [sic] … and be as little connected with us as it naturally can.'[3] Officially only foreigners were members of the societies,

---

[1] The SFRF called itself the 'English Society' and its paper the 'English *Free Russia*', despite having branches across Britain in Perth, Scotland and a particularly active one in Cardiff, Wales.

[2] Their activities included meetings, public rallies, petitions, circulars, fundraising, and letter-writing. See, for example: Henderson, 'Hyde Park Rally', pp. 451-66

[3] Stepniak to Robert Spence Watson, 15 December 1889. Spence-Watson-Weiss Papers, SW1/7/85

which, as Donald Senese has argued, protected the SFRF against accusations that they and RFPF were one and the same. However, Senese believed that, ultimately, both 'followed the line [Stepniak] laid down'.[4] Focusing on interactions within the network shows that patterns of influence and control were more complex.

This network relied on pre-existing networks of social, political, and humanitarian activism to publicise its cause and raise funds. Members of the societies were frequently current or former campaigners for various causes, including women's suffrage, anti-slavery in the US, and Home Rule for Ireland in Britain. Sympathy for Russian revolutionaries also intersected with humanitarian campaigns for Armenia. Personal networks were therefore important and formed the basis for continuities in activism. The involvement of Russian émigrés, however, was crucial to this new activism, particularly as authentic commentators on the horrors of tsarist rule. Volkhovskii lectured widely on behalf of the SFRF across Britain and raised funds, including in a village near Stirling in 1895 as well as in the more populous areas of Wimbledon and Balham in 1899.[5]

A focus on representations of terrorism is necessary because the societies' narratives of persecution and suffering in Russia were linked to representations of revolutionary terrorism. Whether or not they knew Stepniak had killed someone, foreigners knew him as an unashamed advocate of terrorism in Russia through his journalism, books, and novels. As a result, foreigners' encounters with his, and others', representations of terrorism require further investigation.

A transnational perspective is also needed because of the transnational reach and imagined scope of this activism. The network produced propaganda materials for various audiences, in several languages, and their publications demonstrate how they targeted materials and messages. Equally important is further exploration of what RFPF members hoped and imagined they could achieve through this activism. Examining transatlantic interactions within this network also highlights coops inherent to transnational activism, particularly those resulting from financial difficulties. Viewed through the lens of this network, foreigners' activism for the Russian causes was not simply defined by co-operation, solidarity, and sympathy. Instead, competing interests, values, and identities persistently threatened the success of campaigns, damaging relationships between Russian émigrés and their foreign sympathisers and between the SFRF and the SAFRF. Contrasting views on how to define their sphere

[4] Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 51

[5] 'Bridge of Allan Y.M.C.A.: Course of Lectures', UND/F10/H3, Academic papers of Barry Hollingsworth, folder 13, Durham University Library Special Collections; 'The Honorary Treasurer in Account with the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom' [SFRF accounts for 1899]. Boris I. Nicolaevsky Collection, HIA, box 753, folder 3

of activism caused rifts with other foreign sympathisers and within the societies themselves. Such disagreements contributed to the societies' decline and demise.

A longer-term perspective, across the period 1890-1915, additionally exposes the divisions of labour within these networks, particularly that of less well-known individuals and women. Essential administrative and publicity work was not carried out by the most well-known figures. Scholars have usually focused on Stepniak, who was certainly important and influential as a writer, thinker, and speaker, but his role in creating and sustaining this network as a figurehead for the campaign against tsarism requires further exploration. Jane E. Good, for example, perhaps overstates Stepniak's role in the movement in America by focusing almost entirely on the setting up of the SAFRF and not on how it operated.[6] After his death in December 1895, *Free Russia*, the RFPF, and the societies continued. Volkhovskii took over the editorship of the London *Free Russia* and though he took a break between 1904 and 1908, his efforts were crucial in maintaining the paper. It closed a few months after his death in 1914. Stepniak was not a good organiser and this chapter will examine the roles of Volkhovskii and their colleague Lazar Goldenberg in producing *Free Russia* and managing the RFPF across this period. In addition, a long-term perspective enables exploration of the changing dynamics of support for the Russian revolutionary movement abroad.

1.2 Building on pre-existing foundations

This network comprising the RFPF and Societies and its propaganda machine relied on pre-existing foundations for Russian revolutionary activism in Britain and the US. Luke Kelly has shown that the politics of identity among humanitarians was a significant factor in their activism on behalf of Russian issues.[7] Laqua's suggestion that humanitarianism relied upon dual discourses of outrage and solidarity, and thus was distinct from charity, is useful for understanding the processes by which foreign sympathisers came to support Russian revolutionary terrorists in this period.[8] This network was not without precedent, either in producing Russian radical literature aboard or supporting Russian revolutionaries in internal exile in Siberia and abroad. The necessary conditions were: more accommodating attitudes towards their activities, previous Russian revolutionary publications and organisations working abroad, pre-existing sympathies for Russian revolutionary terrorists, the work of those involved in these networks in the 1880s, and pre-existing networks of

[6] Good, 'America and the Russian Revolutionary Movement', pp. 273-7
[7] Luke Kelly, *British Humanitarian Activity in Russia, 1890-1923*, p. 157
[8] Daniel Laqua, 'Inside the Humanitarian Cloud: Causes and Motivations to Help Friends and Strangers', *JMEH*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2014), pp. 176-8

humanitarian, social, and political activists. In contrast to earlier émigré publishing efforts, *Free Russia* had the express purpose of propaganda among foreigners.

Russian radicals and revolutionaries emigrated in order to write, publish, and plan their activities without fear of repression from the tsarist regime. More permissive political environments in Britain and the US in the second half of the nineteenth century enabled Russian revolutionaries and radical thinkers to publish their writing and journals. Alexander Herzen set up his Free Russian Press in London in 1853 followed by his journal *Kolokol* (*The Bell*), which he later moved to Geneva.[9] Herzen hoped to galvanise a wide spectrum of Russian public opinion in support of the campaign to abolish serfdom.[10] Despite being in Russian, the Free Russian Press and Herzen's *Kolokol* prompted interest by the British press in Herzen's ideas and book *My Exile in Siberia*.[11] Switzerland was a popular destination for Russian émigrés in the 1860s and 1870s, for example, hosting radical circles established by young Russians drawn to the university and institutes of higher education. Women travelled abroad to study as they were banned from Russian universities and local police tended to turn a blind eye to political activities unless they threatened public order.[12] The Russian émigré publisher Mikhail Elpidin opened a bookshop in Geneva supplying political and propaganda material to émigrés and travellers from Russia. Revolutionaries attempted to smuggle large quantities of printed material into Russia, though they were not always successful.[13] The RFPF would come to fulfil a role similar to Elpidin's bookshop. Switzerland remained a popular place to settle among Russian revolutionary émigrés, including the RFPF member Lazarev who settled in Clarens after spending only a brief time in London.

Britain and the US attracted larger numbers of Russian revolutionary émigrés in the 1880s and 1890s as formerly popular locations, such as Paris, became more hostile because of increased pressure from the tsarist authorities on foreign governments to prosecute or extradite revolutionaries on charges relating to terrorist activities or propaganda. As the tsarist regime increasingly pressured foreign governments to prosecute or repatriate revolutionaries, continental Europe became a

---

[9] Tatiana Ossorguine, Eugénie Lange and Paul Chaix, 'Périodiques en langue russe publiés en Europe de 1855 a 1917', *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, vol. 11, no. 4 (1970), p. 631

[10] Edward Acton, *Alexander Herzen and the Role of the Intellectual Revolutionary* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 121

[11] Monica Partridge, 'Herzen and the English Press', *SEER*, vol. 36, no. 87 (1958), p. 469

[12] Meijer, *Knowledge and Revolution*, p. 52 and pp. 60-1

[13] Alfred Erich Senn, 'M. K. Elpidin: Revolutionary Publisher', *Russian Review*, vol. 41, no. 1 (1982), p. 17; Williams, '"*Vesti i slukhi*"', p. 56. Williams cites the memoirs of Nadezhda Krupskaia, who organised smuggling of revolutionary literature in the early twentieth century.

less hospitable place for Russian émigrés. In January 1880, the *Narodnaia volia* member Lev Gartman was arrested in Paris and though he was eventually allowed to leave France and travelled to the US via Britain, his arrest alarmed other émigrés.[14] Gartman had been involved in the failed attempt blow up the tsar's train in 1878 and went abroad to try to solicit support for *Narodnaia volia*.[15] The situation deteriorated after the assassination of the tsar in 1881. In December 1882, the Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin was arrested in Lyon for supposedly manufacturing explosives and sentenced to five years imprisonment under pressure from the Russian government. Having visited Britain in the past, Kropotkin followed Stepniak to London on his release in January 1886. Chapter Four examines Kropotkin's trial and life in emigration in more detail.

Producing revolutionary propaganda in Britain was largely permissible and Russians encountered few problems with the authorities, except in cases relating to celebrating the death of the tsar. The German anarchist Johann Most was prosecuted for doing so in his newspaper *Freiheit* (*Freedom*) in 1881 and the Russian émigré Vladimir Burtsev, who was associated with the RFPF, was later imprisoned for the same offence in his newspaper *Narodovolets* (*Member of Narodnaia volia*) in 1897.[16] Most left Britain for the US after his release from prison and though Burtsev tried once more to live in Switzerland, he was expelled and returned to London. Chapter Three explores Burtsev's journal published in London between 1900 and 1904 and its representations of terrorism in more detail.

The societies attracted early supporters by galvanising public opinion in Britain and the US which was already sympathetic towards Russian revolutionaries and terrorists. *Free Russia* built on established narratives of Russian terrorism articulated both by Stepniak and foreign observers, for example in the British and American press. Michael Hughes has identified emerging sympathy for Russian terrorists in the British press with the trial of Vera Zasulich, who shot but did not kill the governor of St Petersburg in 1878, and also traces this sympathy to reports highlighting a lack of reform in newspaper reports of the assassination of Mezentsev and the tsar.[17] While criticising their actions, British and American newspapers nevertheless reflected their readers' fascination with the *Narodnaia volia* members who killed the tsar in 1881. They focused their attention on Sofia Perovskaia. One

[14] Bachman, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', pp. 170-1
[15] Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Road to Revolution: A Century of Russian Radicalism* (Princeton NJ, 2014), pp. 296-7.
[16] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, pp. 83-4 and pp. 90-6
[17] Hughes, 'British Opinion and Russian Terrorism', p. 258 and p. 261

newspaper described her as 'a lovely and intelligent girl.'[18] Revolutionary women appeared particularly intriguing. Edward Reynolds Pease, who would later work closely with Stepniak on his novel and help found the SFRF, was similarly obsessed with Zasulich. A British socialist and founding member of the Fabian Society, Pease's first contact with Stepniak was in 1884 when the Russian had written to him thanking him for money forwarded to Zasulich for the use of the Committee of the Red Cross of *Narodnaia volia* in providing aid to political prisoners in Siberia.[19] In 1889, when planning his honeymoon trip to Switzerland, Pease asked Stepniak for a letter of introduction to Zasulich; however, it seems unlikely they met, as Pease never mentioned it in his letters and she hated public attention.[20] Stepniak's book was released to audiences receptive to his representations of terrorists as heroic martyrs and their actions as a form of justice, for example describing the execution of the tsar's assassins: 'All the condemned died like heroes.'[21] Stepniak repeated these themes in *Free Russia*, not referring to Zasulich as a terrorist but instead focusing on the jury who had acquitted her and her victim's crimes and abuse of power.[22] In addition to sympathy for terrorists, *Underground Russia*'s popularity relied upon widespread interest in Russian revolutionary terrorism, as articulated in a review of the original Italian edition prior to its appearance in English.[23]

Free Russia's readers were also receptive to its message because they had already been exposed to information about the tsarist regime's oppression, particularly the brutal treatment of political prisoners and Siberian exiles. Whereas Stepniak was the most prominent commentator on Russian issues in Britain in the 1880s, in the US his influence was superseded by that of George Kennan, the American journalist and explorer. Kennan's first trip to Russia resulted in the book *Tent Life in Siberia*, an account of his travels across Russia while working for the Russian-American Telegraph Company. Seemingly not expecting that Kennan would support growing claims of the mistreatment of prisoners and exiles in Siberia, on his second visit to the country in 1885-6, the government permitted him access to the

[18] 'Beautiful Sophia Perovski: One of the Nihilist Assassins a Lovely and Intelligent Girl', *Washington Post*, 13 August 1882

[19] Pease to Stepniak, 23 December 1884. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 1. The letter does not survive but is referenced in this letter of 23 December.

[20] Pease to Stepniak, 23 August 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 69ob; As Ana Siljak has noted in a biography of the revolutionary, Zasulich was shy and avoided public attention in her life after the attempted assassination of Trepov. Siljak, *Angel of Vengeance,* pp. 13-4

[21] Stepniak, *Underground Russia: Revolutionary Profiles and Sketches from Life* (London, 1882), p. 143

[22] *Free Russia*, no. 1, 1890, p. 14

[23] 'Subterranean Russia', *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 12 August 1882, p. 215

prison and exile system where he befriended revolutionaries with whom he would later collaborate.[24] *Tent Life in Siberia* had made no mention of the exile system or political life in Russia, and biographer Frederick Travis has argued that it reflected Kennan's focus on adventure and lack of interest in political affairs during his first trip to Siberia.[25] Kennan even gave a lecture as part of his regular repertoire in which he had defended the Russian government's design and purpose for the exile system.[26] However, he was publicly criticised for his position and ignorance of evidence and decided to return to Siberia to investigate further.[27]

Kennan met Feliks Volkhovskii in Tomsk, Siberia, and when the Russian escaped via Canada in 1890, Kennan arranged for Volkhovskii's daughter Vera to be smuggled out of Russia to join her father in London.[28] He also introduced Egor Lazarev and Lazar Goldenberg, who did not know each other prior to working together for the RFPF and SAFRF in the US.[29] Kennan's book *Siberia and the Exile System* (1891), based on his articles for the *Century* magazine, was critical in shaping attitudes towards Russia alongside his extended lecture tours in the US and Britain. Some of these articles were also translated into other languages and printed around the world.[30]

Kennan's articles and book depicted the tsarist regime as oppressive and cruel and his representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism mirrored Stepniak's, showing it as a product of oppression and repression under the tsarist regime, and those involved as previously little more than 'moderate liberals' or 'peaceful socialistic propagandists':

> A terrorist is nothing more than an embittered revolutionist, who has found it impossible to unite and organize the disaffected elements of society in the face of a cloud of spies, an immense body of police, and a standing army; who has been exasperated to the last degree by cruel, unjust, and lawless treatment of himself, his family, or his friends; who has been smitten in the face every time he has opened his lips to explain or expostulate, and who, at last, has been seized with the Berserker

[24] Good, 'America and the Russian Revolutionary Movement', pp. 273-4
[25] Frederick F. Travis, *George Kennan and the American-Russian Relationship, 1865-1924* (Athens OH, 1990), p. 43
[26] Ibid., pp. 83-4
[27] Ibid., pp. 87-8
[28] Travis, *George Kennan*, pp. 126-7; Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky in London', p. 70
[29] Kennan to Goldenberg, 15 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138. Kennan informed Goldenberg about Lazarev, noting he had been 'arrested once at Khabarofka [sic] on the Amur upon suspicion of an intention to assassinate Baron Korff the Governor General of the Amur provinces'. Lazarev's first letter to Goldenberg showed they did not know each other, as he wrote: 'You do not know my patronymic and I do not know yours'. Lazarev to Goldenberg, 29 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 60, l. 1
[30] Kennan to Goldenberg, 18 June 1888. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 6. A translation of one of Kennan's articles had been reprinted in the Dutch East Indies.

> madness, and had become, in the words of the St. Petersburg *Gólos*, "a wild beast capable of anything.[31]

Drawing on the work of Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso, Kennan argued that the terrorists 'represent, physically and psychologically, rather the early Christian martyrs than the French communists or the Chicago anarchists.'[32] Justifying their use of force, he concluded: 'It is true, as the Russian Government contends, that after 1878 the terrorists acted in defiance of all the generally accepted principles of civilized combat; but it must not be forgotten that in life and in warfare, as in chess, you cannot disregard all the rules of the game yourself and then expect your adversary to observe them.'[33] As a result, Americans, as well as others abroad reading Kennan's work, were prepared for the pro-terrorist message promoted by the societies and *Free Russia* from the early 1890s.

Kennan helped preserve a more accepting climate for Russian revolutionary propaganda through his links with politicians and by giving lectures attended by 'prominent Senators' and 'members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee'. He felt he had 'succeeded…in creating a strong feeling against the ratification of the Russian-American extradition treaty [in 1888], and it has been laid aside until the next session of Congress'.[34] Kennan organised Stepniak's US lecture tour, negotiating with the 'good lecture manager' Ozias W. Pond of Boston for forty lectures for a fixed sum and the potential for the same again if they could be arranged.[35] He also tried to get Stepniak's novel serialised in a US magazine in 1888.[36] Kennan then instructed Goldenberg to write to booksellers and periodical dealers presenting the letters as being from Kennan himself, as dictated to a secretary, allowing Goldenberg to use his name to promote the paper.[37] Associations with Kennan helped prepare audiences for Stepniak's arrival and his pro-terrorist message.

Prior to Stepniak, Russian terrorists had sought support abroad. While he was living in the US, Gartman set up the Russian-American National League (RANL) with Goldenberg in New York in 1887. The RANL had branches across the country,

---

[31] George Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System*, vol. 2 (New York, 1891), p. 455 and pp. 438-9
[32] Ibid., p. 455
[33] Ibid., pp. 455-6
[34] Kennan to Goldenberg, 18 June 1888. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 6., ll. 6-7
[35] The first mention of this was the letter from Kennan to Goldenberg, 20 July 1890, GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 27; Kennan to Goldenberg, 30 July 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 29-30. Unfortunately records revealing how much Stepniak was paid for the lectures do not survive.
[36] George Kenan to Sergei Stepniak, 28 December 1888. RGALI, f. 1158, op.1, d. 299, l. 13
[37] Kennan to Goldenberg, 22 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 50-1

including among the large Russian community in San Francisco.[38] The RANL had a broad cultural and political remit, tried to help political exiles, and reportedly hoped to emulate Irish associations in the US and become a political force.[39] In the US, Russian revolutionary terrorism became prominent once more in 1887, when the Russian and American governments began negotiating an extradition treaty which would have threatened émigrés like Gartman. The RANL campaigned against the treaty and responses to its activism in the press illustrated widespread anti-Semitism, associating the RANL, with its many members who were also part of the Jewish Workingmen's Union, with the 'Czar killer' Gartman.[40] The RANL already associated with terrorism, Goldenberg declared that the RANL would do 'all in its power' to support *Free Russia* if it were a monthly publication.[41] When he had the second issue printed in the US, it carried a special notice announcing that the RANL and SFRF 'of England' had 'united' in order to publish the newspaper in there.[42] Goldenberg continued to work for the RANL until he left for London in 1894, even as his work for the RFPF and American *Free Russia* increased, demonstrating the overlap between spheres and periods of activism.

Whereas Goldenberg easily co-opted the RANL to distribute copies of *Free Russia*, Lazarev quickly found himself in conflict with American sympathisers with the Russian revolutionary cause. In early 1891, in Denver, Colorado, Lazarev helped Harriet Scott Saxton, a suffragist and activist for other social and humanitarian causes, to found the Siberian Exile Humane Society (SEHS).[43] By setting up the SEHS, Lazarev and Scott Saxton angered Alfred J.P. McClure, the Secretary of the existing Siberian Exile Petition Committee (SEPC) and a magazine proprietor in Philadelphia. Americans in the SEPC petitioned the Russian government about the

[38] Letters from the various RANL branches, including Newark, California, and the 'Pacific Coast Branch' in San Francisco, can be found in: GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 163.
[39] 'Russian Americans in Politics', *New York Times*, 14 April 1887
[40] Ibid.
[41] Draft letter Goldenberg to Pease, [August 1890]. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 148, l. 7
[42] *Free Russia* [American edition], 2, September 1890. Though difficult to locate, a full run of the newspaper is held by the New York Public Library.
[43] Having arrived in Denver around New Year, Lazarev did various things, including studying farming. He left in late summer and spread RFPF propaganda in other provincial centres, including Milwaukee between August 1891 and July 1893. Scott Saxton to Goldenberg, 28 December 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 153, l. 14ob, Scott Saxton to Goldenberg, 20 July 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 153, l. 43ob, and Scott Saxton to Goldenberg, 23 September 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 153, l. 48ob.; 'To Help Siberian Exiles', *Boston Evening Transcript*, 27 March 1891.; Scott Saxton was a 'celebrated elocutionist' who ran the Denver School of Expression and lectured widely, including in education and entertainment programmes for prisoners in the Canon City Penitentiary and on temperance. 'St Luke's Choir Concert', *Fort Collins Courier*, 4 March 1886; 'By the Prison Association', *Park County Bulletin*, 9 March 1906 and 'A Lecture by Mrs. Saxton', *Salida Mail*, 16 March 1894. Colorado Historic Newspapers Collection.

treatment of political prisoners and appears to have been attempting to organise a nationwide Siberian Exile Petition Association (SEPA) which had emerged following the energetic reaction to a lecture by George Kennan in Philadelphia in November 1889.[44] As Frederick Travis has discovered, Kennan was also unhappy with the wording of the SEPA petition.[45] Conflict between different organisations and committees was a result of their differing aims and methods.

McClure was already irritated with Goldenberg and the RFPF for several reasons, the first being a misunderstanding over who would pay to post copies of *Free Russia* to SEPC sub-committees across the country.[46] Kennan had proposed this scheme, suggesting sending circulars explaining the paper's aims to signatories of SEPC petitions and specimen copies to SEPC sub-committees in order to attract subscribers.[47] McClure argued that he had agreed to distribute the copies in packages of other material he was sending out so they would reach SEPC members, but that Goldenberg had agreed to pay the postage.[48] He was also frustrated because he believed *Free Russia* had misrepresented the SEPC, declaring that they were not 'such fools' as to think they could influence Russian domestic policy by providing the tsar with information appealing to his 'benevolent character' and stating that members would not subscribe to a newspaper which misrepresented their aims.[49] McClure was incensed to find out about the SEHS:

> We despise how deeply the formation of a society in Denver (to whom you gave the encouragement of a Commendatory letter) under a most similar name, to do the very same work we have in hand. It distracts public attention and scatters our forces.
>
> As Americans, we can certainly see more clearly than you what is possible, and we know that our petition movement has been the entering wedge, the unifying element so that we are now in a position to go forward after this education and agitation, to do just what our friends in Denver can best do as an Auxiliary Association under united action.
>
> Be assured this kind of action alienates the interest and sympathy of your best friends and makes us feel that this is the erratic and impatient action of foreigners who little understand the temper of our liberty loving, generous yet conservative people.
>
> We can go forward to accomplish great things unitedly [sic] in the very same lines of action, but separately, we should be a mob, not an army.[50]

[44] 'George Kennan's Crusade', *Washington Post*, 27 November 1889
[45] Travis, *George Kennan*, pp. 197-8
[46] McClure to Goldenberg, 5 December 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 144, ll. 1-2
[47] Kennan to Goldenberg, 19 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 43-44
[48] McClure to Goldenberg, 5 December 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 144, ll. 1-2
[49] Ibid., l. 2. McClure incorrectly referred to issue '4' of *Free Russia* in this letter, perhaps assuming it was a monthly paper, though there were only two issues in 1890.
[50] McClure to Goldenberg, 11 February 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 144, l. 4 [McClure's underlines]

Scott Saxton observed: 'jealousy is a dreadful thing'.[51] She saw the campaign for Siberian exiles' rights and the paper as a collaborative project between Russians and Americans: 'our Free Russia'.[52] Both the SEHS and SEPC/SEPA had humanitarian aims, but the conflict partly arose over how to define the sphere of their activism, who should be in charge, and the proliferation of groups with similar aims. The SFRF faced similar problems, though in Britain the campaign against tsarism was much less developed. Writing about the activities of the radical journalist Adolphe Smith in the early days of the SFRF, Robert Spence Watson claimed: 'There is no need to have any kind of clash in the matter + it is quite certain that we should have serious difficulties if we tried to work together.' Spence Watson did not want to have renegotiate the agreed purpose of the society with those who had already signed the circular and suggested instead that they proceeded with separate organisations.[53]

Some women's contributions to these networks have been overlooked, perhaps because they were perceived to only have been the wives of influential men. Emiline Rathbone Weld Kennan, George Kennan's wife, posted copies of *Free Russia* to people across the US who had 'expressed an interest in the Russian cause'.[54] Without their support and assistance, men's activism would have been less effective or widespread, though we know less about their contributions because they likely frequently went unacknowledged. Like Emiline Kennan, Goldenberg sent out unsolicited copies of *Free Russia* to influential people he believed were already sympathetic to the cause of Russian political freedom. One such recipient was the American writer Mark Twain.[55] Goldenberg knew Twain sympathised with the cause and terrorism because Kennan had written to him in 1888 describing Twain's response at one of his lectures: 'Twain was in tears and could hardly speak on account of his emotion. As soon as he gained control of himself he made a fiery revolutionary address, expressing the warmest sympathy with the fighters for liberty in Russia + with the political exiles, and closed by saying in a most impassioned way "If such a government as that of Russia cannot be overthrown in any other way than by the use of dynamite – then thank God for dynamite!"'[56] Twain opposed monarchical systems of government and dedicated the book he was writing at the

[51] Scott Saxton to Goldenberg, 22 February 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 153, l. 21
[52] Scott Saxton to Goldenberg, 28 November 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 152, l. 1 [Scott Saxton's underline]
[53] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 27 February 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 29
[54] Kennan to Goldenberg, 19 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 43
[55] Draft letter Goldenberg to Mark Twain, 30 August 1890. GARF f. 5799, op. 1, d. 29, l. 9
[56] Kennan to Goldenberg, 18 June 1888. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 8-9

time to the 'twin civilizations of hell and Russia'.[57] He would later become one of the founding members of the SAFRF.

Of the members of the SFRF's initial General and Executive Committees, only correspondence with Pease and Robert and Elizabeth Spence Watson survives in large quantities in Stepniak's archive and elsewhere. However, it is possible to see that Stepniak needed assistance and money from foreign sympathisers in order to realise his propaganda aims. For example, *Free Russia*'s primary audiences were its subscribers, members of the SFRF and SAFRF, who also paid for the newspaper through their subscriptions of one dollar or one shilling annually. The papers were also sold, often at lectures given by members of the societies or the RFPF, the English edition being priced at one penny, but general sales did not contribute much to the societies' overall income.[58] Efforts were made to place the newspaper on general sale through booksellers and periodical dealers in the US, but it seems little came of this.[59] Relying on subscriptions and donations, both newspapers were in perpetual financial difficulty and, as a result, relied on the intervention of wealthy foreign sympathisers or those with significant free time to devote to the campaign.

It is surprising that Edward Reynolds Pease had any spare time at all to devote to helping Stepniak in the 1880s and 1890s as he was involved in several labour organisations and social movements. Pease was primarily interested in the Russian revolutionary cause as a socialist, later writing that, in terms of the struggle for political rights, 'Russia is an extreme instance of what is common to the Socialist Parties of other countries.'[60] After Stepniak arrived in London, Pease requested permission to visit him and ask 'how the Revolution is progressing in Russia, and to know personally one of those whose efforts + suffering are an example to us, to sacrifice whatever is necessary in the great international cause of the people'.[61] The cause, however, also intersected with his own activism. He particularly admired Russian socialists of the 1870s who had provided educational opportunities to

---

[57] Louis J. Budd, 'Twain, Howells, and the Boston Nihilists', *New England Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3 (1959), p. 351 and p. 354

[58] 'The Honorary Treasurer in Account with the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom' [reports of accounts for the years 1898 and 1899]. Boris I. Nicolaevsky Collection, HIA, box 753, folder 3. In 1898, the SFRF received £2.12.2 from the sale of the newspaper, compared to £164.7.5 from subscriptions and donations, out of a total income of £225.2.0. In 1899, these numbers were £8.16.8, £148.17.6, and £247.10.6 respectively.

[59] Kennan to Goldenberg, 22 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 50-1. Kennan instructed Goldenberg to write to booksellers and periodical dealers.

[60] Edward R. Pease in Thomas Kirkup, *A History of Socialism. Fifth Edition largely revised and rewritten by Edward R. Pease* (London, 1913), p. 262. Pease added to Kirkup's 1892 text, relating the recent history of political struggle in Russia and interactions between Russian and other socialists.

[61] Pease to Stepniak, 23 December 1884. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 1

peasants and industrial workers. Pease was active in workers' education in London in the early 1880s, teaching at a night school: 'very dirty smelly lads in their teens came to be taught reading and writing – I suppose even in the early eighties, education was not compulsory, or at any rate many slipped through the net.'[62] His future wife, Marjory Davidson also taught working class children, leaving home to work in a London Board School in 1887, despite her parents' disapproval. Pease asked Stepniak: 'is not that a Russian sort of thing to do?'[63] In 1886, Pease had moved to Newcastle to train as a cabinet maker at the Household Furnishing Co. Ltd, abandoning his career as a stockbroker following a family inheritance.[64] In his memoirs, he claimed becoming a socialist showed him speculation was wrong and made him want to leave stockbroking.[65] He used the opportunity to educate workers about socialism, writing: 'I go about among the workmen as an equal + comrade'.[66]

Among British socialists, Pease attempted to found a 'Nihilist Aid Society' in 1886 with the help of Annie Besant. Besant was also a member of the National Secular Society, campaigning for the separation of church and state in Britain, and Pease met her at her house to discuss the proposal with other secularists Charles Bradlaugh and John M. Robertson, both Liberal Party politicians.[67] The name suggested by Pease, the 'Nihilist Aid Society', implied support for Russian terrorists. While the term Nihilist was often used to refer to a variety of Russian revolutionaries at the time, it was frequently used to describe Stepniak in the international press and Stepniak had reclaimed the term to refer to terrorists in *Underground Russia*.[68] Besant, however, felt 'Friends of Russian Liberty' would be an 'improvement' on the name.[69] Besant, Bradlaugh, and Robertson all later joined the SFRF, alongside other Fabians, including the writers Edith Nesbit and George Bernard Shaw. Mark Bevir has argued that during the 1880s, humanitarians in the Fabian Society became more dominant, illustrating the potential for intersecting reasons for supporting the Russian revolutionary cause.[70]

---

[62] Edward R. Pease, *Some Recollections for my Sons*, unpublished, [1930/1953], p. 16. British Library

[63] Pease to Stepniak, 19 August [1887]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 358, l. 26

[64] Pease to Stepniak, 27 June [1886]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 358, l. 13 and Pease to Stepniak, 9 August 1887. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 358, l. 25. His father had left him some money. Pease, *Some Recollections*, p. 19

[65] Pease, *Some Recollections*, pp. 18-9

[66] Pease to Stepniak, 1 Feb 1887. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 358, l. 21

[67] Pease to Stepniak, 8 Jan [1886]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 12ob and Pease, *Some Recollections*, p. 18. Bradlaugh is known for attempting to take the oath as MP as a secular oath.

[68] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, v. Stepniak noted that almost all that had been written about Russian Nihilists abroad had been wrong.

[69] Annie Besant to Stepniak, 8 August 1885. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 194, l. 1

[70] Mark Bevir, *The Making of British Socialism* (Princeton NJ, 2011), EBL e-book, p. 173

Pease was convinced Russia's persecuted religious minorities would find sympathy among members of Britain's Quaker community, believing that 'Russian Sects are in many ways like the Quakers'.[71] Though he had been a lapsed Quaker since 1881 or 1882, Pease retained links with the community through his teaching work.[72] Stepniak's work exposed the treatment of many religious minority groups, focusing in particular on the treatment of Jews and Stundists, a Russian Christian Baptist sect.[73] Quakers did play an important role in transnational humanitarian campaigns in this period, as identified by Luke Kelly in his study of the British response to the Russian famine of 1891-2, which the SFRF also raised funds for. Kelly argued that narratives of suffering were important in attracting sympathisers to Russian humanitarian causes in this period.[74] Quakers, being pacifists, were not an obvious source of support for Stepniak's terrorism, but two Quakers, the Spence Watsons, would prove instrumental in helping him realise plans for a society promoting the Russian revolutionary cause abroad.

The problem of defining and representing Russian causes can also be seen in the 1890s campaign to resettle the Doukhobors, a Christian sect opposed to violence, which the SFRF participated in. Examining Quaker support for the campaign on behalf of the Doukhobors, Luke Kelly has argued that self-identification with the persecuted religious group was an important draw of support and that the campaign fitted within the Quakers broader aims for international peace as they saw Russia as a source of aggression.[75]The SFRF were one of many groups engaged in campaigning for permission for the Doukhobors to emigrate and raising money to fund the cost. However, Charlotte Alston has demonstrated that such broad campaigns were also fraught with difficulties, particularly over representations of the Doukhobors' attitudes to violence. Alston argues that the Doukhobors' refusal to carry out military service aligned with the views of British Tolstoyans (followers of the Christian non-violent anarchism espoused by the Russian write Lev Tolstoy) but was

[71] Pease to Stepniak, 20 May [1888]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 39ob

[72] Pease, *Some Recollections*, p. 6. Pease could not be certain and occasionally forgot or inaccurate recorded other dates in his memoirs, such as stating Robert Spence Watson died around 1900 when he had died in 1911 (p. 22). He thought Quakers would probably have run the school he worked in. (p. 16).; Pease was interested in new ideas such as spiritualism. Mark Bevir, 'Pease, Edward Reynolds (1857-1955)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/35445 [accessed 13 February 2017]

[73] See the chapter on 'Modern Sectarianism' in Stepniak, *The Russian Peasantry* (London, 1888), pp. 339-74.

[74] Luke Kelly, 'British humanitarianism and the Russian famine, 1891-2', *Historical Research*, vol. 89, no. 246 (2016), p. 826

[75] Luke Kelly, 'Christianity and Humanitarianism in the Doukhobor Campaign, 1895–1902, *Cultural and Social History*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2016), pp. 339-55

problematic for other activists involved in the campaign.[76] In the case of terrorism, however, the members of the RFPF sought to control their public image through their publishing output and work with the Societies.

The Peases and Stepniaks were friends, Pease having asked the Russians to meet with Davidson before their marriage, because she did not know anyone in London. Despite the many demands on his time, Pease also devoted a significant amount of time to editing Stepniak's novel *The Career of a Nihilist* (1889).[77] However, his letters contained frequent spelling errors, including an occasion where he spelt Marjory's name two different ways in the same letter, suggesting he was helping a friend, not contributing professional expertise.[78] It seems he worked for free, his letters not mentioning payment, which may have been why Stepniak asked for his help, having had frequent clashes over payment with his previous editor and collaborator William Westall.[79] Pease also lent Stepniak money and Stepniak even attempted to pay him back, which was unusual.[80] Edward Pease became a member of the SFRF Executive Committee and Marjory Pease also became active in the organisation, but only two letters from Pease survive from after the end of 1889, so it is difficult to confirm his influence on the founding and direction of *Free Russia*. However, his correspondence illustrates that the SFRF and *Free Russia* were made possible by collaboration between Russians and foreign sympathisers with prior interests in Russian issues.

Though Stepniak had discussed the idea of founding a 'Russian Society' with Edward Pease in 1886, it was not until Robert and Elizabeth Spence Watson became involved, with their enthusiasm for action over words, that this idea was realised.[81] In February 1889, Robert Spence Watson invited Stepniak to lecture at the Newcastle Sunday Society, where he was president, and to stay with him, his wife Elizabeth, and their children at their home in Gateshead.[82] Both Spence Watsons were involved in other social and humanitarian causes. Robert Spence Watson had travelled to Alsace-Lorraine with the Society of Friends to oversee distribution of relief to non-

[76] Charlotte Alston, '"A Great Host of Sympathisers"', pp.211-2
[77] See Chapter Five.
[78] Pease to Stepniak, 23 August 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 69 and l. 70ob
[79] William Westall to Stepniak, 4 June 1885. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 462, ll. 6-8ob. Stepniak usually took a larger share of the advance and disputed having agreed Westall could take the entire royalty payment until he had recouped his share.
[80] Pease to Stepniak, 8 June 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 77-77ob
[81] Pease to Stepniak, 8 Jan [1886]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 12ob
[82] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 14 February 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 2. It appears this was the first time they had met.

combatants in the Franco-Prussian War.[83] They were also active in promoting education and Robert was a committee member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, of which he became president in 1900. Elizabeth Spence Watson would later become a significant figure in the women's suffrage movement in the North of England. Inspired by Stepniak's books and his lecture, after his departure from Newcastle, both Spence Watsons wrote to him expressing their desire to help those living under tsarist rule. Robert Spence Watson also sent a donation, to be spent however Stepniak decided.[84] Despite his pacifism and his other beliefs, such as in settling labour disputes by arbitration, Robert Spence Watson did not condemn outright Stepniak's justifications of terrorism, writing: 'Your work is truly noble. I can't, of course, hold some of your views. To some I am intensely opposed, but when the vessel holds good measure of good stuff, why should we quarrel with the shape or pattern?'[85] An active SAFRF member who was also a Quaker, the writer Lillie Buffum Chace Wyman, expressed similar views:

> I don't think I am exactly in sympathy with the Terrorist part of the movement. It is not merely my Quaker blood that objects. I am not convinced of its wisdom, but I frankly admit that it is impossible for an outsider to judge correctly all the circumstances. I <u>am</u> convinced of the immense moral purpose underlying your revolutionary movement, and I rejoice to have been able to unite with the attempts to aid the Russian cause by bringing to bear upon it the moral influence of the Western world.[86]

Such statements suggest the interconnected narratives of suffering, political freedom, and terrorism enabled foreign sympathisers to reconcile their personal values with terrorism.

The Spence Watsons' initiatives and money were crucial to the success of the English SFRF. Robert Spence Watson was its chairman and treasurer from its founding in 1890 to his death in 1911. Despite often being overlooked, Elizabeth Spence Watson worked for the society, sending out circulars and sending updates to Stepniak on the progress of subscriptions.[87] Stepniak recognised her role when he wrote to her in November 1889, as the Spence Watsons were enthusiastically putting together a circular and appeal, to say: 'I hope ou [sic] will be able to do more than spreading truth about Russian conditions. That is well and good for <u>us</u>. But <u>your</u>

---

[83] Percy Corder, *The Life of Robert Spence Watson* (London, 1914), pp. 110-1. Spence Watson declined honours offered by the French for his work.

[84] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 22 March 1889. RGALI, f.1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 4.; Elizabeth Spence Watson to Stepniak, 22 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 470, l. 1

[85] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 22 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 5

[86] Lillie B. Chace Wyman to Fanni Stepniak, 25 July 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 461, l. 16 [Wyman's underlines]. Wyman was responding to Stepniak's novel and *Russia Under the Tzars*.

[87] Elizabeth Spence Watson to Stepniak, 11 April 1890, RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 470, l. 9

society may be able to get at the truth and bring it out to light.'[88] The Spence Watsons were the largest donors supporting the SFRF's newspaper *Free Russia*, but when the lists of subscriptions were printed in the newspaper, Robert Spence Watson requested that their donations be concealed in some way, so it did not give the impression they dominated the society.[89] Kennan also mirrored the Spence Watsons' roles in the US to some extent and in October 1890 began sending money for the express purpose of printing and distributing *Free Russia*.[90] However, as discussed later, Kennan's waning commitment to the SAFRF and the American *Free Russia* contrasted to the Spence Watson's ongoing dedication.

Stepniak's correspondence with Elizabeth Spence Watson and Wyman illustrates one area in which their conceptions of the scope of foreigners' activism on behalf of Russian issues differed. Elizabeth Spence Watson initially suggested: 'surely if there was a sufficiently strong public opinion in England on the question that could have some effect. Perhaps you will laugh at me – but I have been wondering whether if pressure was brought to bear on our Queen, + she were to write an autograph letter to the Czar – <u>that</u> would be of any use.'[91] Though acknowledging foreigners could have some influence on Russian domestic policy as they had in opposing serfdom, Stepniak believed this influence would be limited. He replied:

> Do not you think that in such conditions benevolent advices from foreigners who occupy the very high positions would induce him to change his line of conduct? It is like rose water for curing the plague as a friend of mine said on one occasion.
>
> No, dear madame: in Russia, as everywhere else, freedom will be won by fighting not otherwise. The foreign friends and sympathies can help the course of our freedom by strengthening the fighting body, or more exactly the opposition as far as it is morally possible to do to foreigners. This is at all events the only really valuable assistance they could give us.[92]

Wyman also suggested that 'moral influence of the Western world' could persuade the tsar to enact reform.[93] This disagreement highlights the paradox inherent in *Free Russia*. The paper's programme declared its purpose as using foreign public opinion to influence Russian domestic policy, but Stepniak clearly did not believe the influence of this pressure on foreign governments to make intercessions in Russian domestic policy would end in success.[94] However, not all of the Russian members of

---

[88] Stepniak to Elizabeth Spence Watson, 15 November 1889. Spence-Watson-Weiss Papers, NCL, SW1/7/84
[89] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 22 March 1889. RGALI, f.1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 4
[90] Kennan to Goldenberg, 22 October 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 54
[91] Elizabeth Spence Watson to Stepniak, 22 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 470, l. 1 [Spence Watson's underline]
[92] Stepniak to Elizabeth Spence Watson, [No date]. Spence Watson Weiss Papers, SW1/17/93
[93] Lillie B. Chace Wyman to Fanni Stepniak, 25 July 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 461, l. 16.
[94] 'Our Plan of Action', *Free Russia*, vol. 1, no. 1 (June 1890), pp. 1-3

the RFPF seem to have agreed with Stepniak's view. In the early 1890s, Goldenberg drafted a letter to the tsar, pretending to be an American, arguing for rights for political prisoners, suggesting he believed, at least then, that foreigners' direct appeals to the tsar could be effective.[95]

Given Stepniak's emphasis on violent revolution in his letter to Elizabeth Spence Watson, it also seems strange the Spence Watsons would support Stepniak when his only interest in them appeared to be in the support they could offer to a 'fighting body'. Pease, on the other hand, also a Quaker, was enthusiastic about meeting Zasulich and Stepniak's depictions of Russian revolutionary terrorism. He noted that his sister opposed his support for Russian terrorists, remarking: 'Irish people are, you see, rather sensitive on the matter of conspiracies: they have too much of them at home.'[96] It is unclear from Pease's letter and his family context who he was referring to here as the Peases were a family of English Quakers, however, it illustrates Pease's awareness the sensitivity of the British political climate to foreign revolutionaries promoting terrorism as a result of ongoing Irish revolutionary terrorist activities, as will be discussed in further detail in Chapter Two. Both Pease and the Spence Watsons were able to accept Russian revolutionary terrorism, having read Stepniak's books and hearing him lecture about the brutality of tsarist rule in Russia and the absence of any form of legal political opposition.

Many of the core active members of both societies, including the Spence Watsons, were involved in other political, social, and humanitarian campaigns. The networks through which they campaigned were built onto pre-existing networks of activism. In Britain, the SFRF had strong links to Liberal politics, both within the Liberal Party and in the National Liberal Federation.[97] Robert Spence Watson was active in local and national Liberal politics, including as a founding member of the National Liberal Federation and as its president from 1890 to 1902. Elizabeth Spence Watson was president of the Newcastle Women's Liberal Association. Among early members of the SFRF and its large General Committee were several backbench Liberal MPs, as recognised by Luke Kelly.[98] The majority of these represented constituencies in the North of England.[99] A similar pattern can be seen in 1895, in a

[95] Draft letter Goldenberg to 'Your Imperial Majesty', [No date]. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 29, ll. 20-21. His English was so terrible, it is unlikely anyone would have believed an American had written it.

[96] Pease to Stepniak, 8 Jan [1886]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 12ob

[97] See Hollingsworth, 'Society of Friends of Russian Freedom' for further discussion of the role of liberal politics and public opinion.

[98] Kelly, *British Humanitarian Activity in Russia*, p. 137

[99] *Free Russia*, 1, June 1890, p. 18. The three-person Executive Committee dealt with the day-to-day running of the SFRF and *Free Russia*

list of SFRF supporters released to advertise the society's Annual General Meeting. Again, the list named several MPs, of whom the majority were Liberal Party politicians representing northern constituencies.[100] Perhaps due to turnover of MPs, only two names from 1890 appeared again in the 1895 list.[101] However, new support was drawn from among Liberal political networks. When sending out circulars promoting the new society and its cause in early 1890, Robert Spence Watson had specifically targeted MPs.[102] It was not the case, however, that the SFRF was a partisan affair and Spence Watson encouraged cross-party support. In April 1890, he wrote to Stepniak to inform him that the Conservative MP Henry Charles Stephens had written to him. Spence Watson thought Stephens should be on the General Committee.[103] He accepted, though Spence Watson remarked that he needed 'a little persuasion.'[104]

In Britain, the SFRF also maintained strong links with the peace movement. Robert Spence Watson was president of the Peace Society for a time and the SFRF's secretary, Joseph Frederick Green, was simultaneously secretary of the International Arbitration and Peace Society (IAPA). He worked for both causes from the same office in Outer Temple, London, the address listed on the front page of *Free Russia*.[105] Robert Spence Watson also worked on many arbitration cases between industrial workers and employers.[106] Just as the SFRF's networks relied on pre-existing networks of activism, new connections were formed in the SFRF. Green first got to know George Herbert Perris, who would later become influential in the British peace movement, through the society. Just as support for terrorism among Quakers might appear unlikely, the pacifists Green and Samuel George Hobson, another member of the both the SFRF and IAPA, became involved in an operation with Chaikovskii, in which they tried to smuggle six thousand guns into Russia in late

---

[100] 'Society of Friends of Russian Freedom: The Annual Meeting of the Society', UND/F10/H3, Academic papers of Barry Hollingsworth, folder 13, Durham University Library Special Collections.

[101] The exceptions were William Pollard Byles, MP for Shipley, listed as a member of the 'Managing Sub-Committee' in 1890, and Alfred Webb, MP for Waterford in Ireland, represented the Irish Parliamentary Party, whose MPs supported Home Rule for Ireland. Robert Spence Watson was among those in the Liberal Party who also supported this. *Free Russia*, 1, June 1890, p. 18

[102] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 22 January 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 20

[103] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 10 April 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 42. Stephens was listed as a member of the General Committee in the first issue of *Free Russia*.

[104] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 17 April 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 47

[105] Paul Laity, *The British Peace Movement, 1870-1914* (Oxford, 2001), p. 135. In later years, the SFRF's Executive Committee often met at his house.

[106] Corder, *Robert Spence Watson*, p. 170. Spence Watson was often the sole arbitrator on cases.

1904.[107] Supporting the SFRF, then, for many was intrinsically bound up with supporting a measure of violence by Russian revolutionaries.

The SAFRF was founded in Boston when Stepniak visited on his lecture tour, where Sergei and Fanni Stepniak arrived in January 1891.[108] The Stepniaks stayed in Boston for at least a month before leaving for Washington sometime in March.[109] Ostensibly a national organisation, in reality the majority of its activities were organised and carried out by a few activists who formed the Executive Committee in Boston. They mostly came from Boston's political, social, and humanitarian activist circles, particularly anti-slavery campaigners and/or those involved in campaigning for women's suffrage. As with the English SFRF, it is difficult to identify whose idea it was to found the SAFRF and how exactly it was formed. However, by the middle of 1891 the significant members of the SAFRF Executive Committee were in place and they became the main force behind the publication of the American edition of *Free Russia* in New York. Among the most active members in the 1890s was the treasurer Francis Jackson Garrison.[110] Garrison is perhaps the least well-known of the children of the abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison because his youth and school studies prevented him from playing an active role in supporting his father's anti-slavery activism.[111] His brother, Wendell Phillips Garrison, editor of the influential *Nation* newspaper, expressed an early interest in the cause, but ultimately did not become active in the SAFRF.[112] Other active SAFRF members included Julia Ward Howe, a famous American abolitionist and women's suffrage campaigner. Garrison was another active SAFRF member involved in the campaign for women's suffrage.[113]

Another key member of the SAFRF was Edmund Noble, who became the organisation's secretary in August 1891 after Edward A. Spring had left Boston and

---

[107] Raymond Challinor, 'Gun-Running from the North-East Coast, 1905-7', *Bulletin of the North-East Group for the Study of Labour History*, vol. 6 (1972), p. 1; The operation apparently involved smuggling the guns in containers of lard. Laity, *British Peace Movement*, p. 135.

[108] On 3 January Fanni Stepniak requested 100 copies of *Free Russia* to be sent to her husband in Boston and confirmed their arrival in a letter dated 24 January. Fanni Stepniak to Goldenberg, 3 January 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 100, l. 1 and Fanni Stepniak to Goldenberg, 24 January 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 100, l. 2

[109] They left at some point between her last letter clearly from Boston on 23 February and her letter confirming their arrival in Washington, on which Goldenberg noted the date of his reply: 2 April. Fanni Stepniak to Goldenberg, 23 February 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 100, l. 15 and Fanni Stepniak to Goldenberg, [no date]. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 100, l. 19

[110] Garrison to Goldenberg, 19 August 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 16;

[111] Harriet Hyman Alonso*, Growing up Abolitionist: The Story of the Garrison Children* (Amherst MA, 2002), p. 239; He helped with door-to-door campaigning and proof-reading at his father's journal *The Liberator*. Henry Mayer, *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York, 1998), p. 530

[112] Wendell Philips Garrison to Stepniak, 6 May 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 241, l. 1

[113] Francis Jackson Garrison to Stepniak, 24 May 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 242, l. 15ob

the post. Noble was a journalist, born in Scotland, who had worked in Russia as a special correspondent for English and Scottish newspapers in 1882-4, where he had met and married a Russian woman, the writer Lydia Lvovna Pimenova**,** before moving to the US in 1885.[114] Edmund and Lydia Pimenova-Noble's long-standing interest in the Russian revolutionary movement and enthusiasm to assist the cause, meant they often arranged events to raise funds and awareness, while also funding these activities from their own pockets. Lydia Noble frequently lectured on Russian topics and attempted to raise awareness of the newspaper where she could.[115]

Garrison and Noble's relationships with Goldenberg seem to have been similar to Robert Spence Watson's with Stepniak regarding the day-to-day running of the paper. Like Stepniak, who made use of Spence Watson's contacts, Goldenberg asked Garrison if they could use Garrison's firm to print *Free Russia* in exchange for adverts, hoping to save money, but Garrison thought they would not and that they would also be too expensive as they usually did 'high class book work'.[116] Spence Watson was determined to influence the content of the paper, for example insisting on a balanced view in a bibliography of books on Russian issues, whereas Stepniak wanted to exclude books which were unsympathetic to the revolutionary cause and which he believed printed lies about the tsarist system.[117] Spence Watson continued to write regularly for the paper until his death. In America, Garrison and Noble provided additional editorial matter. In both cases, the Russians received payments from the Societies for work on the paper but did not have access to unlimited funds.[118]

SAFRF members felt it was important to have an influential figurehead to lead the society. In anticipation of Kennan's eventual refusal to become president, Goldenberg proposed Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson, a minister, abolitionist,

---

[114] 'Mrs. Edmund Noble', *New York Times*, 4 August 1934; 'Edmund Noble, 84, Journalist, Dead', *New York Times*, 9 January 1937

[115] Lydia Pimenova-Noble gave lectures in full Russian national dress, which included reciting Russian poetry. Noble to Goldenberg, 25 November 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 10 and Noble to Goldenberg, 30 December 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 17. George Kennan also gave lectures wearing the furs he had worn while in Siberia. This dramatic technique was also used by other lecturers of the time. Travis, *George Kennan*, p. 39; An advertisement for a lecture did not mention *Free Russia* as it was felt people would be more likely to attend if they did not think she was promoting subscriptions to a society or paper. It was nevertheless felt her lecture would help the cause. Garrison to Goldenberg, 31 July 1892. GARF, 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 80ob

[116] Garrison to Goldenberg, 17 July 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 13

[117] Stepniak to Robert Spence Watson, 14 April 1890. Spence Watson Weiss Papers, SW1/17/91 and Robert Spence Watson to Sergei Stepniak, 16 April 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, ll. 48-9

[118] Garrison to Goldenberg, 22 February 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 47ob; Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 30 July 1892. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 33. Spence Watson referred to a five-pound payment for 'literary material'.

and Civil War veteran. Goldenberg suggested they needed to find someone like Spence Watson in England, who was 'independent + broad minded' and although he did not know Higginson personally, he had 'heard some people to speak well of him'.[119] Noble agreed that they needed to find someone who could bring 'social prestige to the society, and at the same time deeply touched with the needs and condition of the Russian people.'[120] Unfortunately, Higginson declined the presidency, and Noble remarked that, although there were many 'reformers' in Boston, they were all busy with other causes.[121] Noble also recommended Goldenberg speak to the American doctor and suffragist Mary Putnam Jacobi in New York for ideas of potential presidents.[122] The SAFRF struggled as they never managed to find someone willing to devote as much time as Robert Spence Watson, or indeed so much of their own money.

1.3 The Limits and Scope of Transnational Co-operation

Historians have studied the SFRF and SAFRF primarily as national organisations in isolation or to examine broader support for the Russian revolutionaries abroad.[123] Dmitrii Nechiporuk has illustrated how limited the SAFRF's sphere of activism was in the US.[124] David Saunders and Michael Hughes have examined the SFRF's place in wider interactions between Russia and Britain, with Saunders examining the place of long-term links with the North East of England and Hughes the dynamics of Russophobia and responses to terrorism in the 1880s.[125] Historians have also used *Free Russia* to explore transnational humanitarian advocacy and co-operation.[126] *Free Russia* was an unusually long-lasting revolutionary publication and is an important resource for studying relationships between Russian revolutionaries and

---

[119] Draft letter Goldenberg to Garrison, 24 October 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 25. Goldenberg thought it best Garrison find a president for the SAFRF, perhaps because he knew few suitable individuals personally.

[120] Noble to Goldenberg, 3 November 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 5

[121] Noble to Goldenberg, 14 November 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 8. Another Civil War veteran, Colonel Robert Ingersoll, was linked to the SAFRF, having supposedly presided over a mass meeting in 1892. Noble to Goldenberg, 4 February 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 32

[122] Noble to Goldenberg, 14 November 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 8

[123] For example: Good, 'America and the Russian Revolutionary Movement, pp. 273-4, Hamburg, 'London Emigration', Hollingsworth, 'Society of Friends of Russian Freedom', and Donald Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*,

[124] D.M. Nechiporuk, '"Chto amerikantsy mogut sdelat' dlya Rossii?": agitatsiia amerikanskogo Obshchestva druzei russkoi svobody I zhurnal "*Free Russia*" (1891–1894 gody)', *Istoricheskii ezhegodnik* (2008), pp. 137-50

[125] David Saunders, 'Tyneside and the Making of the Russian Revolution', *Northern History*, vol. 21, no. 1 (1985), pp. 259-84; Hughes, 'British Opinion and Russian Terrorism', pp. 255-77

[126] Charlotte Alston, 'Transnational solidarities and the politics of the left, 1890-1990 – introduction', *European Review of History*, vol. 21, no. 4 (2014), p. 447; Henderson, 'Hyde Park Rally', pp. 451-66

foreign sympathisers. The English edition and its American and German-language editions together illustrate the need to study these publications and the societies in transnational and comparative contexts, particularly to see the limits of transnational co-operation, discover how individuals within this network viewed their own roles, and understand how and why conflicts arose. Comparing the different editions of the newspaper reveals how they targeted propaganda for different audiences, though maintaining a core message. This research also reconsiders the relative influence of Russians and non-Russians as, for example, *Free Russia* was officially designated the organ of the SFRF. Key issues examined in this section are conflicting interests in the American campaign, the campaign to abrogate the Russian-American extradition treaty in 1892-3, the collapse of the American *Free Russia* in 1894, and the founding and nature of the German edition of the paper, *Frei Russland*.

Although Stepniak's visit to the US was a significant catalyst for the founding of the SAFRF, Goldenberg already had a great deal of autonomy in producing the American *Free Russia*. Pease offered him stereotype plates or print moulds of the first two issues to print in New York and 'sell at what price you please'.[127] Goldenberg's initiative and contacts certainly established interest in the paper and generated audiences for Stepniak's lecture tour. Kennan enthusiastically took up the cause of finding subscribers for the paper from July 1890, believing it would be necessary to distribute a few hundred, but better a thousand, free copies of the paper. At this stage the London office supplied copies of the paper, though Goldenberg later arranged to print copies in the US, meaning he needed more funds. Stepniak's inexperience in the newspaper-publishing business was also clear in his attempts to attract advertisements. The publishers of his novel thanked him for placing their advert in *Free Russia* but thought the prices quoted for advertisements were 'relatively too dear.'[128] Goldenberg's role in the RFPF's activities, while previously overlooked, illustrate the importance of looking beyond individuals such as Stepniak, who lacked organisational or management skills.

Goldenberg was instrumental to producing the SAFRF's derivative edition of *Free Russia* which, over time, was oriented to a greater degree towards American readers.[129] The initial issues of the American edition were almost identical to the original edition, with adverts, accounts of lectures, and news aimed at readers in

[127] Pease to Goldenberg, 4 August 1890. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1Fo, d. 148, ll. 1-1ob
[128] D. Gordon to Stepniak, 20 September 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 23ob
[129] As the newspaper's uncredited editor, Goldenberg was paid for his work by the SAFRF. Garrison, as the SAFRF's treasurer' regretted being unable to pay him more than $300 per year. Garrison to Goldenberg, 22 February 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 47ob.

Britain. Garrison first suggested putting in new material in June 1891.[130] This additional material included items such as advertising, including adverts for the SAFRF, but also news items and editorial material. Noble supplied most of this new material, mostly in the form of his 'American Notes', for which he was paid a small amount per month.[131] The core content of the paper, such as Stepniak's long editorials, remained but, over time, the number of articles specific to the American edition increased, and the paper began to differ more greatly. Kennan and Garrison both believed that the English paper's content and form, as well as Stepniak's writing style, were unsuitable for American readers.[132] Noble agreed, writing in January 1892 of his hope to write more for the newspaper and noting 'at present Free Russia is too heavy and solid for American readers. I am not criticising Stepniak – thus far he has done everything in a masterly fashion – but I think we could have a department better suited to our readers on this side of the water.'[133]

Members of the RFPF envisaged not only that *Free Russia* would have a transnational audience across English-speaking countries, but that its content could be transmitted to different audiences. Copies of the American *Free Russia* were sent to 'Russian subscribers' suggesting there was potential interest inside Russia in discourses about the country, the revolutionary movement, and terrorism abroad.[134] Similarly, Volkhovskii wrote to Goldenberg to say their Russian-language publication *Letuchie listki*'s content was intended to be about half material already published in *Free Russia* and translated and half new material.[135] This again suggests that the messages in *Free Russia* were felt to have transnational appeal.

In contrast to the American edition, the German language edition *Frei Russland* was controlled directly from the London office. It was not a result of collaboration between the English SFRF and RFPF office and a local group in Switzerland. The Buchdruckerei Grütlivereins in Zurich printed the paper and the paper listed its 'administration' as the 'Buchhandlung des Schweiz. Grütlivereins in

---

[130] Garrison to Goldenberg, 23 June 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 8

[131] During the period when the American *Free Russia* was larger due to the agitation against the Russian-American extradition treaty, Noble received around $10 per month, though he noted this was not done on a 'commercial basis'. Noble to Goldenberg, 12 December 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, ll. 211-211ob

[132] Both Garrison and Kennan believed *Free Russia* should contain a smaller proportion of fiction, Garrison believing they should have a monthly letter from St Petersburg in its place and Kennan providing a list of topics on the theme of 'Russian news from its own sources of information'. Garrison to Goldenberg, 2 November 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 87 and Kennan to Goldenberg, 23 October 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 117-117ob

[133] Noble to Goldenberg, 25 January 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 30 [Noble's underlines]

[134] Garrison to Goldenberg, 28 October 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op.1, d. 133, l. 137ob

[135] Volkhovskii to Goldenberg, [no date]. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 24, l. 68ob

Zürich', but listed the address of the editorial office as '*Free Russia*' at 2 Hyde Park Mansions, London, which was Volkhovskii's home at that time. *Frei Russland* ran to eleven monthly issues between January and November 1892. The London members of the RFPF raised funds to support the paper and it does not seem to have ever been independently financially viable. In May 1892, Feliks Volkhovskii wrote to Lucy Rossetti asking her to ensure her daughter, 'comrade-secretary' (it is not specified whether this referred to Olivia or Helen, who edited the self-published anarchist journal *The Torch*) should collect part of the money she was collecting for the Russian cause for

> the special purpose of maintaining and pushing forward of the German periodical "Frei Russland" (the germ. edition of Free Russia). This point must be made quite clear when receiving a donation, because all donations, given without pointing out their special destination will go to the general fund and Frei Russland will recieve [sic] nothing, while propaganda in German is of the greatest important & the German periodical is in great need of money. Money for this purpose is wanted only temporarily, as the periodical will become very soon self supporting; but just at present means are wanted badly.[136]

The majority of the copies of the German *Free Russia* were shipped back to Wilfrid Voinich at the RFPF office in Hammersmith, though copies were sent to bookshops and dealers around Europe and the US, including 25 copies to Goldenberg in New York.[137] It therefore seems to have been rather expensive and pointless to produce the paper in Zürich, although it gave the appearance of a further site within the transnational network the RFPF was building. The London office even collected some of the subscriptions for *Frei Russland* and forwarded the funds to Grütlivereins.[138] A letter from Robert Spence Watson to Sergei Stepniak suggests *Frei Russland* was a project set up by the RFPF, falling largely outside of the SFRF's influence, which explains why Volkhovskii was keen to have funds reserved for the purpose. Spence Watson wrote to Stepniak in January 1892:

> Now, as to the German Edition. Has this matter been before the Committee. [sic] It certainly should be before we send out these Authorities and then there should be a little recast stating that it is by the authority of the Committee and in pursuance of a Resolution come to on a certain day + so forth.
>
> I agree with you that the Swiss Ambassador must not be brought into the business.[139]

It is unclear whether Stepniak ever ventured to obtain the SFRF Committee's approval and it was never printed in *Frei Russland*. However, the extent to which *Frei*

---

[136] Volkhovskii to Lucy Rossetti, 15 May 1892. Coll Misc 0493, LSE [Volkhovskii's underlines]

[137] 'Verzeichnis der Ablagen für "Frei Russland"' [List of suppliers for *Frei Russland*], April 1893. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii Papers, HIA, box 8, folder 6, 'Frei Russland'. 700 of the 1099 total copies listed were marked for 'John Kielchevsky', the pseudonym of Wilfrid Voinich.

[138] W. Anderfuhren to [RFPF], 2 May 1891 [1892?]. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 125, l. 1. The date on this document appears to be incorrect.

[139] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 2 January 1892. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 472, ll. 1-2

Russland operated outside of the influence of the SFRF must not be overstated. The content was largely the content of *Free Russia* in translation, which included numerous contributions by SFRF members, translated into German. German readers were seen as a responsive audience and when a French edition of the paper was proposed, Stepniak felt the French would not be a receptive audience for their propaganda message, at least at that time.[140]

Frei Russland ceased due to a lack of funds. Letters from W. Anderfuhren sent to the SFRF and RFPF in London from November 1893 show Anderfuhren believed the SFRF had agreed to guarantee the finances of *Frei Russland*, but that the paper remained in debt by 216.80 Swiss francs to Grütlivereins.[141] According to a Grütlivereins invoice from October 1894, the London office had paid part of the debt and arranged to settle the remaining amount.[142] Anderfuhren argued that they could not write off the debt as they were a 'concern of working men'.[143] The RFFP's attitude towards this debt was indicative of their general lack of funds and its members' own personal situations. These impacted on the finances of the RFPF as they borrowed money from it to live.[144]

The American *Free Russia* also closed due to a lack of funds, but the circumstances of its demise were much more complex. For a long time, Goldenberg, Garrison, and Noble remained convinced that they could sustain publication. At first there was a general consensus that the SAFRF and American *Free Russia* needed Kennan to be president and editor respectively in order to be successful. Some confusion arose over a comment made by Kennan regarding funding for the paper. It seems Kennan suggested to both Goldenberg and Stepniak that he believed an American edition of the paper would need $5000 for a 'guarantee fund' for the first year in order to ensure its success.[145] Garrison's response to this news illustrates how they interpreted this statement: 'As to helping to raise the $5000 to secure Kennan's editorship, I think a careful estimate of the form, cost, +c., of the proposed venture should be made, + a business-like presentation of it made before expecting

---

[140] Stepniak to Robert Spence Watson, 14 April 1890. Spence Watson Weiss Papers, SW1/17/91

[141] W. Anderfuhren to the Honorary Secretary of the Society of Friends of R. Freedom, 6 November 1893. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii Papers, HIA, box 8, folder 6

[142] W. Anderfuhren to the Honorary Secretary of the Society of Friends of R. Freedom, 15 October 1894. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii Papers, HIA, box 8, folder 6

[143] W. Anderfuhren to the Honorary Secretary of the Society of Friends of R. Freedom, 6 November 1893. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii Papers, HIA, box 8, folder 6

[144] Accounts, File 6, 'Flying leaflets', Coll Misc 1156, LSE. Receipts for three of five instalments due to the RFPF for a loan of forty pounds to Volkhovskii in the 1890s show he repaid each instalment late, including the fourth two years late.

[145] Kennan to Stepniak, 15 April 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 299, ll. 22-3. Kennan mentioned the sum in this letter.

any considerable subscriptions from persons of means'.[146] Kennan wrote to Lazarev, who copied part of the letter to Stepniak, and also to Stepniak himself, to make it clear he did not want them to think he had agreed to edit the paper in any eventuality and that the amount he had suggested was merely his advice to them.[147] Nevertheless, the SAFRF began fundraising in earnest for the 'Kennan Guarantee Fund'.[148]

This sum was far beyond the commercial and fundraising abilities of the SAFRF, the American *Free Russia*, and Goldenberg's RFPF office in New York, illustrated in part by early letters from Garrison to Goldenberg listing subscribers who should receive *Free Russia*. Subscribers paid one dollar per year for a subscription to *Free Russia*, for which most of the period 1891-4, the paper received only half. Onto some early letters from Garrison, Goldenberg numbered the lists of names, which provides an incomplete record of the number of subscribers. A letter dated 2 October 1891 records the 1195th subscriber.[149] Of the annual dollar subscription, the SAFRF gave fifty cents directly to *Free Russia*. Garrison hoped to use the other half to 'secure a body for organization which I hope would prove more compact + effective than a mere subscription would make it, without special + practical direction. So we will divide our poverty'.[150] The SAFRF did, however, use their share of the funds to pay for *Free Russia*, both as donations and in return for a monthly advert, in the space where an advert for the English SFRF had appeared in the English edition.[151]

In comparison to Kennan's figures, expenditure on the paper was also low. In February 1892, Garrison estimated the annual cost of producing and sending out the newspaper to be $1200 per year and believed that the SAFRF could raise $600.[152] He regretted that this meant they could only pay Goldenberg $300 per year for his work on the paper, which Garrison felt was too little.[153] Garrison and Noble regularly praised Goldenberg's economy in producing *Free Russia* in their letters and

---

[146] Garrison to Goldenberg, 16 June 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 5ob

[147] Letter from Kennan to Lazarev, quoted in Lazarev to Stepniak, [No date]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 328, l. 14. Kennan reiterated this to Stepniak. Kennan to Stepniak, 29 April 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 299, l. 25

[148] Lucia Purdy to Goldenberg, 8 December 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 149, l. 14. Purdy planned a concert to raise funds.

[149] Garrison to Goldenberg, 3 October 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 22. The next letters with numbered lists of subscribers do not appear until January 1892, when the SAFRF began collecting renewal subscriptions, and in records after this it is unclear whether numbers refer to new subscribers or renewals.

[150] Garrison to Goldenberg, 19 June 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 6ob

[151] Garrison to Goldenberg, 3 December 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 31. Garrison sent a cheque for twenty-five dollars, comprising five dollars for the advert in the December edition and twenty dollars as the Society's donation to the paper.

[152] Garrison to Goldenberg, 22 February 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 47ob

[153] Ibid., l. 47ob

apologised that they could not pay him more.[154] Goldenberg did have some unrealistic visions for *Free Russia*, including thinking the SAFRF might be able to raise $4000 for a guarantee fund in 1892 and suggesting in 1893 that Kennan might give *Free Russia* $300-400 of his own money.[155] While no formal accounts survive for the RFPF's New York office, the SAFRF, or the American *Free Russia*, it is possible to see that the sum Kennan suggested was also many times greater than the actual running costs for the American *Free Russia*. These letters reveal Kennan and Goldenberg both envisaged *Free Russia* as a large and expensive project with a much bigger audience than it ever reached, whereas Garrison, over time, began to realise their initial financial aspirations would remain unfulfilled. Garrison did suggest that raising money among wealthy Jews in New York could attract some large donors, and his suggestion of Mr Straus and Mr Schiff to Goldenberg did lead to some significant donations.[156] Travis has suggested that American Jews were inclined to support *Free Russia* because it raised the issue of the oppression of Jews in Russia.[157] However, these did not approach the numbers suggested by Goldenberg for the SAFRF's fundraising potential.

Kennan did not want to take on the editorship of a paper whose future was not secure. He already had his own career and was occupied with his own efforts to assist the Russian revolutionary movement. Over time, the relationships between the SAFRF, Goldenberg, and Kennan seemingly deteriorated. Kennan's initial enthusiasm and provision of funds to support the American *Free Russia* soon dissipated and Goldenberg, Garrison, and Noble appear to have become increasingly frustrated with his broken promises to contribute to the paper and advertise it at his lectures.[158] Kennan's initial interest in the paper appears to have been partly motivated by his desire to make a living through editing a paper on Russian political issues for American audiences, perhaps also partly explaining why he suggested such a large amount of money was required to produce the paper for a year.[159] Travis has estimated Kennan's earnings at over forty thousand dollars in

[154] Garrison to Goldenberg, 8 July 1893, GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 125
[155] Garrison to Goldenberg, 24 February 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l.49 and Garrison to Goldenberg, 11 December 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 142. Garrison thought both proposals unrealistic.
[156] A Mr Straus sent $100 and a Mr Schiff sent $100 in June 1892 and promised to send the same amount annually for two years. Garrison to Goldenberg, 1 June 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 64
[157] Travis, *George Kennan*, p. 212
[158] Garrison to Goldenberg, 2 February 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 47ob. Garrison remarked that he would ask Kennan again he intended to do anything for *Free Russia*.
[159] Kennan to Goldenberg, 23 October 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 118

1889-90 and that he had managed to put some of this aside, but this was earned from long years of lecturing tours.[160] By 1890, Kennan also needed to rest.

Instead of supporting the American *Free Russia* as its financial situation worsened, Kennan planned a new project. In May 1893, he travelled to Europe with the principal aim of meeting with Baron Maurice von Hirsch, a German-Jewish philanthropist. He had hoped to secure financial support for a new paper and told only Goldenberg, Noble, and Garrison of his intentions: he planned to inform Stepniak and Volkhovskii only if he was successful.[161] Kennan envisaged editing this paper with Noble's assistance, publishing it simultaneously in English and Russian, and that it would circulate in Russia, among Russian émigrés in Europe and the US, and among foreign sympathisers. He proposed to get a 'first class man' such as Gleb Uspenskii or Nikolai Mikhailovskii and to pay that person enough to 'leave Russia forever and devote himself exclusively to this work'.[162] Kennan tried on two occasions to get an appointment with Hirsch, but was unable to secure the opportunity to discuss his plans and returned to the US empty handed, though intending to try again on his return to London in December[163] Kennan's attempt to obtain support for an entirely new project, rather than the ailing American *Free Russia*, suggests either he did not want to work on *Free Russia* or felt Hirsch would not support it, both of which suggest the competing motivations of different individuals supporting the Russian revolutionary cause abroad meant attempts to unite them could never succeed.

In 1894, as the American *Free Russia* limped to an unceremonious end, it must have been clear to Noble, Goldenberg, and Garrison that it would soon close. Garrison noted that the March 1894 receipts were 'surprisingly good', but by the time of planning the publication of the June-July 1894 edition of the paper, he knew it would be the last.[164] However, this issue never appeared, and the paper simply disappeared. The SAFRF then closed for the first time in 1898. Regretting he and his colleagues had not been able to do more to support the Russian revolutionary cause, its treasurer Francis Jackson Garrison wrote to Robert Spence Watson, blaming domestic political, social, and economic problems for dwindling interest in the SAFRF's activities. Garrison sent two pounds to Spence Watson, the remnants of the

---

[160] Travis, *George Kennan*, p. 225

[161] Kennan to Goldenberg, 9 May 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 132-3. Kennan wrote: 'Let me caution you again not to say anything about it, because if I should fail it would be better not to have it known that I had tried. If I succeed there will be a place for you on the paper.'

[162] Ibid., l. 132. Even if Kennan had secured the funds, it seems unlikely these influential revolutionary figures would have agreed to emigrate and participate in his project.

[163] Kennan to Goldenberg, 30 August 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, ll. 137-8

[164] Garrison to Goldenberg, 8 March 1894, GARF, f. 5799, op.1, d. 133, l. 151 and Garrison to Goldenberg, 13 July 1894. GARF, f. 5799, op.1, d. 133, l. 156

SFRF's funds 'which cannot do better service now than in the hands of the English Society.'[165] Garrison and Noble could no longer sustain the paper. As they had known from the outset, despite Boston being home to many reformers, these potential supporters were too busy on other campaigns.[166] One of the reasons Garrison and Noble felt the American edition of *Free Russia* collapsed was because they did not receive regular news and authentic letters from inside Russia to print in the paper. In October 1893, Garrison wrote to Goldenberg: 'I think it is particularly unfortunate that we cannot count upon a regular letter from St. Petersburg to give us the latest points, and to show that we are in touch with Russia'.[167] The SAFRF would be revived five years later, but it would not occupy such a central role in national debates on Russian-American relations again.

1.4 Free Russia and Ethical Terrorism

Representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism were central to the societies' campaigns because of their close association with Stepniak and the many books and articles he had written for foreign audiences. Stepniak never openly admitted to personally having carried out an act of terrorism. When asked, he denied having had anything to do with Mezentsev's assassination.[168] He did not, however, pass over the opportunity to point out how significant an event it had been: 'It was an ugly time. General Mesentzeff had just been killed in broad daylight, in one of the principal streets in the capital, and those by whom he was killed had disappeared without leaving any trace behind them. This being the first act of the kind, it produced an immense impression.'[169] Stepniak was exposed as General Mezentsev's killer several times in British and American newspapers. However, none of these incidents seem to have had a significant negative effect on his popularity among foreign sympathisers. For example, in 1885, the New York Irish revolutionary newspaper the *United Irishman*, which also promoted terrorism and raised money to fund terrorist activities, printed a notice declaring it was '"Stepniak," who is M. Kazcheffsky, who killed General Messinoff'.[170] These mistakes in reporting Stepniak's real name and Mezentsev's name were repeated in 1890 when the *New York Tribune* and *Washington Post* printed the same accusations after Stepniak's lecture tour to the

[165] Garrison to Robert Spence Watson, 25 January 1898. Spence Watson Weiss Papers, SW1/7/11.
[166] Noble to Goldenberg, 14 November 1891. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, l. 9
[167] Garrison to Goldenberg, 28 October 1893. Goldenberg Papers MS 1381, Tuckton House Papers, LRA
[168] Scotto, 'The Terrorist as Novelist', pp. 122-3
[169] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 77.
[170] 'Russia Loves the Fenians', *United Irishman*, 11 September 1886

US.[171] Then in 1894, an article appeared in the *New Review* making the same allegations.[172] Some scholars have claimed this latter article was the source of rumours about Stepniak's true identity and that it had a negative impact on his political activism.[173] Olive Garnett was one of Stepniak's friends who professed to have been shocked at the news.[174] However, it seems that certainly in the US, and likely in Britain, Stepniak's real identity and past actions were known to his foreign sympathisers before this, in part, due to Irish revolutionary terrorists who sought to expose him and the hypocrisy of the British public for supporting him.

Stepniak's representations of terrorism centred on his criticisms of tsarist rule, including the persecution of religious minorities, the inhumane treatment of political prisoners and exiles, and economic problems exacerbated by a corrupt and ineffective bureaucracy.[175] These problems, he argued, derived from the abuse of the tsar's autocratic power. Acts of terrorism were, therefore, a necessary form of justice in opposition to the injustice of tsarist rule:

> What Government, therefore, was this which acted so insolently against all the laws of the country, which was not supported, and did not wish to be supported, by the nation, or by any class, or by the laws which it had made itself? What did it represent except brute force?
>
> Against such a Government everything is permitted. It is no longer a guardian of the will of the people, or of the majority of the people. It is organised injustice.[176]

Stepniak believed the lack of political representation for the people enabled the abuse of power. Having no recourse to legal political opposition, terrorists legitimately targeted the regime and its representatives in order to obtain political representation and the power to reform society, stating that all terrorism would cease when political representation was obtained.[177] Reform in Russian society could not be achieved without removing the tsar's autocratic powers, therefore terrorism remained the only effective solution to humanitarian crises.

---

[171] 'Who is Stepniak', *Washington Post*, 25 February 1890. The article in the *Washington Post* was reprinted from the *New York Tribune*.

[172] Ivanoff, 'Anarchists: Their Methods and Organisation: Part II', *New Review*, January 1894, pp. 10-11

[173] Bachman, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', p. 375; Carol L. Peaker, 'Reading Revolution: Russian Émigrés and the Reception of Russian Literature in England, c. 1890-1905' (PhD dissertation, University of Oxford, 2006), p. 60

[174] Barry C. Johnson (ed), *Olive & Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-95* (Birmingham, 1993), p. 240

[175] In the 1880s, Stepniak wrote extensively on Russian politics, society, and the economy, including three books *Russia under the Tzars* (1885), *The Russian Storm Cloud* (1886), and *The Russian Peasantry* (1888), *King Stork and King Log* (1895), a series of articles in *The Times* between 1884 and 1886, and articles in various other newspapers and periodicals in Britain and the US.

[176] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 40

[177] Stepniak, 'Terrorism in Russia and Terrorism in Europe', *Contemporary Review*, no. 45 (1884), pp. 329-30

Applying these same principles to other countries, Stepniak concluded that the preconditions for the legitimate use of terrorism only existed in Russia.[178] When asked to comment on ongoing Irish revolutionary terrorist activity in 1885, he condemned it, contrasting their activities with those of Russian revolutionaries. He claimed Irish terrorists did not have the support of the majority of the population and described their activities as 'mere baby work', suggesting their bombs, which often killed and injured bystanders, were less effective than the assassinations carried out by Russian revolutionary terrorists.[179] As the Irish had political representation in the form of MPs in the House of Commons, Stepniak argued that they did not have the grounds to use terrorism legitimately and even encouraged military action to suppress unrest in Ireland and prevent revolutionary terrorist activity.[180] Stepniak and his colleagues, however, continued to face the problem that their situation appeared similar to Irish revolutionary terrorists, who had emigrated to the US and funded and planned acts of terrorism from there. Conscious that comparison with Irish terrorists might damage his cause in Britain, Stepniak consistently condemned Irish terrorism in English forums, though he had earlier written agrarian terror in the Russian revolutionary journal *Delo*.[181] His condemnation of other terrorism extended beyond Irish revolutionaries and he later wrote: 'although the Russian Revolutionists have not registered at the Patent Office any monopoly for the use of dynamite, they may, I suppose, expect that others should not try to pass their counterfeit wares for the genuine article.'[182] Not all comparisons with the political situation in Ireland harmed Stepniak's cause in Britain. Robert and Elizabeth Spence Watson both supported Irish Home Rule, which would have allowed for greater independence for Ireland, though remaining under British rule. Robert Spence Watson protested against aspects of British rule in Ireland, including the treatment of tenant farmers and the suspension of trial by jury, and supported Home Rule.[183] According to his nephew and biographer, Spence Watson supported an extended franchise and was 'a true democrat, he naturally welcomed the advent of working men members to the House of Commons'.[184] Corder described Elizabeth Spence Watson as a 'keen lover of

[178] Stepniak, 'Terrorism in Russia and Terrorism in Europe', p. 340.
[179] 'From a Revolutionary Point of View: Interviews with a Nihilist and a Fenian', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 January 1885. The Fenian referred to in the article's title was Michael Davitt who did not then support terrorist activities. Just two days before, Fenian dynamiters had placed bombs at the Houses of Parliament injuring two police officers and four bystanders.
[180] Ibid.
[181] S.M. Kravchinskii, 'Irlandskie dela', *Delo*, no. 8, 1881, pp. 149-177 and no. 9, 1881, pp. 195-217
[182] Stepniak, 'The Dynamite Scare and Anarchy', *New Review*, 6, 1892, 32, pp. (p. 531).
[183] Corder, *Robert Spence Watson*, pp. 246-7
[184] Ibid., p. 181

justice and gifted with an untiring zeal in the furtherance of all good causes'.[185] The Spence Watson's case illustrates the importance of Stepniak's articulation of terror as a form of justice aligned with foreigners' prior interests in promoting justice and the rule of law.

At the peak of the fame and success of the SAFRF, the topic of much of the material produced specifically for the American edition of *Free Russia*, was the Russian-American Extradition Treaty, proposed in 1893. In their *Free Russia*, the SAFRF addressed one key contemporary debate and argued that even proven terrorists should not be extradited to Russia.[186] In a letter to Goldenberg, Noble looked back to the case when the Russian government had demanded the extradition of Lev Gartman because of his involvement in an attempt to assassinate the tsar. Noble noted that though there had been 'loud claims for his extradition, the request of Russia was at that time refused.'[187] Kennan wrote to the American president in March 1893 to explain the consequences of signing an extradition treaty with Russia, referring to the infamous letter sent by the Russian terrorist group *Narodnaia volia* to Alexander III after they had assassinated his father, Alexander II:

> I beg leave to urge upon your attention Mr President the fact that the writers of this letter [to Alexander III] are not the peaceful reformers, the liberals, or the moderate political offenders of Russia. They are the "terrorists" – the representatives of the extreme wing of the Russian revolutionary party – the men and women who have been called "nihilists" and "anarchists" and who have been compared with [John Wilkes] Booth and [Charles J.] Guiteau [assassins of presidents Abraham Lincoln and James Garfield]. Is there anything in their demands that is unreasonable or fanatical? Is there anything in their character, as shown in this letter, which would justify the government of the United States in treating them as common criminals and sending them back in irons to be tried by court-martial and hanged in the capital of the Tsar? Which is the most in accordance with the spirit of American institutions and with the civilization of the 19th century – the Russian Penal Code, as quoted above, or the letter of the terrorist executive committee to Alexander III.[188]

Noble wrote an article for the April 1893 edition of *Free Russia* discussing several high-profile terrorist acts in Russia, including the incident in 1879 when Alexander Soloviev attempted to assassinate the tsar by shooting him. Noble reviewed the opinions of several legal experts and concluded that, though acts of terrorism could be considered murder, Russian terrorists, or 'Nihilists', who attempted to assassinate the sovereign were carrying out political crimes because they were attacking the office and symbol of the sovereign, and they acted for the good of humanity.[189] In

[185] Corder, *Robert Spence Watson*, p. 32
[186] Edmund Noble, 'Regicide and Extradition', *Free Russia*, American Ed. (April 1893), pp. 3-5 and George Kennan, 'Russian Justice', *Free Russia*, American Ed. (April 1893), pp. 5-7
[187] Noble to Goldenberg, 10 November 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, ll. 93ob-94
[188] Kennan to Goldenberg, 23 March 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 138, l. 123
[189] Edmund Noble, 'Regicide and Extradition', *Free Russia*, American ed. (April 1893), pp. 3-5

1905, when the Aliens Bill designed to restrict immigration to Britain was introduced to parliament, Noble wrote a similar article for the English *Free Russia*, arguing that the principles of the justice system should be used to protect people fleeing persecution in foreign countries.[190] Not permitting terrorists to be deported could consequently be considered to be something other than an expression of support for terrorism. It could also mean upholding American values. David Foglesong has identified American-Russian relations as reflecting a wider 'American global mission' but that ultimately these efforts in the 1890s were based on 'ignorance and wishful thinking'.[191] These efforts to export American values and culture were ultimately unsuccessful. However, self-identity, pride, and justice were embedded in political activism on behalf of the Russian revolutionary cause in multiple national contexts.

Whereas the debate concerning the SEPC seems to have arisen because of disagreements over ownership of the campaign, the SAFRF also struggled to work with other associations because of the breadth of its support for revolutionary activity in Russia. When interest in the Russian revolutionary cause grew in America with the debates concerning the proposed extradition treaty in 1893, the SAFRF proposed to work together with the Russian Treaty Abrogation Society (RTAS) on the campaign. However, the RTAS was only interested in campaigning on Russian issues so far as preventing the proposed treaty passing into law and had no other aims with regard to Russia.[192] Their secretary, the lawyer Henry Dwight Sedgwick III, objected to a misrepresentation of the two societies' relationship that had appeared in the 'Notes of the Month' column of *Free Russia* in September, which stated that the RTAS also had as its organ the newspaper *Free Russia*. Sedgwick declared that in no circumstances would he be sending any money from RTAS subscriptions to fund the newspaper.[193] Though Noble felt that it was a 'pity' that the two societies could not work together, Sedgwick did preserve some co-operation, inviting Goldenberg to attend an RTAS meeting and apologising for not writing a promised account of the meeting for publication in *Free Russia*.[194]

Despite the American *Free Russia*'s overt support for Russian revolutionary terrorists, as in the case of Robert and Elizabeth Spence Watson, a letter to Fanni

---

[190] Edmund Noble, 'American Views of Russian Assassination', *Free Russia*, 16, April 1905, 4, p. 50

[191] David S. Foglesong, *The American Mission and the "Evil Empire": The Crusade for a "Free Russia" since 1881* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 3 and p. 33

[192] Henry Sedgwick to Goldenberg, 4 October 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 154, l. 2.

[193] Henry Sedgwick to 'The Editors of Free Russia', 4 October 1893. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 154, l. 3.

[194] Henry Sedgwick to Goldenberg, 20 November 1893 GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 154, l. 4; Henry Sedgwick to Goldenberg, 16 December 1893 GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 154, l. 5.

Stepniak from the American writer and social reform activist Lillie Buffum Chace Wyman in 1891 demonstrates how individuals who personally opposed political violence could offer their support to Russian revolutionary terrorists' propaganda:

> I don't think I am exactly in sympathy with the Terrorist part of the movement. It is not merely my Quaker blood that objects. I am not convinced of its wisdom, but I frankly admit that it is impossible for an outside to judge correctly all the circumstances. I am convinced of the immense moral purpose underlying your revolutionary movement, and I rejoice to have been able to unite with the attempts to aid the Russian cause by bringing to bear upon it the moral influence of the Western world.[195]

In a later letter to Fanni Stepniak, Wyman also felt 'that is not your cause but ours', echoing the earlier sentiments of Harriet Scott Saxton.[196] The reaction of other activists campaigning for the abrogation of the treaty also echoed Alfred McClure's reaction to *Free Russia*'s aims and message. In the case of terrorism and the extradition treaty, some individuals were willing to adapt their morals to accommodate Russian revolutionary terrorism and support *Free Russia,* but there were also those who limited their sphere of activity to organising petitions and kept *Free Russia* at arm's length.

Ultimately the surge of interest in *Free Russia* created by the campaign to have the Russian-American extradition treaty abrogated did not reinvigorate the paper's finances. In March 1894, Noble wrote to Goldenberg: 'I am inclined to wonder with you where all this beautiful enthusiasm for Russian freedom that encouraged us so much during the anti-treaty agitation, has departed to. But I don't believe in striking our flag until the water reaches it. Many things might happen between now and May to clear up the weather.'[197]

1.5 Free Russia and SFRF after 1900

The SAFRF's political activism and edition of *Free Russia* did not last more than a few years and the historiography of the SFRF and the émigré members of the RFPF would suggest that their work also diminished as the 1890s drew to a close. However, the English edition of *Free Russia* continued to appear and the SFRF continued to operate. Chapter Four will discuss one of the organisations which inherited the legacy of the SFRF's activism, the Parliamentary Russian Committee, which worked with Peter Kropotkin, and Chapter Three will discuss Volkhovskii's Russian-language writing and activism in this period after 1900. This section will

---

[195] Lillie B. Chace Wyman to Fanni Stepniak, 25 July 1891. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 461, l. 16. Wyman was writing in response to Stepniak's *Career of a Nihilist* and *Russia under the Tzars*.

[196] Lillie B. Chace Wyman to Fanni Stepniak, 11 May 1895. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 461, l. 21

[197] Noble to Goldenberg, 24 March 1894. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 147, ll. 233-4

instead focus on *Free Russia* after 1900, those involved in its production, and its representations of terrorism in this period.

Free Russia continued to be internationally-focused in this period, attempting to make some compensation for the loss of the American edition. Between 1900 and 1902, Noble regularly wrote articles for the newspaper under the heading 'From over the Atlantic' in which he reported on discussion of Russian issues in the American press and politics. He then produced a few articles for the newspaper in 1905 responding to recent revolutionary events in Russia and the Russian defeat in the Russo-Japanese War. Noble suggested in an article about assassinations in Russia in 1905 that there was widespread support for Russian revolutionary activities in America, suggesting that *Free Russia*'s representations of terrorism as a just and morally legitimate form of revolutionary activity retained their transnational appeal among foreign supporters.[198] Naarden has illustrated how popular enthusiasm for Russian revolutionary violence increased among Western European socialists in response to the events of 1905 in Russia.[199] Articles promoting Russian revolutionary terrorism in *Free Russia* that year demonstrate how widespread this enthusiasm was.

In response to political assassinations in Russia in the period after 1900, articles in *Free Russia* justified these revolutionaries' activities and emphasising the guilt of the targets of these assassinations. Comparing the assassinated Minister of the Interior Stolypin in 1911 to his earlier predecessor von Plehve, who was assassinated in 1904, Volkhovskii wrote: 'Any reasonable man, who has some knowledge of Russian actuality, will hardly deny that the five years of M. Stolypin's rule did even more harm to Russia than that of Plehve.'[200] Volkhovskii continued, arguing that it was commonly-known that people in the streets congratulated each other on hearing of the new of Plehve's death and suggested that this would again be happening in response to Stolypin's assassination.[201] He then concluded the article with the saying 'Who sows the wind reaps the storm.'[202] Volkhovskii's article suggests that images of Plehve and Stolypin as being guilty of crimes against the population of the Russian Empire were significant components attracting transnational sympathy for Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period after 1900, just as they had been in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

A prominent theme in *Free Russia* in this period emerged in response to the Aliens Bill and British immigration policy being discussed in parliament, coinciding

---

[198] Edmund Noble, 'American Views of Russian Assassination', *Free Russia*, April 1905, p. 50
[199] Naarden, *Socialist Europe and Revolutionary Russia*, pp. 170-1
[200] F. Volkhovskii, 'The End of Stolypin', *Free Russia*, October 1911, p. 2
[201] Ibid., p. 3
[202] Ibid., p. 4

with the increase in high-profile terrorist acts and assassinations being carried out by the Socialist Revolutionary Party's *Boevaia organizatsiia* (Fighting Organisation) in Russia. Together with articles illustrating the brutalities of tsarist rule, comment on the moral necessity to accept political refugees into Britain suggests that appealing on humanitarian grounds to foreign supporters remained an important method of attracting support, including for terrorists.

1.6 Revival of the SAFRF

The societies' fundraising efforts on behalf of humanitarian causes were much more successful than their efforts to specifically support their newspapers. In 1891 and 1892, the SAFRF raised significant funds to provide aid to Russian peasants starving during a famine and the distribution was administered by the Russian writer Lev Tolstoy through his Tolstoy Famine Fund.[203] This spirit of humanitarianism drove the revival of the American society in 1903, led by the American women's suffrage campaigner Alice Stone Blackwell. Stone Blackwell was editor of the *Women's Journal* from 1883 to 1917 and was active in various causes, including the Women's Christian Temperance Union. In the *Women's Journal*, she compared the treatment of Jews under tsarist rule to the treatment of African Americans and other minorities in the US.[204] In the 1890s, Stone Blackwell had also become involved in the campaign to provide aid to Armenian refugees. Her approach to helping Russians followed a similar pattern to her activism on behalf of Armenians. Stone Blackwell organised for the translation and publication of collections of Armenian and Russian poetry. In her preface to a volume of Armenian poetry, she wrote: 'the sympathy already felt for the Armenians in their martyrdom at the hands of the Turks would be deepened by an acquaintance with the temper and genius of the people, as shown in their poetry.'[205] Her preface to the volume of Russian poetry emphasised her criticisms of Russian autocratic rule ('utter inefficiency, incapacity and corruption') and its oppression of ethnic and national minorities and writers.[206] She described the volume as an attempt to show 'the thoughts and aspirations of some Russian lovers of freedom'.[207]

---

[203] Garrison to Goldenberg, 23 January 1892. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 133, l. 42. The SAFRF had already sent around seven hundred dollars and had almost seventy dollars in hand.
[204] Smith, 'From Relief to Revolution', p. 611
[205] Alice Stone Blackwell, 'Preface', in Alice Stone Blackwell (ed.), *Armenian Poems* (Boston MA, 1896), i. Stone Blackwell transformed translated versions of the poems in English and French into verse for the volume (ii)
[206] Alice Stone Blackwell, 'Preface', in Alice Stone Blackwell (ed.), *Songs of Russia* (Chicago IL, 1906), p. 5
[207] Ibid., p. 5

Despite Stone Blackwell's enthusiasm, some members of the original SAFRF refused to become involved, for example, Kennan and Garrison both said they were too busy. Instead, Stone Blackwell turned to women, including some who had been members of the original SAFRF, to revive the society. She used her networks established through the *Women's Journal* and her feminist activism to raise money for striking workers in Russia in 1905, when revolutionary activity once again brought the Russian revolutionary cause to international attention.[208] Stone Blackwell's sympathy for Russian terrorism also echoed sentiments expressed by supporters of the societies in the 1890s. She wrote to a Russian acquaintance: 'Just now my sympathy is more strongly than ever with the terrorists. I think of the machine guns mowing down the people by thousands in Moscow!'[209] In a letter to Florence Isadora Duncan, an American writer helping to resurrect the Society, she also suggested she might be able to persuade Julia Ward Howe to write a 'stanza of the "Battle Hymn"; if it can in any way be used to aid the fund'.[210] It seems Ward Howe did write such a verse to be used to promote the cause, but it is unfortunately lost.[211] This was another example of links with the American movement to abolish slavery.

Alice Stone Blackwell's revival of the SAFRF revealed the enduring appeal of the Russian revolutionary cause among foreign sympathisers. Despite its grounding in her humanitarian ideals, the project quickly took on many of the old identities of the SAFRF. The link between terrorism and humanitarian causes in Russia remained unbroken in foreign sympathisers' minds. Meanwhile, the newly-formed SAFRF drew on established representations of the Russian revolutionary cause, looking to the imagery of anti-Slavery and the American Civil War to create narratives of justice and heroism. Done consciously, this strategy derived from the legacy of the Russian émigrés such as Sergei Stepniak, who sought to align their interests with foreigners'. The SAFRF closed again within a few years, reflecting a similar decline in popular interest in the Russian revolutionary cause after the 1905 Revolution to waning interest in the cause in the US after the Russian-American Extradition Treaty had been passed.

The revival of the SAFRF illustrates how humanitarian concerns underpinned much enthusiasm for campaigns on Russian issues. Importantly, however, it also

---

[208] Smith, 'From Relief to Revolution', p. 616

[209] Stone Blackwell to Dr I. Hourwich, 27 December 1905. Letters of Alice Stone Blackwell, Folder 1, Schlesinger

[210] Stone Blackwell to Florence Duncan, 24 March 1905, Florence I. Duncan Papers, Schlesinger. Ward Howe's 'Battle Hymn of the Republic' was a famous Civil War era song.

[211] Stone Blackwell to Florence Duncan, 6 April 1905, Florence I. Duncan Papers, Schlesinger

shows that women's roles in this activism must not be overlooked and that they provided the element of continuity in the SAFRF here.

1.7 Conclusion

Studying the SFRF, SAFRF, and the three editions of *Free Russia* together, reveals that transnational political activism generated spaces of co-operation as well as conflict. It has demonstrated that, while Stepniak was certainly an important catalyst in the formation of the network, he did not exercise much, if any, control over the American edition of *Free Russia* as time passed. In the case of *Frei Russland*, it appears that the members of the RFPF targeted transnational audiences. The Russians discussed in this chapter relied on support from sympathisers who were already active in humanitarian causes, and social and political movements. Without these individuals and their connections, and their money, *Free Russia* would not have survived. The short-lived American and German-language editions disappeared because there was not enough interest, and in the American case because Americans were overwhelmed with causes to support and raise funds for.

Looking beyond the traditional boundaries of scholarship on the Societies of Friends of Russian Freedom, which has tended to focus only on the 1890s and examine the societies in the context of a single country, this study has revealed the extent to which their foundations were grounded in enthusiasm for Russian revolutionary terrorism and how their humanitarian aims were underpinned by a view of Russian society inextricably linking terrorism to the liberation of the Russian people. By exploring the roles of other individuals in the societies, this study has also reconsidered the roles of George Kennan and Sergei Stepniak in Russian revolutionary propaganda abroad. Instead, the networks of activism were much more complex. The societies' success relied upon the pre-existing personal networks of activists in various fields. Looking at the SFRF and SAFRF together in this way has also highlighted the role of women in forming, running, and publicising the societies. Often ignored as simply wives of male activists, evidence shows that they played instrumental roles in the societies' successes. Reclaiming women's activism in this transnational network is an area demanding further attention, particularly those women who, as wives of the members of the Russian Free Press Fund, have been rendered invisible in historical scholarship.

Chapter Two: Russian and Irish Revolutionary Terrorists in the 1880s

2.1 Introduction

In his 1977 book *Terrorism*, Walter Laqueur argued that 'Russians had a considerable influence of terrorist movements, contemporaneous and subsequent, throughout the world.'[1] It is, as Lindsay Clutterbuck has shown, possible to argue the case for the origins of certain activities within terrorism. Clutterbuck, for example, argued it was Irish revolutionaries who developed new bomb technologies and created the concept of the terrorist 'campaign' in order to maximise the impact of their activities, whereas Laqueur believed *Narodnaia volia* had innovated in the areas of bomb technology, tactics, and the exploitation of new media technologies.[2] However, other important questions relating to late-nineteenth century terrorism concern not just evaluating the origins of particular elements of terrorism, but address how ideas were shared and transferred and how contemporaneous terrorist groups negotiated complex geopolitical issues in their writing and propaganda work. Irish revolutionary terrorism of the late nineteenth century was an important context for the production of Russian revolutionary terrorist propaganda abroad in this period. Though it was not the only example of foreign terrorist activity at the time, it was most influential on the context of the Russians in the RFPF in Britain. A transnational perspective is more useful than comparison here, as propaganda and attempts to shape public opinion had to account for other foreign terrorisms.

As in other chapters of this thesis, this study sees terrorism as a cultural phenomenon, existing beyond the boundaries of the act itself. Therefore, though Russian revolutionary terrorist activities were in a period of dormancy throughout much of the 1880s and 1890s, it remained an important period in the history of Russian terrorism. As illustrated in Chapter One, the 1880s were an important period in the development of widespread foreign support for the Russian revolutionary cause, particularly as a result of the work published by Sergei Stepniak and George Kennan. In contrast, the early 1880s marked the high point of Irish revolutionary terrorist activities in England. Irish revolutionaries, whom historians have referred to as 'Fenian dynamiters', carried out an extended and targeted bombing campaign in England. Like Russian revolutionaries, Irish revolutionary terrorist propaganda activities were also transnational in scale, the East Coast of the US hosting a key community of émigrés, also mirroring similar transatlantic networks of Russian revolutionaries explored in Chapter One. Though some examples come from outside

---

[1] Laqueur, *Terrorism*, p. 43
[2] Clutterbuck, 'Progenitors of Terrorism', pp. 176-7; Laqueur, *Terrorism*, p. 219

of this decade, the impact of this transnational context was clearest in this decade. Chapter One also demonstrated that British sympathisers with the Russian revolutionary cause also supported political and humanitarian causes in Ireland, indicating the importance of investigating this particular context in greater depth.

This chapter addresses several important questions. Firstly, it explores the scant evidence for co-operation between Russian and Irish revolutionary terrorists. Secondly, it explores how Russian and Irish revolutionaries represented the other in their work as part of the process of constructing their own media identities and justifying their terrorism. Finally, it explores contemporary beliefs that Russian and Irish terrorists belonged to a vast transnational conspiratorial network intent on destroying the contemporary social and political order. Together, they provide some further answers to the question of how transnational contexts influenced Russian revolutionary terrorist propaganda, as examined in Chapter One, and how foreigners perceived Russian terrorism.

Focusing on representations of terrorism and networks supporting terrorist propaganda publishing, this chapter also places this in a wider context of Russian and Irish revolutionary activities. As among Russian revolutionaries, terrorists were only a part of the Irish revolutionary movement in this period. Historians have often divided nationalists into constitutionalists and militants, but L. Perry Curtis has shown, by examining violent language in revolutionary rhetoric, that violence among Irish revolutionaries existed on a spectrum as violent language was frequently used.[3] However, as with the Russian revolutionary movement, perceptions of Irish revolutionaries as violent or as terrorists did not always correspond to reality. This chapter focuses on the US-based Irish revolutionary, and proponent of terrorism, Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa. O'Donovan Rossa is relatively well-known in the history of Irish nationalism and was the subject of the writer Patrick Pearse's famous 'Graveside Oration' at his funeral in Dublin in 1915. In the 1880s, O'Donovan Rossa was a member of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood (IRB), a transnational organisation committed to bringing about revolution by a variety of methods, from uprisings in Ireland, invasions into Canada, and acts of terrorism in England. His case offers the opportunity to explore representations of terrorism in his newspaper, the *United Irishman*, as well as in associated publications. He was also frequently discussed in British diplomatic correspondence relating to Irish revolutionary activity in the US. Therefore, his case also offers the opportunity to explore rumours about

[3] L. Perry Curtis, 'Moral and Physical Force: The Language of Violence in Irish Nationalism', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 27, no. 2 (1988), p. 188

revolutionary terrorism in this period and perceptions of the threat to the British government.

There were several groups of Irish revolutionaries practising terrorism at this time. It is difficult to divide Irish revolutionaries more broadly into different groups at this time, as Jonathan Gantt has suggested, as the 1880s were a period of reorganisation of the Fenian Brotherhood into Clan na Gael in the US.[4] There was also significant movement between Ireland, where the IRB operated, and the US. O'Donovan Rossa, however, was one link between newspapers promoting Irish revolutionary terrorism in the 1870s and 1880s and linked terrorist activity in Ireland with émigré activists in the US. Niall Whelehan has referred to the circle of terrorists surrounding O'Donovan Rossa as the 'Fenian dynamiters' or 'dynamiters' following contemporary usage.[5] O'Donovan Rossa also used the terminology of 'Skirmishers' in the *United Irishman*. Contemporaries, including the British Foreign Office, used the term Fenian to refer broadly to Irish revolutionaries, though it was often used to refer to the idea of a US-based Fenian Brotherhood in their correspondence.[6] Clan na Gael also appears in the files to refer to Irish revolutionaries, but seems to have been used interchangeably with the term Fenian by diplomats. As a result of this complicated political landscape and because this thesis is interested in terrorism, its justifications, and its representations, as opposed to revolutionaries' wider political, this thesis uses 'Irish revolutionary terrorism'.

In the 1860s, O'Donovan Rossa had worked on the *Irish People* newspaper in Dublin and he was arrested and imprisoned for treason in 1865 for plotting an uprising. In 1869 he was elected to Parliament in a by-election, but the result was declared invalid because he was in prison. In 1870 he was given amnesty after promising not to return to Ireland and he boarded a ship to the US with several other prominent Irish revolutionary republicans. In the 1870s O'Donovan Rossa collaborated with Patrick Ford on his newspaper, the *Irish World*.[7] With Ford, O'Donovan Rossa set up the Skirmishing Fund which advertised for subscriptions in

[4] Jonathan Gantt, *Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community, 1865-1922* (Basingstoke, 2010), pp. 131-2

[5] Niall Whelehan, *The Dynamiters: Irish Nationalism and Political Violence in the Wider World, 1867-1900* (Cambridge, 2012)

[6] The Foreign Office's correspondence files relating to Irish revolutionary activities in the US are held at the National Archives under the shelf mark FO5 and the large number of thick bound volumes attests to the importance of this issue to British diplomats in the US.

[7] Ford lived most of his life in the US, fought in the Civil War, and worked on several newspapers before founding the *Irish World*. His journalism prior to the *Irish World* reflected his support for abolition. He was an important figure in the Irish-American community in New York. Maureen Murphy, 'Ford, Patrick', *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a3328 [accessed 20 November 2018]

the *Irish World*. This fund was used to pay for the dynamite campaign in England. In the late 1870s, O'Donovan Rossa was accused of embezzling funds, the trustees took over the Skirmishing Fund, and the fund was renamed the National Fund. O'Donovan Rossa then set up a new Skirmishing Fund alongside his own newspaper, the *United Irishman*, in 1881, establishing a rival to the *Irish World* newspaper. In later issues this Skirmishing Fund became known as the 'Resources of Civilisation', a reference to dynamite in the title of a pamphlet discussed later in this chapter.[8]

Historians have identified phases in the historiography of the Irish revolutionary movement. The first phase of historiography comprised conscious efforts to construct a national identity using history. In response to this, historians of the 1930s established an emotionally-detached style of historiography. In the 1960s and 1970s historians began to write accounts that were critical of the nation state. Historians D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day criticise this latter period as 'revisionism' shaped by political motivations.[9] Attempts to write 'value-free history' of Ireland clearly impacted upon histories of revolutionary violence and terrorism. Leon Ó Broin's history of the IRB, published in 1976, rejected the idea that revolution was inevitable in favour of considering new sources, primarily British government sources.[10] Ó Broin was a member of Sinn Féin and Fianna Éireann as a young man and later become a civil servant in the Irish Free State. His study of the IRB was a conscious attempt at an emotionally-detached narrative. British sources provide a source for examining the history of the IRB, but they are particularly useful for studying British official perceptions of Irish revolutionaries. Officials' preoccupation with terrorism means that they are rich resources for this research.

In 2011, Alvin Jackson argued that only in recent years had historians been able to study violence against the state without being accused of supporting it. Prior to this, the political climate had led to 'a more clinical, embarrassed, or nervous approach to the history of Irish militant nationalism, or political violence more widely' which has subsided since the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 and the St Andrew's Agreement of 2006.[11] This turn in the historiography enables a closer reading of the sources from revolutionary propaganda without needing to speak to or avoid

[8] 'Resources of Civilisation', *United Irishman*, 3 January 1885
[9] D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day, 'Introduction: 'Revisionism' and the 'revisionist controversy'', in D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds), *The Making of Modern Irish History: Revisionism and the revisionist controversy* (London, 1996), pp. 1-14
[10] Leon Ó Broin, *Revolutionary Underground: The Story of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, 1858-1924* (Dublin, 1976), ix
[11] Alvin Jackson, 'Widening the Fight for Ireland's Freedom: Revolutionary Nationalism in Its Global Contexts', *Victorian Studies*, vol., no. 1 (2011), p. 96

contentious issues in contemporary politics. Niall Whelehan is another historian whose recent work has used Foreign Office files to study Irish revolutionary terrorism in transnational perspective.[12] Boyce and O'Day argued that the inward-looking nature of the historical profession in Ireland limited the potential of writing Irish history in transnational perspective.[13] Whelehan identified the interconnected processes of deconstructing state myths of heroism and transnational approaches to Irish history beyond elite politics and the much-used argument of Irish exceptionalism.[14] Enda Delaney has also argued that histories of the Irish diaspora need to be integrated into histories of Ireland in order to understand issues such as class formation, popular religion, and the dynamics of power in Irish society.[15] Delaney, a historian of Irish demography and emigration in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, described the Famine, which began in 1845, in terms of the networks, personal and professional, spreading information and raising money for relief and pre-paid passages to America, moving beyond a simplistic emigration narrative.[16] Irish revolutionary terrorism therefore belongs to a wider sphere of Irish-American identity and transatlantic networks. O'Donovan Rossa was not simply in exile and separated from revolutionaries in Ireland. Christine Kinealy linked the 1848 Young Ireland Rebellion to contemporary uprisings in Europe, the first have occurred in France in February. Historians have suggested recent years that the revolutionaries of 1848 considered themselves to be part of a pan-European movement.[17] Kinealy believed historians had not integrated the history of Ireland's 1848 into transnational European models for two reasons: firstly, because the stability of the British government was largely unaffected, therefore the events' character was different and secondly, that 1848 in Ireland was officially remembered as an event that was 'specifically Irish in origin and impact', specifically referring to the centenary commemorations.[18] Matthew Kelly has illustrated that transnational ways of thinking inspired Irish revolutionaries, despite

[12] Whelehan, *Dynamiters*
[13] Boyce and O'Day, 'Introduction', p. 5
[14] Niall Whelehan, 'Playing with Scales: Transnational History and Modern Ireland', in Niall Whelehan (ed), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 7-29
[15] Enda Delaney, 'Directions in historiography: Our island story? Towards a transnational history of late modern Ireland', *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 37, no. 148 (2011), p. 599-621
[16] Enda Delaney, 'Ireland's Great Famine: A Transnational History', in Niall Whelehan (ed), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (New York and Abingdon, 2015), pp. 106-26
[17] Harry Liebersohn, '1848', in Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier (eds), *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (Basingstoke, 2009), p. 1
[18] Christine Kinealy, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester, 2009), pp. 4-5. Kinealy suggests historians have simply not tackled the subject, rather than purposefully writing out transnational dimensions, partially attributing this to politicians' attempts to create a usable past.

that hopes of co-operation with France were unlikely to be realised.[19] Understanding how revolutionaries imagined themselves to have transnational connections and shared values, in opposition to other nations, is important for understanding the interactions between Irish and Russian revolutionary terrorists and terrorist propagandist in this period.

2.2 Evidence for Co-operation?

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, co-operation and contact between revolutionaries from different countries and political backgrounds occurred regularly. European revolutionary socialists included the Irish question in their political and revolutionary models. In 1870, Marx argued that revolution in Ireland against landlordism and capitalism would be one way to effectively attack these systems in England.[20] John Newsinger has argued, however, that the failure to effectively organise a branch of the International Working Men's' Association (IWMA or the First International) in Ireland in the early 1870s led to Marx and Engels abandoning their hopes for revolution in Ireland.[21] Mikhail Bakunin, the Russian anarchist who took part in the first International, believed Marx and others spent too much time discussing Irish nationalism.[22] The difficulties of reconciling Russian revolutionary thought and the revolutionary situation in Ireland, it seems, were a legacy inherited from an earlier period of transnational revolutionary activism.

Constance Bantman has highlighted instances of contact between French anarchists and Russian revolutionaries in London between 1880 and 1914, arguing that '[t]he itineraries of Stepniak, Tcherkesoff, and Kropotkin highlight the importance of a broad Franco-Russo-British connection, based on intellectual and ideological affinities (not necessarily anarchist), built in exile (especially in London), reinforced by friendship and occasionally family bonds.'[23] Bantman uncovered evidence for personal connections between Russian, French, and British revolutionaries in letters,

---

[19] Matthew Kelly, 'Languages of Radicalism, Race, and Religion in Irish Nationalism: The French Affinity, 1848-1871', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 49, no. 4 (2010), p. 824

[20] John Newsinger, '"A Great Blow must be struck in Ireland"' Karl Marx and the Fenians', *Race and Class*, vol. 24, no. 2 (1982), p. 163

[21] Ibid., p. 164

[22] Chandana Mathur and Dermot Dix, 'The Irish Question in Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engels's Writings on Capitalism and Empire', in Séamas Ó Síocháin (ed), *Social Thought on Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2009), p. 103

[23] Bantman, *French Anarchists in London*, p. 95. Varlam Tcherkesov was a Georgian anarchist who had been active in the revolutionary movement in the Russian Empire. He escaped to Western Europe in the mid-1870s and worked with several transnational anarchist organisations and publications. He returned to Georgia and Russia after the 1905 and October 1917 Revolutions, but was forced into exile again and died in 1925.

organisations and publications, and advertisements for their public speeches.[24] Bantman's research shows that this co-operation sometimes took place publicly. Pietro Di Paola has also detailed meetings between Italian anarchists and Kropotkin in London.[25] On the other hand, historians such as Whelehan examining links between Russian and Irish terrorism in this period do not appear to have identified any concrete links such as correspondence or evidence of meetings between these groups.

Exploring this question further has also not revealed any significant new evidence. For example, the personal archives of individuals such as Stepniak and Volkhovskii do not reveal any personal connections with Irish revolutionary terrorists. Russian and Irish terrorists do not appear to have collaborated on publications or written articles for each other's newspapers. One article in O'Donovan Rossa's *United Irishman* from March 1885 suggested that a meeting between Russian and Irish terrorists had taken place in Paris:

> Round the table were seated eleven delegates, two of whom represented the Irish Revolutionists in Great Britain, and three others the Extremists in the United States. There were also two representatives for Ireland, two for the Continent, and two who declared themselves to be delegates from the Invincibles. Thirteen Fenians were also present, who sat against the wall of the room and were not allowed to take part in the discussions. A Russian Nihilist stood in one corner with a manufacturer of dynamite who had come to arrange for the sale of a quantity of that explosive…The Congress rejected a proposal for an alliance with the Russian Nihilists, on the grounds that Russia was the enemy of England, and therefore indirectly the friend of Ireland.[26]

The *United Irishman* acknowledged reprinting the article from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, a newspaper known for its early forays into investigative journalism and political campaigns, which included supporting Home Rule for Ireland in 1885. The story also appeared in several syndicated newspapers across England around the same time.[27] The article suggested the connection between Russians and knowledge of manufacturing explosives and its existence and public embrace by O'Donovan Rossa in 1885 suggests co-operation between Russian and Irish terrorists in this period was not an entirely lost cause. The absence of evidence of co-operation may be a result

[24] Bantman, *French Anarchists in London*, p. 88. For example, a flyer for a 'grand meeting public' [sic] where Kropotkin, Charles Malato and Louise Michel (French anarchists), and Errico Malatesta (an Italian anarchist) were due to speak.
[25] Di Paola, *Knights Errant of Anarchy*, p. 60
[26] 'Fenians in Paris', *United Irishman*, 28 March 1885
[27] These included: 'Stepniak and Davitt: A Nihilist and an Advanced Irishman on the Situation', *Atlanta Constitution*, 27 January 1885 and 'The Explosions from a Revolutionary Point of View', *Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 27 January 1885

of what Owen McGee found, in his history of the IRB, that it is difficult to write a history of this secret organisation because there are few records to work with.[28]

The *United Irishman* repeated the sentiments expressed at the meeting in later articles. In April 1885, one article suggested: 'There are only two things necessary for the destruction of England: First, that London be given to flames in five hundred places, by Irish hands; secondly, that the Russian army at the same moment march into India.'[29] The newspaper suggested approaching the tsar for assistance and in an article in September 1886 claimed the Russian government promised to welcome Irish revolutionaries if they were no longer able to live in the US.[30] This proposed alliance with the tsarist regime would clearly have precluded any alliance with Russian revolutionaries, despite any similarities they may have shared in their goals. A potential alliance with the Russians came from the idea that if Britain would need to take troops out of Ireland if it went to war with Russia, as it had during the Crimean War.[31] Irish revolutionaries also targeted other potential allies against the British. In 1881 the British consul at New York wrote to inform the Foreign Secretary that Irish revolutionaries had sent an agent to discuss an independence petition in the Transvaal with a Dutch diplomat, though the latter 'gave no encouragement whatever to the Fenian Agent and explained to him that his Government had nothing whatever to do with the petition in question.'[32] The *United Irishman* clearly stated that it did not seek outside intervention in Ireland, but Irish revolutionaries throughout this period sought to promote conflicts that might take British troops away from Ireland.[33]

It seems to have been widely believed at the time that terrorists of different nationalities were working together, a belief that was strongly linked to the London Anarchist Congress in 1881, where delegates discussed the issue of 'propaganda by the deed':

> The *Revolte* [sic], an anarchist organ appearing here, publishes a resolution of the Socialist Congress at London with a special reference to Switzerland, recommending in almost set terms the use of dynamite for the destruction of existing institutions. The members of the International are advised to substitute acts for words and to study the facilities for attack and defence placed at their disposal by chemical science, which

[28] Owen McGee, *The IRB: the Irish Republican Brotherhood, from the Land League to Sinn Féin* (Dublin, 2007), p. 11
[29] 'How to subvert the British Empire – A Lesson for Russia', *United Irishman*, 18 April 1885
[30] 'Russia Loves the Fenians', *United Irishman*, 11 September 1886
[31] *United Irishman*, 12 June 1886
[32] Thornton to Granville, 27 January 1881. TNA, FO5-1776-85
[33] *United Irishman,* 29 July 1893

> has already proved so useful to the cause of revolution. This hardly-veiled incitement to murder is likely to receive the attention of the Federal authorities.[34]

Merriman, in his study of Émile Henry's bombing of the Café Terminus in Paris in 1894, has also shown the power of imaginary terrorist organisations, when in fact, Merriman has argued that individual anarchists acting alone posed more of a threat.[35]

Foreign Office correspondence dedicated to Irish revolutionary activity in the US frequently referred to the idea of an imaginary transnational terrorist conspiracy throughout this period. Diplomats and their staff, investigating the activities of various Irish revolutionary groups, reported back to the Home Secretary. They also sent newspaper clippings and digests of the *United Irishman* newspaper, in 1881 when they considered its content to be particularly incendiary, letters containing unsolicited information, and the reports of paid informants and investigators. The letters reported intelligence concerning meetings and collaborations between Irish revolutionaries and revolutionaries of other nationalities in terrorist activities. Though it is not possible to determine the veracity of this information, due to a lack of corroborating or contradictory sources, this correspondence offers an insight into how contemporaries perceived terrorism and transnational terrorist conspiracy in this period, particularly when read together with knowledge of the British government's security concerns. The information must be treated with caution, including the unsolicited material, as since the British paid well, informants may have invented stories, a problem British officials acknowledged at the time.[36] British officials were equally concerned with all types of Irish revolutionary activity in the US in the 1880s, from the import of arms into Ireland, to a rumoured invasion of Canada, the dynamiters' bombs being shipped to England, and the 'dynamite ship' being constructed for the Irish revolutionaries in 1881. They were also interested in factionalism within the movement based on tactical lines, focusing on O'Donovan Rossa when he was accused of embezzling funds from the subscriptions for revolutionary activities.[37]

The idea that Irish terrorists were working together with terrorists of other nationalities emerged as an important concern in 1881. In April 1881, the British consul at New York, Edward Archibald, received a letter from a 'Danish socialist'. The

---

[34] 'Socialism in Switzerland: An Advice from London', *Evening Telegraph* [Dundee], 9 August 1881

[35] Merriman, *Dynamite Club*, p. 215

[36] Clipperton to Granville, 18 August 1884, FO5-1930-36, TNA

[37] Archibald to Granville, 9 July 1880. FO5-1746-13/18, TNA. Archibald reported that Rossa's faction had organised a poorly attended convention in Philadelphia and attempted to gain control of the 'Skirmishing Fund', but that the trustees refused and threatened to expose his expropriation of funds.

letter detailed an international conspiracy to carry out the co-ordinated assassinations of several European heads of state:

> The writer declares himself to be a Socialist, but that he is a hater of bloodshed except in open battle and for a righteous cause. He therefore thinks it right to warn me that it has been decided by the Chiefs in Geneva, Paris and London that the following persons shall be murdered before the 1st of August next, viz: - Her Majesty the Queen, Lord Beaconsfield and Mr Forster and Prince Bismarck; - the King of Spain and the King of Sweden…He further states that a message has been received from London to the effect that gunpowder and dynamite will be deposited in the coffins in Windsor Chapel and the whole will be blown up by an electric battery connected with a wire when the Queen is staying there.[38]

Archibald then reported in July 1881 that he had received intelligence concerning a statement made by Thomas Francis Burke, a prominent Irish revolutionary and associate of O'Donovan Rossa who had been amnestied and exiled to the US at the same time. Burke had supposedly declared that 'Fenians in this country were instrumental in inducing Mr O'Sullivan to undertake the defence of Herr Most of the "Freiheit" in the recent proceedings against the latter.'[39] In March, Most had printed an article in his London-based German-language anarchist newspaper *Die Freiheit* which was not technically illegal but promoted tyrannicide. 'If only a single crowned wretch were disposed of every month, in a short time it should afford no one gratification henceforward still to play the monarch.'[40] For this he was arrested, tried and sentenced to hard labour. After his release he left for the US, where he lived until his death in 1906. 'O'Sullivan' was probably the journalist and later labour organiser John F. O'Sullivan, who then worked at the *Boston Globe*, which printed a report on Most's trial, though it did not support his views. However, following the article was printed a letter signed from Boston socialists showing their support for Most:

> To John [sic] Most. Editor Freiheit:
> Resist most shameful tyranny. Assistance secured. Draw on the International Bank from Monday next.
> (Signed) Justus S. Schwab[41]

Archibald treated the letter from the 'Danish socialist' with some suspicion, but reacted differently to the intelligence regarding Burke, perhaps reflecting that the

---

[38] Thornton to Granville, 11 April 1881, FO5-1777-173, TNA. Lord Beaconsfield was Benjamin Disraeli, Leader of the Opposition, former Conservative Prime Minister, and opponent to Irish Home Rule. Disraeli died on 19 April 1881. Mr Forster was William Edward Forster, Chief Secretary for Ireland. Bismarck's government had passed the 'Anti-Socialist Laws' that existed in Germany from 1878 to 1890. Elun T. Gabriel has argued that German Social Democrats denounced anarchists as part of the process of defining their own political identity. German anarchists, such as Most, were forced to leave the country. Elun T. Gabriel, Assassins *and Conspirators: Anarchism, Socialism, and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (DeKalb IL, 2014), p. 12

[39] Archibald to Granville, 26 July 1881. FO5-1778-379, TNA

[40] Johann Most, *Freiheit*, 19 March 1881, quoted in Bernard Porter, 'The Freiheit Prosecutions, 1881-1882', *Historical Journal*, vol. 23, no. 4 (1980), p. 834

[41] 'Prosecution of an Editor', *Boston Daily Globe*, 1 April 1881

latter was obtained from a paid informant. Archibald does not seem to have doubted that Burke and other Irish revolutionaries would offer their support to Most. Bernard Porter has suggested that British official responses to the Most case marked a turning point in policy towards refugees and, at that time, events in Ireland influenced this response.[42] Around this time, British officials were concerned that the tsar's assassination might inspire more similar activities, particularly from Irish revolutionaries. Queen Victoria's security remained a concern after assassination attempts, including one in 1872 where Arthur O'Connor had waved a gun at her and attempted to have her sign a document freeing Irish political prisoners.[43] They were also concerned that Irish revolutionaries in the US were printing material similar to Most's, newspapers advocating political assassinations, which they attempted to have banned through their diplomatic ties.[44]

Digests from the *United Irishman* newspaper that year contained articles suggesting British diplomats were also interested in comparisons the newspaper made with the Russian case. One article suggested that actions carried out by Irish revolutionary terrorists in England would 'shake the dynasties of Europe'.[45] Perhaps contradictorily, a later article asked when other European nations would come to Ireland's aid.[46] These articles suggest that O'Donovan Rossa and his colleagues attempted to appeal to different sources of support.

The newspaper encouraged the impression that Irish revolutionary terrorists were part of an international conspiracy, including Russians among others, targeting European governments in sensational poems. For example, in April 1881, the *United Irishman* reprinted a poem from *Reynold's Newspaper* titled 'The Fenian Fairies in London', containing the lines:

> And roundabout the house there ran
> The rumor that Koakiowhackerban,
> A Nihilist chief of the reddest hue
> Had been caught on the wholesale dynamite strew-
> Strewing glycerine under the Speaker's chair,
> And nitro-glycerine everywhere.[47]

The invented foreign-sounding name of the Nihilist in the poem was meant to illustrate that the police guarding the Houses of Parliament were paranoid about

[42] Porter, 'Freiheit Prosecutions', p. 856
[43] Arthur O'Connor was the grand-nephew of Irish MP and Chartist leader Feargus O'Connor.
[44] Jonathan Gantt, 'Irish-American Terrorism and Anglo-American Relations, 1881-1885', *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, vol. 5, no. 4 (2006), pp. 333-4
[45] 'Extracts from the "United Irishman"', FO5-1778-143, TNA [*United* Irishman, 23 April 1881]
[46] 'Extracts from the "United Irishman," &c.', FO5-1778-257, TNA ['Dynamite the House of Lords', *United Irishman*, 13 June 1881]
[47] FO5-1777-188, TNA ['The Fenian Fairies in London', *United Irishman*, 16 April 1881]

attempts to bring bombs into the building: so much so that they accused a newly-elected MP of carrying a bomb when it was only his sandwiches, perhaps because he also wore a 'somewhat seedy and shabby great coat'.[48] The poem used the image of Russian terrorism to mock rumours among the British establishment that international terrorists were targeting British figures and the police's incompetence.

The *United Irishman* printed another poem suggesting the existence of an international terrorist conspiracy in Europe in 1883. Titled 'The "Black Hand" is No. 1', the poem suggested that the '"Black Hand" sound', or explosives, would characterise the deaths of those targeted by the conspirators:

> Now, Revolution undermines
> Three Hundred Millions! Force combines
> To Patriotize better Times!
> All Europe quakes and shakes with fear
> And we begin to feel it here!
> Now is the time to take our stand
> On Sheridan, (as Spain "Black Hand,"
> Has organized Dynamite Band!)
> In Paris Grand Duke Constantine,
> Is Nihil chief with Krapotkine!
> The "Reign of Terror" (as in trance)
> Is waking Man from Deathly France!
> When Desperation uses dirk
> As with Lord Cavendish and Burke
> The "Black Hand" has commenced its work!
> England should know that "Number One,"
> In Phoenix Park fired Signal Gun!
> And Moscow soon will be the ground
> To Startle world with "Black Hand" sound![49]

Framed as a response to questions about who controlled the revolutionary movement in Europe, this poem suggested that terrorist activities against oppressive governments were all interconnected. The Phoenix Park murders (Cavendish and Burke) were the symbolic first act in a series of assassinations that would then move the sphere of activity to Moscow and the tsar. Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich, mentioned in this poem, was uncle to the then Tsar Alexander III and was known for his liberalising ideas. The reference here also suggests that the author of this poem was aware of Russian politics.

In 1883, the minister to the US, Lionel Sackville-West, received a letter from an informant, W Oswald Charlton of Brevoort House, New York, which he forwarded to the foreign secretary. Charlton claimed that Irish revolutionary terrorists were targeting several prominent British figures: the Prince of Wales, the Earl of Derby, who was the Secretary of State for Colonies, and Herbert Gladstone, the prime

[48] FO5-1777-188, TNA ['The Fenian Fairies in London', *United Irishman*, 16 April 1881]
[49] FO5-1860-283, TNA ['The "Black Hand" is No. 1', *United Irishman*, 24 March 1883]

minister's son and MP for Leeds. Charlton reported that 'attempts would be made by means of an infernal machine, the inventions of the Russians.'[50] Foreign office officials were greatly concerned that Irish revolutionaries were shipping explosives from the US to Liverpool, reflected by the regularity in which the subject featured in their letters, tracking the progress of ships and passengers supposedly carrying these packages.[51] Though Clutterbuck argued that Irish revolutionaries were most innovative in their use of technology, British officials at the time clearly thought otherwise.[52]

Robert Clipperton, British consul in Philadelphia, reported a letter he received in August 1884, written in German and 'offering to disclose the plans of the Central Committee of the International Anarchist Party in this Country.' Clipperton had investigated who had written it, but concluded that because the author was associated with the 'International Labor League', his testimony could not be trusted.[53] Clipperton ignored the information supplied in the letter and described the International Labor League as a criminal organisation comprised of different nationalities which he believed were certainly in contact with each other, even if it was only their leaders who worked together because of language barriers. He thought they were preparing for both uprisings and 'criminal acts'.[54] Though he did not overtly refer to terrorism, this letter reveals that British officials remained concerned about revolutionaries of different nationalities potentially working together. Like Archibald, however, Clipperton did not accept all intelligence uncritically. Ultimately, however, Clipperton concluded that the League did not pose a threat, despite having around 20,000 members, due to a lack of discipline.[55]

In August 1886, Sackville-West reported on a recent Irish National League Convention in Chicago, which suggested the terrorist threat to Britain was diminishing.

> The Irish delegates Mr Davitt, Mr O'Brien, Mr Redmond and Mr Deasy, notwithstanding the efforts of the Anti-Parnellite or dynamite faction, controlled the proceedings, in the sense of acknowledging Mr Parnell as the leader of the Irish in America, and of repudiating all violent measures advocated by the Extremists. This result, taken in connection with the conviction of the Anarchists in Chicago is a severe blow to the Ultra-Irish faction in America.[56]

---

[50] W Oswald Charlton to Sackville West, 3 January 1883. FO5-1860-20, TNA
[51] For example: Archibald to Granville, 2 March 1881. FO5-1777-12, TNA and Clipperton to Granville, 4 April 1881. FO-1777-123 and 124. The latter referred to O'Donovan Rossa's supposed 'numerous' opportunities to smuggle explosives across the Atlantic.
[52] Clutterbuck, 'Progenitors of Terrorism', pp. 154-181
[53] Clipperton to Granville, 18 August 1884. FO5-1930-36, TNA
[54] Clipperton to Granville, 18 August 1884. FO5-1930-36 and FO5-1930-37/38, TNA
[55] Clipperton to Granville, 18 August 1884. FO5-1930-37, TNA
[56] Sackville-West to Iddesleigh, 25 August 1886. FO5-1975-95, TNA

Charles Stewart Parnell, also leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party (IPP) and MP for Cork City, had formed the Irish National League in 1882 as a successor organisation to the Land League, which Michael Davitt had founded in 1879. The Land League campaigned for tenants' rights, collected rents from tenants, instead of them paying landlords, and offered relief to evicted tenants. The period between 1879 and 1882 when Ireland saw violence and protests on these issues has been known as the Land War. William O'Brien was an IPP MP who had drafted the 'No Rent Manifesto', where tenants would pay rent to the Land League instead of landlords, and John Redmond was another IPP MP, both were supporters of Parnell.[57] Timothy Deasy was an IRB member who was the target of the Manchester rescue that resulted in the execution of three men in 1867, who became known as the Manchester Martyrs.[58] Deasy was smuggled out of Britain. Sackville-West's letter suggests that he had come to believe that dynamiters no longer posed a threat because other significant figures within the Irish revolutionary movement in the US had turned away from terrorism. Changing priorities, as reflected in Sackville-West's letter, included growing support for Home Rule and a move away from terrorism. These events within the Irish revolutionary movement coincided with moves towards introducing Home Rule to Ireland in the Westminster Parliament. In April 1886, the Prime Minister William Ewart Gladstone had introduced the First Home Rule Bill to Parliament and, though it had been defeated on its second reading. At the time Sackville-West was writing, Gladstone's Liberal government driving the bill on Home Rule had just collapsed. As a result, at that time, the bill did not pass into law.

Sackville-West similarly believed the conviction of the anarchists accused of being behind the bomb thrown at a demonstration on the issue of the eight-hour day at Chicago's Haymarket on 4 May 1886 had damaged support for the terrorist methods advocated by O'Donovan Rossa and his circle. It is widely believed now that the four anarchists convicted and executed for the Haymarket bomb were not responsible and the identity of the bomb-thrower remains unclear.[59] Sackville-West clearly thought that the appearance of the use of such methods in the US damaged the credibility of foreign terrorists seeking refuge and support there.

---

[57] Sally Warwick-Haller, *William O'Brien and the Irish Land War* (Dublin, 1990), p. 58; Foster, *Vivid Faces*, xvi. Foster refers to Redmond as 'the inheritor of Parnell's mantle';

[58] Owen McGee, '"God Save Ireland": Manchester-Martyr Demonstrations in Dublin, 1867–1916', *Éire-Ireland*, vol. 36, nos. 3-4 (2001), p. 40

[59] Paul Avrich, *The Haymarket Tragedy* (Princeton NJ, 1984). Avrich examined testimony of related individuals (p. 443), concluding that none of the men hanged for the crime were likely to have thrown the bomb.

2.3 'Professor Mezzeroff'

The case of 'Professor Mezzeroff' is an important example of symbolic contact between Russian and Irish revolutionary terrorists in O'Donovan Rossa's propaganda. In three issues across February and March 1885, his *United Irishman* printed three extracts from a pamphlet by Professor Mezzeroff titled *Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources of Civilization*. At the time, O'Donovan Rossa's faction employed Mezzeroff to teach in their Brooklyn Dynamite School, which gave instruction on 'the safe manufacture and transportation of explosives, namely nitro-glycerine.'[60] Whelehan has discovered that it was unlikely Mezzeroff was actually Russian at all and that he was really a Richard Rogers, a liquor dealer from New York born to a Russian father and a Scottish mother. Mezzeroff also lectured for anarchist groups and wrote for newspapers such as *The Alarm* and Johann Most's *Freiheit*.[61] Though Mezzeroff was apparently neither a Professor nor a Russian revolutionary, Whelehan has argued that his role was 'to bring credibility to Rossa's organisation of United Irishmen who were commonly portrayed in the press as bunglers and swindlers of no real threat to anyone except the gullible Irish immigrants from whom they conned money. In comparison to the professional Russian revolutionary, depicted in the press as a master of secrecy, chemistry and conspiracy, the Irish dynamiters fared badly.'[62]

Whelehan has uncovered several Irish revolutionary pamphlets focusing on the acquisition and sharing of bomb-making knowledge, or what he calls 'a mix of the do-it-yourself instruction of the Scientific American and recent military theories of warfare.'[63] Whelehan's examples included a pamphlet by 'Glencree' titled *Scientific Warfare, or the Resources of Civilization. A Lecture*, which gave instructions for making dynamite, 'a burning fluid', and a time delay method better than a traditional fuse.[64] Another pamphlet which shared characteristics with this was T*he Irish Avenger, or, Dynamite Evangelist*, written by P.M. McGill and published in Washington in 1881. It instructed in the scientific principles behind the manufacture of dynamite, reflecting McGill's other activities. The cover and final page stated that it was to be the first in a series of four, but it appears the rest of the series was never

[60] Niall Whelehan, ''Scientific Warfare or the Quickest Way to Liberate Ireland': The Brooklyn Dynamite School', *History Ireland*, vol. 19, no. 6 (2008), p. 43
[61] Whelehan, *Dynamiters*, p. 160. Whelehan found the local press often referred to him as Richard Rogers and Timothy Messer-Kruse has found police reports suggesting his name was either Samuel or James Rogers. Timothy Messer-Kruse, *The Haymarket Conspiracy: Transatlantic Anarchist Networks* (Urbana IL, 2012), p. 108
[62] Whelehan, *Dynamiters*, p. 160
[63] Whelehan, *Dynamiters*, p. 170
[64] Glencree, *Scientific Warfare, or the Resources of Civilization. A Lecture* (1888), pp. 5-7

realised. The pamphlet concluded with a description of the ingredients for making dynamite:

> The inventor of dynamite, Alfred Noble, says: It is a mixture of nitro-glycerine with rotten stone or silicious marl, Tripoli, chalk, sand sawdust, charcoal, &c.
> Webster's Dictionary, 1881 edition, says: Nitro-glycerine, mixed with pulverized silica or infusorial earth – three parts of the former to one part of the latter.
> Journal of applied chemistry, says: "Dynamite proper is a mixture of 75 per cent. of nitro-glycerine with 25 per cent. of infusorial silica."
> Any druggist or apothecary – almost any person – can make dynamite – the real Sophie Peroffsky dynamite, made for Russia's Czar.
> In No. 2 of this work we will give instructions how to use dynamite most safely, privately, securely and effectively. –
> God bless Ireland![65]

The Irish Avenger too thus acted to spread knowledge of making explosives among a wider audience.

While Mezzeroff's role as a teacher at the Dynamite School fits into this model, his pamphlet does not. It discusses modern methods of warfare but does not instruct in the manufacture or use of dynamite, so the text invites further analysis beyond its links to dynamite instruction for which Whelehan has noted its importance.[66] Mezzeroff discussed the effectiveness of dynamite in scientific terms: 'When gunpowder is fired unconfined, and pure tri-nitro glycerine is exploded unconfined, the tri-nitro is ninety-three times as powerful as the powder.'[67] He argued that one hundred men armed with fifty thousand pounds of dynamite and 'the same kind of fluid which England has in Woolwich arsenal' could do more damage than one thousand Krupp artillery guns could do in twelve hours.[68] He then continued: 'the cost of the material used by the one hundred men would be only three thousand dollars…The guns, powder and shot alone would cost nearly eleven millions.'[69] He clearly encouraged the use of dynamite. However, central to the pamphlet was his commentary on British Imperial rule, justifications for Irish revolutionaries' use of dynamite, and contemporary discourses surrounding honourable warfare. Mezzeroff presented himself as a Russian qualified to comment on these issues, whose judgement was trustworthy. However, he did not make any direct comparisons between the aims of Russian and Irish revolutionaries. His only reference to Russia reflected the belief that British supporters of the Russian revolutionary movement were acting hypocritically:

---

[65] P.M. McGill, *The Irish Avenger, or Dynamite Evangelist* (Washington DC, 1881), p. 16
[66] Whelehan, *Dynamiters*, p. 170
[67] Professor Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources of Civilization', *United Irishman*, 21 March 1885
[68] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources', 21 March 1885
[69] Ibid., 21 March 1885

> the definition of the law [of what constitutes assassination] … the nations have accepted it as such. If a person kills another for public good or for the welfare of humanity, he is neither a murderer nor assassin. And England accepts this as the true meaning, for she refuses to extradite both Bernard, who attempted to kill Napoleon, and Hartmann, who helped to kill the tyrant, the late Czar of Russia. Killing, therefore, for the public good, is neither murder nor assassination.[70]

Britain hosted political refugees of various nationalities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Simon Bernard had been prosecuted in Britain for his involvement in an assassination attempt on Napoleon III, but the jury acquitted him. Though Russians such as Stepniak and Kropotkin were welcomed and supported in Britain, Mezzeroff chose to write about Lev Gartman here. Gartman was not a significant figure in Russian émigré circles in London. Instead, however, he would have been more widely known in the US where he had settled. He appears to have been welcomed in the US and his arrival and first weeks in the US had been reported sympathetically in newspapers across the country.[71] Hartmann was clearly a well-known Russian revolutionary figure in the US and he toured and gave speeches, for example in February 1883 in Philadelphia he declared that the tsar's coronation would not be allowed to take place.[72]

Mezzeroff's main purpose appears to have been to justify Irish revolutionaries' use of terrorism. He rejected the idea that legal methods could achieve political, social, and economic change in Ireland, writing: 'What a man of O'Connell's ability failed to do, with nearly all of Ireland at his back, cannot be achieved by the present agitators with only a small minority to assist them.'[73] Crowds and processions had played an important role throughout O'Connell's campaign for Catholic Emancipation and he gathered huge crowds for the 'monster meetings' as part of the campaign of the Repeal of the Union from 1843 to 1845. Gary Owens has argued that these meetings functioned as a display for the British government showing mass support for Repeal.[74] O'Connell stopped the meetings after they were

---

[70] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources', 21 March 1885

[71] On his arrival, the *Portland Daily Press* reported that 'Leo Hartmann says he has come here not to organize a Socialistic or Nihilistic party in this country. All he desired to accomplish was to make known the condition of the people in Russia in the hope of enlisting intelligent sympathy…He claims that his party desire solely the establishment of constitutional government for Russia.' 'Hartmann's Errand', *Portland Daily Press*, 2 August 1881. On 19 August 1881 the *New York Times* reported his intention to become a US Citizen. 'Hartmann The Nihilist', *New York Times*, 19 August 1881.

[72] 'The Czar not to be Crowned: Leo Hartmann Frees his Mind on the Subject in Philadelphia', *New York Times*, 9 February 1883

[73] Professor Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources', 14 February 1885

[74] Gary Owens, 'Nationalism without Words: Symbolism and Ritual Behaviour in the Repeal 'Monster Meetings' of 1843-5', in James S. Donnelly and Kerby A. Miller (eds), *Irish Popular Culture, 1650-1850* (Dublin, 1999), p. 243. The size of the crowds attending the meetings is disputed. Contemporary nationalist newspapers claimed almost all had more than 100,000 attendees, and that the largest had more than 1,000,000. Gary Owens, 'Hedge Schools of

banned, and he was threatened with arrest. Mezzeroff suggested O'Connell's methods were becoming less popular. Over the course of the 1880s, subscriptions to O'Donovan Rossa's 'Skirmishing Fund', financing Irish revolutionaries' terrorist activities were falling.[75] It seems that Mezzeroff thought terrorism was justified by waning support for militant Irish nationalism in the US Mezzeroff also argued that terrorist acts in England would be more 'humane' than other methods because they involved fewer people and would therefore not be as destructive to society as the uprisings of 1848 and 1867.[76] He also wrote that 'any weapon is justifiable when it is used on defense [sic] of human life, liberty and property.'[77] However, he also thought it would be better to target and destroy property and if using assassinations, to kill the target quickly.[78] He presented terrorism as being potentially humane. Mezzeroff advocated symbolic violence in order to galvanise the population of Ireland to revolution.

The symbolism of weapons in Ireland is significant here too: 'if England had the making of the law, she would do with all Europe what she has done for Ireland – take from them every weapon. From the stone hatchet of the savage to the one-hundred-ton gun, it has been a continuous struggle who could get the most destructive weapons.'[79] Mezzeroff argued that England, as any country would do to its enemies, would reserve the best weapons for itself if it could. He framed the banning of weapons in Ireland as taking away from the Irish the right and ability to fight back on a fair footing. Dynamite thereby replaced other weapons. Destroying English property using dynamite was highly symbolic both because of the weapon and the target. Property represented the oppression of the Irish by English landlords and through taxation. Mezzeroff claimed that English weapons used against the Irish, which he also said threatened the US, were bought with 'money stolen from the workingmen of Ireland and England.'[80] Here he briefly referenced the idea that the British economic system oppressed the poor in their own country too. It is possible this was linked to rising interest in workers' rights in the US in the mid-1880s.

Politics: O'Connell's Monster Meetings', *History Ireland*, vol. 2, no. 1 (1994), p. 35. Anti-Repeal contemporaries claimed the numbers were much fewer, in the tens of thousands. Owens, 'Nationalism without Words', p. 243

[75] Archibald to Granville, 30 November 1880. FO5-1746-143, TNA. The British Consul at New York wrote to the Foreign Secretary about O'Donovan Rossa's unsuccessful attempt to establish his own fund, having been ejected from the *Irish World* and having the 'Skirmishing Fund' removed from his control and renamed the 'National Fund': 'The subscription thus far is not a promising one.'

[76] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources', 21 March 1885

[77] Ibid., 21 March 1885

[78] Ibid., 21 March 1885

[79] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite Against Gladstone's Resources', 14 February 1885

[80] Ibid., 21 March 1885

Discussing contemporary debates about what could be considered honourable warfare, Mezzeroff defended Irish revolutionary terrorists against accusations of immorality and of violating established codes of warfare. Mezzeroff had set out his authority on the subject of warfare: 'I have been a soldier since I was sixteen'.[81] This was an important theme in Irish revolutionary propaganda throughout the nineteenth century. In 1878, the *Irish World* described

> "You are honourable [sic] fellows" say the killing, starving, inhuman men that lie close under the protecting glare of charged bayonets. "You Irishmen were always honorable fellows. Everybody knows that. Everybody knows too, that you will never descend to dishonorable dynamite or midnight rifles from a dark hillside… You have reduced war to a science. Your trade of robbing had to be supported by the trade of man-slaying. You are proficient in it… The Irish people and those who help them must strike you as they best may: must bring an end to your empire of blood and hunger, by night or by day., in bands or in individuals, with chemicals to blow you up, or rifle bullets to blow you down – in any way and every way that may wipe you out – you and your abominations – from the face of the earth.[82]

Mezzeroff gave several examples to illustrate the actions of the great powers which violated these ethical codes. These included Russians burying 'torpedoes' in Crimea to blow up the English as they stepped on them. Mezzeroff also claimed that in the American Civil War the South had used torpedoes against the North's ironclad ships and when the North realised they were so effective they abandoned their denunciations of them as 'hellish, devilish, diabolical, fiendish, unchristian'. He cited the example of British rule in India and at the British attack on Washington in 1813 as evidence that the British were committing the same crimes they accused the dynamiters of.[83] They therefore accused the British of hypocrisy, when the actions of the British in Ireland were compared to their support for terrorists of other nationalities such as Bernard and Gartman.[84]

The pamphlet did not function as a call to arms, but rather as an appeal for financial support. Mezzeroff referenced the establishment of a 'council of war', language used in other revolutionary propaganda and circumstances, but described it as a secretive body whose names would only be known to members of the council.[85] Mezzeroff called for all Irishmen to subscribe to the cause, presumably O'Donovan Rossa's fund that was also advertised in the *United Irishman*, claiming that if everyone did so the necessary funds would be raised very quickly.[86] Mezzeroff suggested restoring Irish land ownership, stating that everyone who subscribed five

[81] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite against Gladstone's Resources', 21 March 1885
[82] 'Honorable Warfare', *Irish World*, 11 May 1878
[83] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite Against Gladstone's Resources', 14 February 1885
[84] Ibid., 21 March 1885
[85] Ibid., 28 March 1885
[86] Ibid., 28 March 1885

dollars or more should be entitled to a share in the land seized from English landowners.[87] This suggests that O'Donovan Rossa and his associates wanted to gather funds for their terrorist activities and that they felt a widespread uprising in Ireland would be unnecessary if this were the case. Irish people did not necessarily have to participate in military action but could participate by donating money.

Despite Mezzeroff seeming to pose a threat to the British government by sharing Russian bomb-making knowledge with Irish revolutionary terrorists, British diplomats in the US were remarkably unconcerned by the whole Dynamite School affair and Mezzeroff's role in it. The British consul at New York, Pierrepoint Edwards, wrote to Granville in August 1882 to report that the school 'really exists under the management of the supposed Russian Mezzeroff, who, some months ago, delivered a lecture here on explosives, for the benefit of the Irish' and that, despite O'Donovan Rossa's violent rhetoric, he did not think the school and dynamite factory really existed so far as he claimed.[88] Mezzeroff featured in the diplomats' digests of the *United Irishman* for the Foreign Office and they sent a copy of his pamphlet to the Foreign Office in 1883, but the accompanying letter did not suggest the existence of this pamphlet was particularly alarming.[89] It is also clear from Pierrepoint Edwards' 1882 letter that he suspected Mezzeroff was not actually Russian, which perhaps explains his lack of alarm.

2.4 Representing the Other

Both Russian and Irish revolutionaries made comparisons with each other's activities when they could enhance their own cause or legitimise their methods. Comparing the work of O'Donovan Rossa and his associates with the works of Russian émigrés in the RFPF illustrates how these comparisons were used and why they were important to their own self-representations. Their actions suggest they were aware of responses to each other's actions and the importance of constructing their own public image in transnational contexts. Though they had different political goals, they also wrote about each other with reference to their own politics, contributing to the narratives of legitimacy underpinning their terrorism.

---

[87] Mezzeroff, 'Dynamite Against Gladstone's Resources', 28 March 1885

[88] Pierrepoint Edwards to Granville, 16 August 1882. FO5-1819-279-80, TNA

[89] For example, the digest of the 25 March 1882 issue contained an article about Mezzeroff, a 'Great Russian Chemist', having arrived in New York to show how $10 of tri-nitro-glycerine could do 'as much destruction as can be done as with a man-of-war' and the digest from 1 April 1882 contained an article reporting that Mezzeroff had supposedly claimed that he could 'in thirty days, instruct any man of average intelligence and make him able to manufacture dynamite in America, England, Ireland, Scotland, or any other part of the world.'

One example of this was the pamphlet *The Irish Avenger*, written by P.M. McGill. Little information about McGill's life survives. He authored another pamphlet, published in Washington in 1867, titled: *The Wrongs and Rights of Labor Fully and Fairly Shown, and a Remedy Proposed: Written for the Benefit of Labor and Capital, Proving that the Mutual Interests of Both Demand Reciprocal Justice* and in January 1870 the US Patent Office issued him a patent for 'Artificial Fuel'.[90] These suggest he was interested in political life and science. A surviving letter from McGill to O'Donovan Rossa from 1871 suggests McGill saw them as colleagues in the fight against English rule in Ireland but that they had disagreed over the decision made by several 'Fenian men' to accept an invitation to Washington. McGill felt that American support for Irish revolutionaries lacked sincerity.[91] O'Donovan Rossa, however, seems later to have been more enthusiastic for the prospects of American sympathy for their cause. In 1885 the *United Irishman* claimed: 'we have no fear American will ever pass a law which will prevent an Irishman from helping his brothers at home to strike terror into the heart of their English enemies.'[92] McGill's precise relationship to O'Donovan Rossa's terrorist activities is, however, unclear. British authorities in Ireland clearly considered *The Irish Avenger* to be a significant publication as it was mentioned by name in the House of Commons in November 1882, alongside the *Irish World*, *United Irishman*, and *Nation* newspapers, as having been seized at the General Post Office in Dublin.[93] Irish revolutionaries spent money importing this pamphlet into Ireland, so must have seen it as a valuable form of propaganda, and it is possible that the funds to do so came from O'Donovan Rossa.

The Irish Avenger defended the use of bombs and explosives as a revolutionary method and made direct comparisons to ongoing terrorist activities in Russia. It contained a poem, beginning with the lines 'Hail dynamite! glorious dynamite!!', and containing the lines: 'Thy pow'r dynamite despot Russia feels/And soon will tyrant Britain too!'[94] McGill associated dynamite with the assassination of the tsar in 1881 and, in particular, Sofia Perovskaia, here called Sophie Peroffsky. This association with Perovskaia reflects contemporary fascination with women terrorists as she was not the bomb-maker or one of the bomb-throwers. The reference to her here suggests readers would have recognised her name and

[90] 'Official List of Patents', *Scientific American*, vol. 22, no. 4 (22 January 1870), p. 68
[91] McGill to O'Donovan Rossa, 25 February 1875. Catholic University of America Digital Collections. http://cuislandora.wrlc.org/islandora/object/achc-fenian%3A999 [accessed 1 December 2015]
[92] *United Irishman*, 3 January 1885
[93] *Hansard* HC Deb. vol. 275 cols. 9-10, 24 November 1882
[94] McGill, *Irish Avenger*, p. 13

identity. Newspaper reports of the time focused on her among the six members of *Narodnaia volia* tried for the crime. More seems to have been known about her than the other five, as the *New York Times* and *Chicago Daily Tribune* both gave an account of her family background when they reported her arrest.[95] The *New York Times* referred to her as the 'chief mover' and 'guiding spirit' of the assassination.[96] The day after reporting her arrest, the *Chicago Daily Tribune* did report that Perovskaia was supposed to have been the person who carried the bomb; the lack of an authoritative account is reflected in reports containing contradictory information.[97] The other members of *Narodnaia volia* who had been arrested and tried alongside Perovskaia did not receive so much attention in the press, except for Rysakov, called 'Russakoff', whose motives the *New York Times* explored in their account of the assassination.[98] At the end of March, the *Washington Post* reported that the life of Tsar Alexander III was in danger if Perovskaia was executed, but did not mention the others.[99] Narratives of the assassination and trial therefore focused on Perovskaia and McGill's pamphlet reflects this. Widespread knowledge of her seems to explain why McGill chose to call it 'Sophie Peroffsky dynamite' rather than simply 'Russian dynamite'.

McGill demonstrated an awareness of the politics of the Russian revolutionary movement, its aims and methods, and its relation to the Irish revolutionary cause: 'He who writes this is neither Socialist nor Nihilist. Yet he does not repudiate their doctrine. They are of the people and know their wrongs best, for they feel them most, and must be commended for endeavoring to destroy the power which mercilessly opposes them, in the way they think shortest and best. Dynamite will be their salvation.'[100] Nihilist here appears to refer to those pursuing political reform in Russia, including terrorists. Western European and American commentators tended to refer to Russian revolutionaries as Nihilists and mischaracterise them all as terrorists, perhaps due to the dominant media image of the Russian terrorist. McGill validated the Socialists' and Nihilists' cause in terms of how Irish revolutionaries justified their own. He described them as being 'of the people', which mirrored Irish revolutionaries'

---

[95] 'Russia and the Nihilists: Sophie Pieoffsky a Chief Mover in the Czar's Murder', *New York Times*, 31 March 1881; 'Another Nihilist Arrested', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 25 March 1881. The article misspelled Perovskaia's name, which was not unusual with Russian names at the time.

[96] 'Russia and the Nihilists', *New York Times*, 31 March 1881

[97] 'Russia', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 26 March 1881

[98] 'Russia and the Nihilists', *New York Times*, 31 March 1881. The article described Rysakov as a 'Nihilist pure and simple' only interested in destruction.

[99] 'The First Warning: Alexander III. Must Cease His Prosecution of the Female Nihilist or Die', *Washington Post*, 29 March 1881

[100] McGill, *Irish Avenger*, p. 11

belief that Ireland could only become truly free if the Irish people fought for their own freedom, as illustrated in the *United Irishman*: 'There is no freedom for a nation or a people that will not fight for freedom.'[101] McGill thereby represented them as legitimate actors. He compared Russians carrying out acts of terrorism against the 'despot' tsar to Irish actions against British rule.[102] In addition to validating their suffering, *The Irish Avenger* framed the activities of revolutionaries in other countries as part of an international struggle against 'aristocracy', a language Irish revolutionaries often used to characterise their struggle against British rule as major landowner in Ireland were often English aristocrats.[103] McGill also stated that 'people are replying everywhere in their own good ways as they think best, by Socialism or Nihilism or Ribbonism. These are secret societies. Tyrannical governments will not allow the people to meet in public', justifying the methods of revolutionaries in other countries also utilising illegal methods.[104] Historians have illustrated the transnational reach of the identity of secret Ribbon societies, in the nineteenth century which supported Irish migrants abroad and responded to discrimination against Irish migrants abroad.[105] Like the symbolic ideas and movements of 'Socialism' and 'Nihilism' suggested by PM McGill, earlier in the nineteenth century, as Jess Lumsden Fisher has shown, Ribbonism was caricatured as agrarian, criminal, and apolitical violence.[106] Lumsden Fisher illustrated how restrictions on what Ribbonmen could write about themselves and their activities publicly meant that external commentators ascribed different meanings to them.[107] All three ideas represented mythologised ideas of threats to public order or imperial regimes. Others' representations of Russian revolutionary ideas and movements, such as this pamphlet, played important roles in essentialising and caricaturing Russian revolutionaries, as will also be explored in further detail in Chapter our focusing on Peter Kropotkin.

---

[101] McGill, *Irish Avenger*, p. 11; *United Irishman*, 29 July 1893
[102] McGill, *Irish Avenger*, p. 13
[103] Ibid., p. 12
[104] Ibid., p. 12
[105] John Belchem, '"Freedom and Friendship to Ireland": Ribbonism in Early-Nineteenth-Century Liverpool', *International Review of Social History*, vol. 39 (1994), p. 34
[106] Jess Lumsden Fisher, '"Night marauders" and "deluded wretches": Public Discourses on Ribbonism in Pre-Famine Ireland', in Kyle Hughes and Donald MacRaild (eds), *Crime, Violence and the Irish in the Nineteenth Century* (Liverpool, 2017), p. 53 and Willeen Keough, '"Long looked for, come at last": discourses of Whiteboyism and Ribbonism in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland', *Irish Studies Review*, vol. 26, no. 1 (2018), p. 7
[107] Fisher, '"Night marauders" and "deluded wretches"', p. 66

As relations between Russian and Irish terrorists deteriorated, the *United Irishman* became openly critical of revolutionary propaganda depicting suffering in Russia:

> There is a general disposition on the part of British writers, now, to call our attention to Russian cruelties and mal-government. The object, it is clear, is to destroy the ancient harmony between the two great nations, Russia and the United States…But if we compare the progress and prosperity of the Russian peoples with those under British rule, we shall find no warrant for the absurd stories told us about Russian cruelty…From descriptions given of the society among the convicts of Siberia one will certainly not infer that it is worse than the society among the banished British subjects in Van Dieman's Land [Tasmania]. Nor did they who were forced to go by land to Siberia worse than they who went by water, in foul, leaky, rotten, pest ships to Canada, Australia and Van Dieman's Land, half of whom were sunk in the sea ere they got to their destined ports.[108]

The newspaper also compared Gladstone negatively to the tsar: 'if the Emperor of Russia, who emancipated 20,000,000 serfs, was deemed worthy of death by the Nihilists, Mr. Gladstone, who never emancipated any one, can hardly be deemed worthy of existence by Irishmen.'[109]

The *United Irishman* also criticised responses to Stepniak in Britain and pointed out that he was a terrorist too in 1886.[110] Stepniak may have encouraged this response through his own comments on the Irish revolutionary cause in English-speaking forums. In January 1885, the *Pall Mall Gazette* published an article by Stepniak (later widely-syndicated across Britain and the US) which criticised the most recent bombing by Irish revolutionaries. Stepniak claimed: 'The Russian Nihilist is quite a different person from the American-Irish dynamitard. One has the country with him; here the country hates him.'[111] Stepniak described Irish revolutionary terrorism as 'stupid' and 'objectless', and 'mere baby work', arguing that social and political conditions and the oppression of ordinary people was much worse in Russia than in Ireland. He advocated quietly increasing the police presence in Ireland in order to stop revolutionary bombs being used in England.[112] At the time this article was published Stepniak was becoming more successful in gathering support for his cause in England (as explored in Chapter One), therefore presumably he wished to distance himself from Irish revolutionaries planting bombs in England. Stepniak had previously written in support of the liberating potential of Irish revolutionary terrorism,

---

[108] *United Irishman*, 13 February 1886

[109] 'Extracts from the "United Irishman"', FO5-1778-148, TNA ['Murderer Gladstone', *United Irishman*, 30 April 1881]

[110] 'Russia Loves the Fenians', *United Irishman*, 11 September 1886

[111] 'From a Revolutionary Point of View: Interviews with a Nihilist and a Fenian', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 26 January 1885. The article comprised interviews with Stepniak and Davitt. Stepniak advised quietly increasing the police presence in Ireland to stop the attacks in England.

[112] Ibid.

in the Russian revolutionary journal *Delo* in a pair of articles published in 1881.[113] However, his later writings in English expressed opposite views. Although his English supporters supported some degree of political freedom for Ireland, Irish revolutionaries' terrorism remained problematic.[114] *The Irish Avenger* and Stepniak's 1881 articles appear to represent a high point of enthusiasm in 1881 for transnational revolutionary terrorist solidarity, which soon broke down as a result of practical considerations.

Two examples which illustrates the importance of contemporary terrorisms on the reception of Stepniak, the RFPF, and their message in Britain and the US appears in a letter written to him by members of the SFRF and SAFRF. In June 1890, Spence Watson wrote to Stepniak: 'As for this dynamite business in Paris, I cannot understand what the French people are about. I suppose there is some political move at the bottom of it all but I do not think it will scare our friends in any shape or form.'[115] In December 1893, Edmund Noble wrote to Goldenberg: 'Last night I sent you a note about the international alliance advocated by Russian newspapers against bomb throwers. It is necessary to show that the agitation against despotic rule in Russia has nothing in common with those murderous attacks on persons and property in countries where there are free institutions, and above all free speech and a free platform.'[116] These comments illustrate how Stepniak and the RFPF were able to gather foreign support because he articulated the political position of Russian revolutionary terrorists in terms British and American sympathisers could accept and understand. Their justifications of terrorism precluded support for terrorism against British or American governments.

Other elements of the Russian revolutionary movement also looked to the case of Irish revolutionary terrorism. The revolutionary group *Chernii peredel*, formed after the split in *Zemlia i volia* over the issue of terrorism, also incorporated revolutionary activity into Ireland into their framework of legitimacy. The members of *Chernii peredel* rejected the terrorism and centralisation of the revolutionary organisation advocated by the members of *Narodnaia volia*. Among them was Vera Zasulich. Although she had shot the governor of St Petersburg in 1878, Zasulich did not support terrorism as a method of revolutionary struggle and *Chernii peredel* instead promoted mass revolution and education of the peasants as the means of

[113] S.M. Kravchinskii, 'Irlandskie dela', *Delo*, no. 8 (1881), pp. 149-177, and no. 9 (1881), pp. 195-217

[114] Robert Spence Watson wrote two pamphlets on the subject: *England's Dealings with Ireland*, published in 1887, and *Home Rule for Ireland: Fear or Hope?*, published in 1893.

[115] Robert Spence Watson to Stepniak, 4 June 189 0. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 471, l. 71ob

[116] Noble to Goldenberg, 14 December 1893. LRA MS1381/304

political change. The fourth issue of their eponymous short-lived newspaper contained the following comment on the situation in Ireland: 'Successful, organised, systematic action in the form of proletarian and agrarian terror, is itself effective proof to the people that protest against oppression… is completely possible…We point out here the popularity among the people and the aid given to those who participate in numerous agrarian action groups in Ireland.'[117] Observing Ireland during the period of the Land War (1879-82), they saw that terror was popular with the wider population. They understood terror as a means of galvanising the people into an uprising. The newspaper talked about organised activities, but also noted that there were numerous different groups operating around the country, suggesting a level of co-ordination was necessary, but not necessarily a highly-centralised organisation. Though *Chernii peredel* looked to a different type of terrorism than O'Donovan Rossa's faction's activities, they observed the financial support offered and popularity or agrarian terror in Ireland as legitimising.

In addition to their problems with Russian terrorists, Irish revolutionaries were also deeply suspicious of aspects of the European revolutionary tradition that Russians associated with. Religion was a significant part of this. Catholicism played an important role in the rhetoric of O'Donovan Rossa and his associates. The Catholic Church in Ireland had become politicised during the 1820s during Daniel O'Connell's campaign for Catholic Emancipation, the right for Catholics to sit in the Westminster Parliament. Fergus O'Ferrall argued that O'Connell's Catholic Association politicised local church issues and linked them to the national, parliamentary-oriented campaign through the institution of the Catholic Rent.[118] Although emancipation offered some new opportunities to Irish Catholics, tensions between the Catholic community and the state remained, such as in higher education and the professions, as illustrated by Senia Pašeta.[119] Like O'Connell, O'Donovan Rossa saw the potential link that parish priests offered between local and national issues and printed articles in the *United Irishman* claiming priests in the US supported the use of dynamite against the English.[120]

---

[117] *Chernii peredel*, no. 4, September 1881

[118] Fergus O'Ferrall, *Catholic Emancipation: Daniel O'Connell and the Birth of Irish Democracy, 1820-30* (Dublin, 1985), p. 77. The Catholic Association set the rent at one penny per month and used it for a variety of campaign purposes and relief.

[119] Senia Pašeta, *Before the Revolution: Nationalism, Social Change and Ireland's Catholic Elite, 1879-1922* (Cork, 1999)

[120] 'We notice that Father Brann, in his lecture in New York, and Father Boyle O'Reilly, in his lecture at a Land League meeting in Boston, strongly hints [sic] at dynamite for England.' 'They Believe Secretly in Dynamite', *United Irishman*, 31 October 1885. 'Father Brann' was probably the Catholic Priest Henry A. Brann who died in New York aged 84 in 1921. *New York Times*, 29 December 1921. In 1886 the *United Irishman* again reported on Brann:

Both the *Irish People* and *United Irishman* newspapers expressed solidarity with Polish revolutionaries. At this time Poland was partitioned between the major powers in Eastern Europe: Prussia, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Russian Empire. In the area under Russian rule, the Catholic Church was heavily suppressed, the official religion being Russian Orthodox Christianity. Polish nationalism had also been a popular cause with sympathisers in Western Europe, particularly after the failed Polish Uprising in 1863-4, and the British press was broadly sympathetic to their cause.[121] The *Irish People* and *United Irishman* highlighted similarities between the position of Irish and Polish revolutionaries in their home countries, ruled by a foreign, imperial power and suffering restrictions and persecution in practising their faith.[122] A prominent Irish nationalist Michael Davitt, however, reporting from inside Russia and on the events of pogrom in Kishinev in 1903, criticised the actions of the Russian government but also blamed the ordinary Russian people for the violence and killings.[123] Davitt came to the conclusion that Zionism offered the best solution to what had happened.[124] However, by his own admission, Davitt was led by Russian officials in his observations and interpretations of events in Russia.[125] The potential space for expressions of solidarity was therefore small and Davitt was not an impartial observer. The cause of Jewish people's rights in Russia was popularised in England in the 1880s, including by Stepniak and his associates.[126] It appears that religious freedom became an important element of transnational solidarity campaigns in this period and both Irish and Russian activists emphasised this. However, because the Russians revolutionaries' cause was not directly comparable to their

---

'Father Brann, of Ireland, lecturing in Jersey City last week, said…"I cannot approve of blowing up anything with a dynamite shell; yet if coercion should be tried, it would take all the old pumps in Jersey City to take a tear out of my eye if anything peculiar happened."' *United Irishman*, 24 July 1886. John Boyle O'Reilly was not a priest, but rather an Irish poet whose poem 'The Dead who Died for Ireland' was printed several times in the *United Irishman*.

[121] K.S. Pasieka, 'The British Press and the Polish Insurrection of 1863', *SEER*, vol. 42, no. 98 (1963), p. 37

[122] James Stephens, the founder of the IRB, established the *Irish People* in Dublin in 1863, which ran until 1865. O'Donovan Rossa was among the prominent IRB members who worked at the newspaper who were arrested in 1865 after a raid on its offices. The newspaper described Russian rule in Poland as 'occupation' and compared transportation of Irish to Poles sent into exile in Siberia. 'Foreign Intelligence', *Irish People*, 5 December 1863 and 'Soon or Never!', *Irish People*, 12 December 1863. The *United Irishman* similarly made direct comparisons between the Irish and Polish populations. United Irishman,10 April 1886

[123] Michael Davitt, *Within the Pale: The True Story of Anti-Semitic Persecutions in Russia* (London, 1903), x, pp. 44-6, and p. 87

[124] Ibid., p. 82

[125] Ibid., vii-viii

[126] In the 1880s, Stepniak alluded to the treatment of Jews and the suppression of the Jewish question in his 1885 book *Russia Under the Tzars* (e.g. pp. 324-5) and the topic would later receive much attention in *Free Russia*.

own, for religious or nationality reasons, Irish revolutionaries did not draw links with the Russians' campaign.

Religion and revolution collided in Irish revolutionaries' interpretations of Russian revolutionaries' place in the European revolutionary tradition. Kropotkin identified the legacy of the French Revolution in nineteenth-century anarchist politics:

> the Great Revolution has bequeathed to tar some other principles of an infinitely higher import; the principles of communism…Babeuf is the direct descendant of ideas which stirred the masses to enthusiasm in 1793; he, Buonarotti, and Sylvain Maréchal have only systematised them a little or even merely put them into literary form. But the secret societies organised by Babeuf and Buonarotti were the origin of the communistes matérialistes secret societies through which Blanqui and Barbes conspired under the bourgeois monarchy of Louis-Philippe. Later on, in, 1866, the International Working Men's Association appeared in the direct line of descent from these societies. As "socialism" we know now that this term came into vogue avoid the term "communism," which at one time was dangerous because the secret communist societies became societies for action, and were rigorously suppressed by the bourgeoisie then in power.
> There is, therefore, a direct filiation from the Enragés of 1793 and the Babeuf conspiracy of 1795 to the International Working Men's Association of 1866–1878.[127]

Casey Harison has also argued that at the time of the 1905 Revolution in Russia, Lenin saw in the Paris Commune 'timely rules for how workers might seize control of the state and then hold onto it' and that Bolsheviks later used the Commune as a source of legitimacy.[128] Russian revolutionaries throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, both socialists and anarchists, believed they had inherited the values of the French revolutionary tradition.

For Irish revolutionaries, this heritage was problematic. In 1871, the *Irish World* condemned the anticlerical actions of the Communards. Prior to the assassination of the Archbishop of Paris and other bishops on 24 May 1871, the newspaper appeared to admire the tactical successes of the Communards, even as they criticised their political-ideological position: 'The insurrection is controlled by bold, dextrous, and bloody-minded men. The leaders may be visionary and impractical in many of their theories of government; but they are sufficiently able to deal with the business they have taken in bed.'[129] After the assassination, the newspaper's tone shifted: 'The devils of the Commune have gone down to destruction, scaling their atrocities with

---

[127] Peter Kropotkin, *The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793*, trans. N.F. Dryhurst. The Anarchist Library. http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-the-great-french-revolution-1789-1793#toc70 [accessed 26 November 2015]. Kropotkin's *Great French Revolution* was originally published in French in 1909 and translated into English by Dryhurst for publication in London and New York the same year. Nannie Florence Dryhurst was an anarchist associated with the *Freedom* newspaper group Kropotkin had helped to found in 1886.

[128] Casey Harison, 'The Paris Commune of 1871, the Russian Revolution of 1905, and the Shifting of the Revolutionary Tradition', *History and Memory*, vol. 19, no. 2 (2007), p. 8

[129] 'The Reds Victorious', *Irish World*, 22 April 1871

the assassination of the venerable Archbishops of Paris.'[130] Criticisms of European revolutionaries continued after the suppression of the Commune. The *Irish World* condemned a supposed plot to assassinate the pope in July of that year:

> It was arranged by the conspirators – as the report has it – that one of their comrades, to be designated by lot, should insinuate himself into the train of attendants that followed the Holy Father during the celebration of his jubilee, and then carry out his black scheme by means of a poniard [a long knife]. The assassination was planned for Sunday, the 16th June, the last day of the Papal Jubilee… That International Society is made up of a pretty hard crowd, and there are men belonging to it who will go as far as the devil himself in wickedness; but men are not supposed to act without some object in view. We fail to see any object, good or bad, to be gained by the International in this thing, now laid to their charges, and therefore we are unwilling to lay the odium on that body…it behoves the Society to come out with a disclaimer.[131]

The 'International Society' seems to refer to the International Workingmen's Association (the IWMA, or First International). In 1867, the *New York Times* had reported on meetings of 'workingmen' in Lausanne and Geneva in which it had been agreed that 'The Pope is to be abolished – every nation has its peculiar Pope – and a Republican Government is to be universal.'[132] While the *Irish World* acknowledged that members of the International might not be responsible, they seem to have believed they were capable of it. Internationalist revolutionaries were thereby linked with anti-clericalism, in opposition to attempts to use the Catholic Church as a means to gather support.

The *United Irishman* commemorated the victims of the Communards' anti-clerical killings in 1887. The article was framed as an account written by an American who had known the archbishop.[133] Reiterating the anticlericalism of the Commune and framing its victims as martyrs, the newspaper reinforced the notion that the Irish revolutionary cause was incompatible with the socialist and anarchist revolutionaries who claimed the heritage of the Paris Commune.

Irish revolutionaries also opposed the Commune as a result of pride in foreign military victories in which Irish men had participated. The *Irish World* newspaper particularly celebrated the contributions of Irish-Americans to American Independence in the American Civil War.[134] It did not celebrate the politics of the Civil

---

[130] *Irish World*, 3 June 1871. The article states the 'Archbishops', though there was only one archbishop, so it appears that this refers to the archbishop and the other priests who were killed.

[131] *Irish World*, 1 July 1871

[132] 'Democratic Tendencies', *New York Times*, 2 October 1867

[133] 'Martyred by Communists', *United Irishman*, 30 April 1887

[134] The front page of the *Irish World* of 2 March 1872 carried a picture captioned 'Washington Bearing Witness to the Catholics in the Revolution'. This symbolism was repeated on the front page of the paper on 1 March 1872. The most prominent flag behind George Washington is this second image features the symbol of a glowing harp.

War and indeed Toby Joyce has argued that during the war itself 'Opinions on the Civil War were confused and often based on the agendas of the contending factions.'[135] Irish soldiers had fought for both the Confederacy and the Union. Instead their individual bravery and Irish heritage were celebrated. Around the same time the *Irish World* turned against the Communards for their anti-clerical killings, the *Irish World* hailed news that General MacMahon of the French army was headed towards Paris to suppress the Commune, featuring a large drawing of MacMahon alongside the news.[136] MacMahon was of Irish descent, though his family had lived in France for several generations and the *Irish World* had closely followed news of the Franco-Prussian war. MacMahon's army returned to retake the capital in May 1871, after France's defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. Pride in Irish military prowess that played a significant role in the formation of militant Irish revolutionary republican identity in the late nineteenth century clearly impacted on their relationships with revolutionaries of other nationalities.

In September 1871, the *Irish World* also dissociated the cause of workers' rights from socialist and anarchist politics. Reporting on a demonstration on the issue of the eight-hour working day in New York noted that the red flag of the International and shouts of 'Vive la Commune' met little response.[137] Reframing international revolutionary politics helped them to establish their own narratives of revolutionary legitimacy.

2.5 Conclusion

Interrogating the widely-held view that Russian revolutionary terrorism of the late nineteenth century influenced contemporary and later terrorisms in more detail and using new sources has illustrated that the process of transferring revolutionary methods, symbols, and technologies between groups and in transnational contexts was more complex than has been previously recognised. This chapter has shown that Russian and Irish revolutionary terrorists in the 1880s constructed their public identifies with reference to each other. However, it is largely limited to its study of the representations of terrorism and external responses to the context of individuals and groups coalescing around Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa. Symbolic co-operation with Russian terrorists played a role in O'Donovan Rossa's faction's self-fashioning and the representations of their activities as modern and professional. Incorporating the other into their representations of their own activities could be legitimising and, in the

[135] Toby Joyce, 'The American Civil War & Irish Nationalism', *History Ireland*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1996), p. 41
[136] *Irish World*, 27 May 1871
[137] *Irish World*, 23 September 1871

case of Irish terrorists, could be used to mock British politicians, officials, and the police. The case of Professor Mezzeroff shows that the symbolism of a Russian expert helping Irish revolutionary terrorists went far beyond the exchange of bomb-making knowledge and technology. Instead, Mezzeroff was primarily mobilised in O'Donovan Rossa's propaganda to comment on the situation in Ireland and the legitimacy of Irish revolutionary terrorism from what was supposedly a Russian perspective.

The case of Mezzeroff, in particular, demonstrates the opposing themes in the representations of terrorism explored in this chapter. Russian and Irish revolutionary terrorists saw international revolutionary contexts as legitimising their own activities, but also condemned aspects of other revolutionaries' activities. Mezzeroff's comment on the legitimacy of Irish revolutionary terrorism was especially important as the *United Irishman* frequently compared the situation in Ireland negatively to that in Russia in order to argue for the legitimacy of the use of terrorism against English rule. Geopolitical concerns and understanding their own potential sources of support meant that expressions of solidarity and co-operation were short-lived. Religion was another important influence on the relationship between Russian and Irish revolutionary terrorists. Ultimately, Russians' socialism, anticlericalism, and claim to European revolutionary heritage meant that their activism was incompatible with Irish revolutionary nationalism which was closely tied to Catholicism. Despite a lack of concrete evidence, British officials clearly believed in the existence of a transnational revolutionary terrorist network threatening European states and monarchies. As the strength of this belief declined across the 1880s, it is possible to see how Stepniak was able to prepare British audiences for the activities of the RFPF and SFRF.

Chapter Three: The Transnational Terrorist Publishing Work of Feliks Volkhovskii and Vladimir Burtsev, 1900-1914

3.1 Introduction

The Russian revolutionary émigrés Feliks Volkhovskii and Vladimir Burtsev were both active in writing and publishing about revolutionary terrorism in the period between 1900 and 1914 and are well-studied in histories of the Russian revolutionary emigration. This chapter examines this period in their careers in order to identify the legacies of nineteenth-century representations of terrorism and publishing organisations such as the RFPF in these twentieth-century Russian-language publishing activities. These legacies have been often overlooked by historians. As suggested by Davide Turcato, tracing individual revolutionaries' lives and careers in publishing activities can provide new insights into transnational political activism.[1] Individuals' biographies can reveal how movements were anchored spatially, the influence of political legacies, and the dynamics of change. Robert Henderson's biography of Burtsev is one example of recent scholarship in the field which illustrates connections across time and space.[2] In this period, Volkhovskii and Burtsev wrote for and edited periodicals whose contributors, editorial staff, and readership formed transnational networks across Europe and Russia. Volkhovskii and Burtsev also worked with the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party (PSR) on these publications and other publishing projects. The leadership of the PSR in exile in Paris had established itself as a new and important centre of terrorist propaganda abroad, with links to terrorists in Russia. In contrast to the last decades of the nineteenth century, after 1900 terrorists were more active in Russia, carrying out high-profile assassinations among other activities. Working with the PSR, Volkhovskii, Burtsev, and other former RFPF members belonging to the older generation of revolutionaries still active in the early twentieth century continued to participate in debates about the ethics and representation of terrorism. Helen Williams has argued that Volkhovskii was equal in standing to the more well-known Burtsev in the transnational publishing activities of this period.[3] While Burtsev appears frequently in histories of the PSR, in contrast Volkhovskii rarely receives much attention in academic studies of the party. This chapter seeks to understand Volkhovskii and Burtsev as representing the geographical and ideological peripheries of the party as well as living links to the revolutionary past. It is focused on their

[1] Turcato, 'Italian Anarchism', pp. 407-444
[2] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*
[3] Williams, '"Vesti i slukhi"', p. 45-61

activities founded in London, where they both lived for significant portions of their lives in this period.

Focusing on Volkhovskii and Burtsev's published writings and their associated correspondence offers a new approach to the history of Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period. Both Volkhovskii and Burtsev wrote for and edited several relevant periodicals in the period between 1900 and 1914, several of which were remarkably long-lived. The longevity of these publications makes it possible to draw some conclusions about developments over time in representations of terrorism in this period. Geifman has shown that the Central Committee of the PSR was divided and in chaos after the revelation that the leader of the BO Evno Azef was a police spy. They struggled to articulate their position on the matter.[4] This chapter will explore representations of terrorism before and after the Azef affair in these publications in order to draw conclusions about its relative influence on the work of those with long-standing support for the idea of ethical terrorism.

The contrasting nature of Volkhovskii and Burtsev's relationships with the PSR and other revolutionaries offers some opportunity for comparison about the nature of revolutionary networks in this period, in addition allowing us to draw broader conclusions about cultures of writing and publishing about terrorism in this period. Burtsev's writing about terrorism, the publications he edited, and his relationships with other revolutionaries have been studied by a number of scholars, whereas this period of Volkhovskii's life and career remains largely unexplored. The only study of Volkhovskii's life in this period is an article written by Donald Senese, which focuses on his English-language work and networks in this period rather than his Russian-language writing and publishing activities.[5] Though Volkhovskii continued to work on the English-language *Free Russia* in the twentieth century, his work on Russian-language publications seems to have steadily increased in these years, except during a period of illness. Therefore, in addition to investigating well-known periodicals with a focus on terrorism, this chapter will also highlight the importance of several previously overlooked periodicals and complement the analysis of *Free Russia* and the legacies of the RFPF in English-language publishing about Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period offered in Chapter One.

This chapter will conclude with an analysis of Volkhovskii and Burtsev's relationships with the PSR as they were shaped by their views on terrorism and their own (un)willingness to participate in debates on this issue within the party. This

[4] Anna Geifman, *Entangled in Terror: The Azef affair and the Russian Revolution* (Wilmington DE, 2000), pp. 129-30
[5] Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky in London', pp. 67-78

section will also consider how they chose to represent their connections with the party through their publishing work, particularly with reference to the idea of *nepartiinost* (non-partisanship). The PSR's relationship with terrorism in this period was complex as historians such as Anna Geifman have shown. The party's Central Committee in emigration and local groups on the ground in the Russian Empire did not always justify their use of terrorism in the same terms.[6] Members of the PSR's BO and affiliated organisations were among the best-known and prolific terrorists in this period, though support for terrorism existed among less obvious political groups, including the liberal Kadets, who refused to condemn terrorism outright and supported fundraising events for terrorism in Paris and Geneva.[7] Additionally, Geifman discovered widespread and convincing evidence illustrating that, on both local and central party levels, distinctions between political and ordinary criminal violence and between different political groups' activities were rarely recognised or clear, showing that, for example, individuals were frequently members of multiple political groups at a local level and that party leaders and theorists often referred to co-operation.[8] As a result, Geifman has illustrated that revolutionaries' debates about terrorism were much more complex than previously recognised.

3.2 Volkhovskii, Burtsev, and the Periodical Legacy of the RFPF

Though he was not a member, the RFPF supported Burtsev's work in the 1890s, providing funds and assistance for research, writing, and publishing. RFPF members working with the SFRF also raised funds for Burtsev's legal defence and to campaign on his behalf during his trial and imprisonment for calling for the assassination of the tsar in *Narodovolets* in 1897. Henderson also reports that the RFPF lent Burtsev type to produce his infamous pro-terrorist journal *Narodovolets*.[9] Burtsev's other main project in the 1890s was the book *Za sto let* (*The Last Hundred Years)*, which Henderson has shown was instigated by the RFPF, with one of its members Egor Lazarev collecting money to produce this book from a Russian émigré in New York. This émigré was later discovered to have been working for the tsarist secret police. Members of the RFPF also suggested the format for the work, based on Lev

[6] Geifman's *Thou shalt kill* (1993), approaches the subject comprehensively, examining the issue from a variety of political perspectives and exploring the tensions between centre and locality in party terrorist activity.

[7] Geifman, 'The Liberal Left Opts for Terror', pp. 551-2

[8] Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, p. 196 and p. 182. Geifman presented local membership of interparty unions as evidence for co-operation and argued that Boris Savinkov, a leading figure in the PSR's BO, had been open to cross-party co-operation if it included a commitment to the use of terrorism.

[9] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, p. 84. It is unclear where Henderson discovered this, however, the type may have been excess capacity from that used to produce *Letuchie listki*, which was by 1896 appearing less frequently.

Tikhomirov's 1883 *Kalendar narodnoi voli* (*Calendar of Narodnaia volia*), detailing important events and dates in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement.[10] Saunders has shown that RFPF members also influenced Burtsev's writing on terrorism, stopping him from including a statement supporting its use in *Za sto let*.[11] The RFPF paid Adolf Rublev and Vasilii Zhuk (the pseudonym of Vasilii Maslov-Stokoz) to assist Burtsev with research for the project and Stepniak wrote letters in support of their admittance to the British Museum Reading Room.[12] In the 1890s, Zhuk also became a regular contributor to *Free Russia*, compiling the 'Rossica' sections from his home at the Tolstoyan community at Purleigh, Essex, in which he described recently-published books about Russia and Russian issues.[13]

In 1900, Russian revolutionary émigrés formed the *Agrarno-Sotsialisticheskaia liga* (Agrarian-Socialist League, or ASL) at the funeral of the Russian revolutionary theorist Peter Lavrov in Paris.[14] Among them were members of the RFPF and their associates in London, including Volkhovskii, Shishko, Goldenberg, Lazarev, and Chaikovskii. The ASL was among the predecessor organisations to the PSR, and Viktor Chernov, the influential theorist who would later become the leader of the PSR, wrote its political programme. Hildermeier has argued that the ASL programme looked back to the early ideas of the *Zemlia i volia* movement, focusing on mass propaganda, whereas the members of the group coming from the older revolutionary generation, or most of the RFPF members, remained committed to terrorism as a method of revolution.[15] This transition from the RFPF to the ASL has not been explored by historians, but archival documents reveal that the ASL did not simply subsume the RFPF overnight. Personal connections formed in the 1890s supported Volkhovskii and Burtsev's work financially and gave them access to writers. By this time both Shishko and Lazarev had left London and they lived at various times in Switzerland and Paris. Both joined the PSR and worked

[10] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, p. 78; Alfred Erich Senn, 'The Russian Revolutionary Movement of the Nineteenth Century as Contemporary History', Kennan Institute Occasional Paper Series, no. 250 (Washington DC, 1993), pp. 23-4. Henderson suggests it was Zasulich's *Kalendar* which provided the model, but Senn's analysis of *Letuchie listki* showed it was more likely to have been Tikhomirov's.

[11] David Saunders, 'Vladimir Burtsev and the Russian Revolutionary Emigration (1888-1905)', *EHQ*, vol. 13, no. 1 (1983), p. 41

[12] Ibid., p. 78

[13] Zhuk to Volkhovskii, 7 June 1902. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 1, folder 33, HIA. Zhuk included in this letter some material for the column written in Russian, which presumably Volkhovskii then translated for the paper. Volkhovskii added several further titles in his blue pencil in the blank space at the end of the letter, suggesting Zhuk was not responsible for the whole column.

[14] V.M. Chernov, *Pered Burei: Vospominaniia* (New York, 1953), pp. 124-5

[15] Manfred Hildermeier, *The Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party before the First World War* (Münster/New York, 2000), p. 38

for the party in addition to supporting Volkhovskii and Burtsev's work on its peripheries.

Despite its apparent disappearance, RFPF members saw it as continuing to exist beyond the formation of the ASL. In 1901, for the census, Goldenberg gave his profession as 'Secretary R.F.P. Fund'.[16] The RFPF's main lasting success was their bookselling business, which supplied Russian-language books to émigrés in Britain and France, bookshops, and institutions such as the British Museum. This area of the business provided funds for their propaganda activities. Goldenberg had taken responsibility for this area of the RFPF's activities after arriving in London. Letters in the archive of the RFPF at GARF show Goldenberg maintained the legacy of the RFPF as a supplier of Russian-language books. Though the bulk of the letters in the *dela* concerning these activities are from the period up to 1907, a small number of letters survive from the period between 1908 and 1910.[17] In 1910, in the thirteenth issue of *Byloe*, Burtsev also included Goldenberg's name on a list of suppliers of the journal, which included bookshops and dealers across Western Europe and in New York.[18] Together, these records indicate the longevity of the RFPF's business and networks and, though no financial records survive, suggest the existence of a source of funds for ongoing Russian-language publishing activities based in London. Goldenberg's memoirs state that the RFPF closed in 1905, after freer publishing conditions in Russia rendered it superfluous.[19] While this may officially have been true, the legacy of the RFPF's bookselling business remained intact beyond this.

Between 1902 and 1914, Volkhovskii wrote for and edited two periodicals and two newspapers for the PSR, while continuing to edit *Free Russia*. During the period between 1904 and 1907, he stopped his work on both English- and Russian-language publications while he spent significant periods abroad, including in hospital in Lausanne in Switzerland recovering from an operation, and organising propaganda work among soldiers and officers in Finland.[20] He edited the periodicals *Narodnoe delo* (*The People's Cause*) and *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik* (*The People's Cause. An Almanac*), which appeared irregularly in five issues between 1902 and 1904 and seven issues between 1909 and 1912 respectively.[21] Both appeared in issues of

[16] 1901 Census. England. Hammersmith, London. RG13 47/117. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 3 July 2018]
[17] GARF, f. 5799, d. 174 and d. 175. Letters from various individuals regarding book sales
[18] *Byloe*, no. 13 (1910), p. 161
[19] 'Goldenberg's Reminiscences', Tuckton House Papers, LRA MS1381/29, p. 90
[20] F. Volkhovsky to Robert Spence Watson, 20 January 1906. SW1/19/4, Spence Watson Weiss Papers, NCL; Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky in London', p. 77
[21] Tatiana Ossorguine-Bakounine, *L'Émigration russe en Europe: catalogue collectif des périodiques en langue russe, 1855-1940* (Paris, 1976), p. 68

around a hundred pages or more and contained essays and short fiction on subjects such as revolutionary history, contemporary social issues, and revolutionary theory. Both *Narodnoe delo* and the *Sbornik* were officially publications of the PSR. *Narodnoe delo* was an official publication of the Central Committee of the party and was founded in a period of major expansion of their propaganda publishing operations.[22] Volkhovskii also edited the newspaper *Za narod!* (*For the People!*) between 1907 and 1914 and the PSR's main party organ *Znamia truda* (*The Banner of Labour*) between 1912 and 1914.[23] This chapter focuses on Volkhovskii's work on the *Sbornik* and *Za narod*. Little archival material survives relating to the *Narodnoe delo* of 1902-4, limited to a single folder of draft articles of which a single item is marked in Volkhovskii's characteristic pencilled handwriting as being destined for publication in the unpublished sixth edition of the periodical.[24] Therefore, while the content of *Narodnoe delo* is relevant to understanding legacies of nineteenth-century representations of terrorism, records relating to the operations of the other two publications permit investigation of the legacies of networks and organisations. Volkhovskii's work editing *Znamia truda* in the last two years of his life is also excluded because this chapter is primarily concerned with Volkhovskii and Burtsev's work on the geographical and ideological peripheries of the PSR and, additionally, as in the case of *Narodnoe delo*, surviving records do not appear to reveal the extent of Volkhovskii's role and influence. Equally importantly for this study, representations of terrorism began to feature less regularly in Volkhovskii's work before this, as this chapter will show, therefore this publication is of less relevance.

Whereas Volkhovskii worked on several publications relevant to this study across this period, Burtsev primarily focused on a single journal in the years between 1900 and 1914. *Byloe* (*The Past*, though it was given the title *The Things That Were* in English on its first few issues) underwent a series of transformations during the course of its existence. The journal recounted the history of the Russian revolutionary movement, including through original documents, eyewitness accounts of revolutionary events, and letters to the editor from revolutionaries.[25] More so than in the periodicals Volkhovskii wrote for and edited, terrorism is a prominent theme in *Byloe*. Burtsev published six issues in London between 1900 and 1904, before

[22] A. I. Spiridovich, *Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Rossii v period imperii: Partiia sotsialistov-revoliutsionerov i eia predshestvenniki, 1886-1916* (Petrograd, 1918), pp. 110-11
[23] In. Ritina [I.I. Rakitnikova], 'Feliks Vadimovich Volkhovskii', *Mysl*, no. 40, 1 January 1915. https://socialist-revolutionist.ru/component/content/article/82-public/1243-rakitnikova-ii-statya-feliks-vadimovich-volxovskij [accessed 13 June 2017]
[24] PSR Archives, 648, IISH, Amsterdam
[25] Burtsev set out his preferred content several times, including in 'Ot redaktsii zhurnala "Byloe"', *Byloe*, no. 7 (1908), pp. 156-9

returning to Russia after the revolution of 1905, where he helped to re-found the journal in St Petersburg under the editorship of the revolutionary publicist Pavel Shchegolev with help from Vasilii Bogucharskii (real name Iakovlev). This version of the journal appeared monthly in 1906 and 1907, running to twenty-two issues, until it was suppressed by the tsarist authorities.[26] Bogucharskii and Shchegolev then turned their attention to two new publications *Nasha strana* (*Our Country*) and *Minuvshie gody* (*The Past Years*) with a similar focus on historical documents and essays.[27] In 1907, Burtsev emigrated once again and travelled to Paris where he re-founded *Byloe* for the second time under his editorial control. He ignored the Petersburg edition when numbering the issues in this period, though he did not ignore their content, publishing articles referring to documents and articles that had appeared during that time.[28] This second period of *Byloe* under Burtsev's sole editorship comprised issues seven to fourteen and a fifteenth, unpublished issue, dated from 1908 to 1913. Burtsev and Shchegolev again re-founded the journal in Petrograd in 1917 with the help of other revolutionaries, where it continued until 1926 when it was suppressed by the Soviet censors.[29] Burtsev, however, was imprisoned by the Bolsheviks in 1917 and eventually left Russia, so again he did not play a major role in this period of *Byloe*. Like Volkhovskii, surviving correspondence in Burtsev's personal archive illuminates his relationships with party members in the PSR and with other revolutionaries and his participation in debates about the ethics of terrorism.

Revolutionary publishing, including that of the PSR, in this period was complex as editors reused materials in different periodicals and pamphlets. The publications discussed in this chapter did not have entirely unique content or operations. Notwithstanding its claim to be an almanac, the *Sbornik* did not only print reused or collected materials and featured new articles and stories by Volkhovskii.[30] It did, however, reprint articles from the *Narodnoe delo* of 1902-4, pieces which had originally appeared as pamphlets, and those which had appeared in other PSR publications, including articles discussing terrorism. The PSR produced numerous pamphlets and by 1904 its publishing house (*Tipografiia partii sotsialistov-*

[26] M.S. Cherepakov and E.M. Fingerit, *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat (1895-oktiabr 1917). Spravochnik* (Moscow, 1957), p. 36
[27] F.M. Lure, *Khraniteli proshlogo. zhurnal "Byloe": Istoriia, redaktory, izdateli* (Leningrad, 1990), p. 5
[28] For example, in V.N. Figner, 'Pamiati narodovolstsev (o portretakh Perovskoi, Zheliabova, Kibalchicha, Gelfman, Barranikova, Kalodkevicha, Sukhanova i Bogdanovicha.)', *Byloe*, no. 7 (1908), pp. 139-147
[29] Lure, *Khraniteli proshlogo*, p. 5
[30] For example: F. Volkhovskii, 'Skazka o soldatskoi dushe', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 4 (1909), pp. 5-12

revoliutsionerov) advertised forty-three titles, alongside sixteen that had been published by the ASL. Pamphlets reprinted in the *Sbornik* as articles included 'V borbe za zemliu i voliu', which had originally appeared in the ASL series of pamphlets in a print run of 10,000 copies.[31]

The fifth issue of the *Sbornik*, published in 1910, is particularly interesting because it seems to have been produced in tandem with a standalone publication titled *Pamiati Leonida Emmanuilovicha Shishko*. Both the separate publication and the issue of the *Sbornik* memorialised Volkhovskii's former RFPF colleague Leonid Shishko after his recent death with new articles about his life. This separate publication reproduced some of Shishko's articles, including about the nature of revolutionary organisation. Shishko argued that a highly-centralised party did not preclude them bringing about democracy.[32] This argument underpinned many justifications of the use of terrorism as a tool of revolutionary liberation. Of particular interest is the reprinting of Shishko's open letter to the French socialist politician, writer, and publicist Jean Jaurès which discussed terrorism and revolutionary tactics. The letter justified Russian revolutionary terrorism, arguing it was an essential part of the revolutionary process in Russia.[33] It seems that Jaurès held Shishko in high regard, having printed an article by him in his *L'Humanité* around the time of his death.[34]These projects illustrate the ongoing importance of individuals from older revolutionary generations such as the former RFPF members to revolutionary publishing and the respect they had earned from the émigré revolutionary community for their previous activities and writings.

Similarly to Volkhovskii in *Narodnoe delo* and the *Sbornik*, editors of other revolutionary publications reprinted materials from *Za narod*. In 1907, Nikolai Rusanov, the editor of *Vestnik russkoi revoliutsii* for the PSR, requested material from *Za narod* to reprint in the journal, but explicitly asked Volkhovskii not to send any of his poetry. He revealed in the same letter that Volkhovskii had recently contributed articles to the *Vestnik*.[35] Shishko also contributed to the *Vestnik* during its

---

[31] 'Izdaniia', in D. Khilkov, *Terror i massovaia borba* (1904), p. 49. The list of publications in the back of this pamphlets lists the titles published by the ASL and PSR and includes details of their print runs.

[32] L. Shishko, 'K voprosu ob organizatsii', in *Pamiati Leonida Emmanuilovicha Shishko* (1910), p. 70

[33] L.E. Shishko 'Otkrytoe pismo Zh. Zhoresu', in O. V. Budnitskii, *Istoriia Terrorizma v Rossii v Dokumentakh, Biografiiakh, issledovaniiakh* (Rostov-on-Don, 1996), pp. 243-248

[34] 'Le Régime Constitutionnel est-il possible en Russie?', *L'Humanité*, Sunday 22 January 1910. PSR Archives, folder 581, IISH, Amsterdam

[35] Rusanov to Volkhovskii, 16 July 1907. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 109, Houghton

existence between 1901 and 1905 and later wrote for Volkhovskii's *Sbornik*.[36] The interconnected nature of networks of revolutionary publications, their contributing authors, and editors means that their content was not produced in discrete contexts. Equally problematic are the anonymous or pseudonymous identifiers attached to the articles, which make it difficult to determine which individual among these close networks wrote them. However, in selecting content discussing terrorism, Volkhovskii, like Burtsev, adhered to his own political beliefs, as this chapter will show.

Similarly, Burtsev shared material between the periodicals he edited. David Saunders described his journals *Byloe* and *Narodovolets* (*Member of Narodnaia volia*) respectively as being Burtsev's 'raw material', consisting of memoirs and historical documents, and the place where he developed his theories of terrorism based on those materials.[37] However, Burtsev does not always seem to have been clear where it was best to publish certain materials himself. One letter, from a 'Mark Volkhov', was labelled by Burtsev as 'correspondence – for "*Narodovolets*"', but he evidently changed his mind, crossing this out and replacing it with a 'B', indicating it was destined to be published in Byloe.[38] This shows the interconnectedness of the periodicals, as Saunders suggests, and indicates that their relationship to one another was perhaps more complex.

In addition to sharing an editor, the *Sbornik* and *Za narod* focused on similar themes, reflecting Volkhovskii's interests. The two publications were also linked by their finances. Given the scarcity of information regarding the publication of *the Sbornik*, it is difficult to precisely define this relationship, however, records from 1909 show a small amount of money was transferred from *Za Narod* to the *Sbornik* in 1909, including funds to pay for postage.[39] The publications were also linked by fundraising efforts. In 1910, the fifth issue of the *Sbornik* contained the same notice which appeared in the March issue of that year's *Za Narod,* ending with the words: 'money is sorely needed'.[40] As funds were always low, the links between different publications could be exploited in order to support those which needed to attract more funds. Though no content appears to have been explicitly reused between

---

[36] Cherepakov and Fingerit, *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat*, pp. 42-3

[37] Saunders, 'Vladimir Burtsev', p. 55

[38] Mark Volkhov to Vladimir Burtsev, 5 November 1903. RGASPI, f. 328, op. 1, d. 164, l. 1. It is possible that 'Mark Volkhov' was a pseudonym chosen after the nihilist character in Ivan Goncharov's 1869 novel *Obyv* (*The Precipice*).

[39] *Schet s 25 sent 1909 po 25* oct *1909*. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA [document written and titled in a mixture of Russian and English]

[40] 'Na podderzhanie gazety "Za narod!"', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 5 (1910). The address given for donations was the site of the PSR's library at the 'Société Russe' on Rue Pascale in Paris.

these two publications, it is clear that their operations were linked in some way and that Volkhovskii hoped to keep them going in combination.

Documents in Volkhovskii's personal archive suggest *Za narod* relied upon the administrative functions and smuggling networks established by the RFPF from its London office. An account for the period 25 September to 25 October 1909 shows £8.10.0 being paid to a 'Lazar' who was likely Goldenberg.[41] In 1901 Volkhovskii forwarded 8/4 from Lazarev, then working for the PSR, to Spence Watson for the SFRF, an exchange that indicates the ongoing links between Volkhovskii's Russian- and English-language propaganda work.[42] Evidence that *Za narod* was distributed through networks established by the RFPF can be found in a letter from 1909 when the newspaper's printers informed 'Monsieur A Chevin' that two thousand copies of the newspaper had been sent to Paris and two hundred to 18 Augustus Road, Hammer.[43] These numbers match the proportions in the printers' quotes regarding the numbers to be printed on ordinary paper and on bible paper, suggesting that the copies on bible paper were sent to the RFPF office for distribution. The use of bible paper for smuggling made copies of the newspaper thinner and more easily concealed. The experience in smuggling and the networks established by the RFPF seem, therefore, to have been mobilised for new purposes in this period.

The spaces on the north western fringes of London in the late nineteenth century inhabited by Volkhovskii and his colleagues while they were working on these publications mapped onto those in which the RFPF members had lived and worked in the previous decade. In London, this space was an area between Hammersmith and Bedford Park.[44] In the 1890s, the RFPF operated out of rooms in a house at 15 Augustus Road, Hammersmith (since renamed Brackenbury Gardens). When Goldenberg moved to London in 1895, he moved in to the office, whereupon he registered (illegally) to vote at the address.[45] The local connections formed by members of the RFPF also helped to support them in later years as, for example, Goldenberg moved from Augustus Road to about a mile and a half away in the early

[41] Schet s 25 sent 1909 po 25 oct 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA [document written and titled in a mixture of Russian and English]

[42] Robert Spence Watson to Feliks Volkhovskii, 22 March 1901. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 362, Folder 8 of 10, Houghton. The SFRF's only real expenditure was on *Free Russia*.

[43] Guy Bowman to Monsieur A. Chevin, 31 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA

[44] Except Chaikovskii, who lived in Harrow.

[45] Goldenberg first appeared in on the electoral register at no. 15 in 1898. He was also listed as sole occupant of a dwelling there on the 1901 census, working at home. 1898 Electoral Register. Hammersmith, London. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 3 July 2018]; 1901 Census. England. Hammersmith, London. RG13 47/117. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 3 July 2018]

years of the twentieth century, but in the 1911 census he is listed as the lodger of a family who had lived in rooms in the house at 15 Augustus Road at the same time he had.[46] The practical difficulties of life in emigration, relying on local connections, and local knowledge must not be understated. When the office of *Za narod* was set up in 1907, the house at number 18 Augustus Road was chosen, the building immediately opposite number 15. The location remained convenient. In this period, Goldenberg met his later wife, Cecily Eleanor Kaye, who also lived not far from this new address and the office at Augustus Road.[47] In the 1890s, the office at 15 Augustus Road had been close to the homes of Stepniak and Volkhovskii, both of whom lived at several different addresses during this period. During the period between 1900 and 1907, when Volkhovskii was not active in Russian-language publishing work though continuing to edit *Free Russia* for some of this period, he lived a significant journey from this area on the edge of in South London at addresses in Clapham and Balham. Volkhovskii returned to Fulham in the period when he resumed active work with other émigrés from the new office.[48] A new member of staff, Vasilii Iarotskii, who was a member of the younger generation of the PSR, having only been born in 1887, also moved to the area to work on *Za narod*.[49] Evidence of Iarotskii's work for the newspaper can be found in letters addressed to his revolutionary pseudonym Chekin, misspelled as 'Monsieur A. Chevin', relating to the printing of *Za narod*.[50]

The links Volkhovskii had established with members of the liberal and left-wing parts of the British political scene were one foundation of his continuing importance to the Russian revolutionary emigration. Volkhovskii appears to have passed on an invitation from the British Labour politician James Ramsay MacDonald to the Russian translator known as Pavel Boulanger, who was famous for his

---

[46] Goldenberg appeared on the 1911 census at 237 The Vale, Acton, as the lodger of the Williams family, listing his profession as 'book dealer'. 1911 Census. Hammersmith, London. RG14 6954. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 3 July 2018]

[47] Kaye is listed on the 1901 census as living at 2 The Orchard, Acton and then on the 1911 census as living at 9 Flanchford Road, Shepherd's Bush. They married at some point between the 1911 census and Goldenberg's death in 1916, whereupon she was listed as the executor of his will. 1901 Census. Hammersmith, London. RG13 1205/66. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 3 July 2018]; 1911 Census. Hammersmith, London. RG14 200. www.ancestry.co.uk [accessed 3 July 2018]

[48] Addresses obtained from postcards in various archival collections including Volkhovskii's personal archives at the Hoover Institution and the Houghton Library, Harvard University and the GARF fond 5799 of the RFPF. Volkhovskii's address between 1907 and 1912 remains unclear, but he lived on Kings Court Mansions on the Fulham Road, not far from Augustus Road, in 1912 and 1913.

[49] PSR Archives, folder 645, IISH, Amsterdam. Letters and notes at the end of the file give Iarotskii's address as the *Za narod* office and nearby in Bedford Park.

[50] For example: Guy Bowman to Monsieur A. Chevin, 31 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA

translations of Tolstoy's works.[51] Volkhovskii enjoyed a friendly correspondence with Boulanger, who helped him to publish some of his short stories.[52] One possible benefit of maintaining such links was the opportunity to receive money from foreigners and in 1900, Ramsay MacDonald sent Volkhovskii £2 15s 6d he had raised on his behalf in Glasgow.[53] Russian revolutionaries also turned to Volkhovskii when searching for opportunities to visit Britain and make connections for other purposes. The former *Narodnaia volia* terrorist Nikolai Morozov wrote to Volkhovskii in 1908 asking him to help organise some lectures. At that time Morozov was working as a scientist at the university in St Petersburg and had written several books on religion. He hoped to lecture on his cosmological theories concerning the 'Apocalypse'.[54] Morozov's letter suggests the personal connections formed in nineteenth-century revolutionary activism in Russia remained important into the twentieth. Additionally, the example suggests that Russian revolutionaries saw Volkhovskii as an influential intermediary to potential British audiences and supporters of their work, in politics and otherwise.

3.3 Representing and Remembering Terrorism

The publications Volkhovskii and Burtsev wrote for and edited in this period memorialised terrorists in order to contextualise ongoing terrorist activities and established narratives of the revolutionary past. Through these publications, Volkhovskii and Burtsev strengthened narratives of nineteenth-century terrorism in addition to memorialising more recent acts of terrorism. Created in the 1890s, Burtsev's *Za sto let* was formed of two parts. The first described what were referred to as 'characteristic movements' in Russian revolutionary history.[55] The second comprised a list of arrests, exiles, publications, and obituaries arranged in chronological order. This was accompanied by an extensive index. One of the

[51] Bulanger to Volkhovskii, 26 December 1899. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 87, Houghton. The letter refers to an invitation to the MacDonalds' Volkhovskii forwarded to Boulanger. Letters from Boulanger are combined in a folder under a pseudonym of Chernov, but do not appear to be from Chernov as the handwriting differs and addresses found on some the letters from Boulanger are the same as the address where the translator appears to have lived at that time. The letter does not specify which MacDonalds the letter refers to but from the information in the following note, this seems the most likely identification.

[52] Bulanger to Felix Volkhovskii, 20 March 1899. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 87, Houghton

[53] J.R. MacDonald to Volkhovsky, 21 April 1900. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 302, Houghton

[54] Morozov to Volkhovskii, 12/29 June 1908. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 78, Houghton. Morozov was also the former lover of Olga Liubatovich, the subject of Stepniak's biographical sketch titled 'The Female Nihilist'. He had spent the period between 1882 and 1905 in prison.

[55] Burtsev, *Za sto let*, vol. 1, v

categories Burtsev chose for organising the information under the headings of each year was 'Terrorist activities' and Burtsev included among these events the killing of spies in the revolutionary movement, aligning with his own interests in exposing spies in later years.[56] Dense with details of events, *Za sto let* made prominent the names of those involved in revolutionary activities, including acts of terrorism. These lists of events were incorporated into Burtsev's theory of terrorism and revolution as told in the first part, which was exposed using authentic historical documents. He used these documents to illustrate that nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary terrorists acted ethically. For example, he printed a statement issued by the Executive Committee of *Narodnaia volia* in September 1881 in response to the assassination of the US President James Garfield, or at least what remained of the Committee after the arrests which followed the assassination of the tsar. The statement opposed the assassination, arguing that violence was only justified in the face of despotism, either by an individual or a party.[57] Placing Russian revolutionary terrorism in contrast to other global terrorisms in terms of legitimacy had been a tactic embraced by Stepniak in the 1880s and Volkhovskii and the RFPF in the 1890s in their English-language work. Burtsev used this document to perpetuate this view.

The writing and editing work of Volkhovskii and Burtsev in the period between 1900 and 1914 also memorialised nineteenth-century Russian revolutionary terrorism. This practice aligned with the wider ideological priorities and needs of the PSR. Historians such as Manfred Hildermeier have argued that the PSR looked back to the activities of nineteenth-century terrorists such as *Narodnaia volia* to provide a theoretical foundation for PSR terrorism. Hildermeier argued that Viktor Chernov, the party's leader and principal theorist, and Grigorii Gershuni, leader of the BO until his death in 1908, both supported these efforts. However, many in the party remained sceptical about terrorism, particularly on its right wing which favoured legal political opposition, and terrorism remained one of the most contentious issues within the party.[58] In the first few years after 1900, focus on major nineteenth-century events in discussions of terrorism was more prominent, as there were few high-profile assassinations taking place in Russia. The two periods of Burtsev's *Byloe*, 1900 to 1904 and 1907 to 1913, reflect the changing relative importance of terrorist acts, with twentieth-century acts coming to take precedence in the later period.

Representations of terrorists and terrorism in the publications Volkhovskii and Burtsev wrote for and edited between 1900 and 1914 focused on several common

[56] Burtsev, *Za sto let*, vol. 2, p. 93 and p. 99
[57] Ibid., vol. 1, p. 180
[58] Hildermeier, *Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party*, pp. 56-7 and p. 323

themes. These included the representation of terrorists as well-rounded revolutionaries who also participated in propaganda work and who were conscious of the history of revolutionary activity in Russia. They also included the representation of terrorists as being individuals who were both unusually brave and leaders in intellectual life.

The motivations of terrorism were commonly represented as acts of tyrannicide, with the victims being responsible for their own fate. However, there were infrequent references to the idea that acts of terrorism could inspire mass revolution. Burtsev also chose to focus on the more problematic aspects of terrorism: spies and ineptitude. A particularly strong thread in contextualising these representations in the publications Volkhovskii and Burtsev wrote for and edited was authenticity, as will be discussed in this section.

3.3.1 Historical Consciousness

Aligning with broader theoretical trends among the leadership of the PSR, Burtsev located the origins of ongoing revolutionary terrorism in the activities of *Narodnaia volia*. Burtsev also emphasised the knowledge of revolutionary history as being essential to ethical terrorist practice and he represented members of *Narodnaia volia* as having an awareness of their own place in revolutionary history. In the sixth issue of *Byloe*, he reproduced a quotation from Andrei Zheliabov, one of the leading members of *Narodnaia volia* hanged for the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. The quotation illustrates how terrorists were informed by knowledge of the history of the revolutionary movement and its struggles against the autocratic state in choosing terrorism:

> In order to understand this form of revolutionary struggle, at which the party arrived in the present time, it is necessary to get to know the present in the past of the party, and this past exists. These years were few, but very rich with experience…the Russian *narodovoltsy* were not always acting with projectiles and shells, that our actions were youthful, rose-tinted, dreamy and, if [terrorism] happened, then it is not us who are guilty.[59]

Zheliabov placed the blame for terrorism on the regime, suggesting that the terrorists were idealists and dreamers not only focused on death and destruction. The *Sbornik* similarly represented terrorism as the inevitable result of the wider revolutionary activism of *Narodnaia volia*.[60] In both cases, terrorism was represented as the last option available to revolutionaries as a result of state repression and only came about after a long period dedicated to other forms of political activism. The imbalance

[59] [Quotation from A. Zheliabov, origin not stated], *Byloe*, no. 6 (1904), p. 2

[60] P. Petrovich, 'Revoliutsiia i gorodskie rabochie', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 3 (1909), p. 16. Hildermeier identified 'Petr Petrovich' as a pseudonym of an unknown PSR member. Hildermeier, *Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party*, p. 175

of power and inability of revolutionaries to achieve change by any other means necessitated terrorism. Establishing a historical precedent for this justification of terrorist activism in the early years of the twentieth century supported the argument that terrorist acts were ethical responses to tsarist oppression. The PSR's support for both publications suggests the perceived importance of creating a history for the party's revolutionary and terrorist activism to the party, as demonstrated in their statement printed in the third issue of *Byloe* in 1903.[61]

Volkhovskii and Burtsev represented terrorists as being aware of their place in revolutionary history and their relation to other potentially revolutionary groups in society in order to demonstrate that their activism was ethical. Particularly important was the representation of terrorists as participating in revolutionary activity beyond terrorism and having respect for workers and peasants. Burtsev opened the first issue of *Byloe*, following a poem about 'Russian Tsarism', with an article about the *Narodnaia volia* terrorist Ignatii Grinevitskii (1856-1881), who had thrown the bomb that killed the tsar in 1881. Burtsev claimed that Grinevitskii was a 'typical member' of *Narodnaia volia*, emphasising his work spreading propaganda among workers and describing him as 'one of the energetic propagandists'.[62] The journal also represented the programme of *Narodnaia volia* as following the ideas of Mikhail Bakunin, in believing that among the peasants there were already socialist ways of thinking and forms of social organization.[63] As the articles in *Byloe* covered a variety of revolutionary subjects, this issue also contained an article by Peter Kropotkin titled 'Propaganda among the Petersburg workers at the beginning of the 70s'. In his article, Kropotkin described how he was able to engage workers in discussions about the revolutionary movement abroad by dressing like them and using their language. He recounted his experiences a lecture in which 'deeply interested' members of the audience asked questions about workers' organisations.[64] The *Sbornik* mobilised the memory of *Narodnaia volia* as a source of political legitimacy for the PSR by suggesting the use of terrorism could co-exist with genuine faith in the people as the founders of the new society, representing the group as a multi-dimensional political party, and demonstrating that there was widespread support for terrorist activism.

Volkhovskii also positioned the memory of Shishko as a supporter of terrorism in the context of his wider revolutionary activism. In the 1910 special issue of the

[61] 'Zaiavlenie ot Partii-Sotsialistov-Revoliutsionerov', *Byloe*, no. 3 (1903), p. 1
[62] Vl. Burtsev, 'Pamiati Grinevitskago', *Byloe*, no. 1 (1900), p. 6 and p. 8
[63] X., 'V borbe za Zemliu i Voliu', p. 169. Offord, *Russian Revolutionary Movement in the 1880s*, p. 12
[64] P. Kropotkin, 'Propaganda sredi peterburgskikh rabochikh v nachale semidesyatikh godov', *Byloe*, no. 1 (1900), pp. 34-5

Sbornik dedicated to Shishko's life, the first article framed Shishko's revolutionary activism within the broader history of the late nineteenth century revolutionary movement and where its material intersected with that of the second, the authors used similar phrases and followed similar narratives.[65] The second article 'Vechnaia pamiat!' ('Eternal Memory!') was attributed to Volkhovskii and it seems possible that the first was also written by Volkhovskii. The articles about Shishko followed a narrative consistent with other representations of revolutionary terrorists (and revolutionaries more broadly) in the *Sbornik*. Both articles on Shishko enthusiastically praised his dedication to producing literature for ordinary people, supporting the PSR's attempts to represent itself as a party of and for the people. Volkhovskii also wrote that ordinary people demanded his works 'again and again'.[66] The first article also claimed that Shishko's book *Razskazy iz Russkoi Istorii* (*Stories from Russian History*) published in Russia in 1906 was influential in 'opening the eyes of the people'.[67] Shishko's accounts of revolutionary history encompassed a wide variety of subjects, including, for example the Decembrists who had revolted against the tsar in 1825.[68] This long-term view of the development of terrorism as a response to tsarist despotism aligned with narratives in Volkhovskii and Burtsev's work. Shishko's work was used both as histories of the revolutionary movement but also as evidence of the ideas and values held by revolutionaries. Positioning Shishko, a supporter of terrorism, as selfless and dedicated to the people and evidence that the people supported his views reinforced ethical models of terrorism. Morrissey has argued these representations became 'contaminated' after the revelation in 1909 that Evno Azef, of the PSR's terrorist wing, the *Boevaia organizatsiia* (BO), was a police spy.[69] Burtsev, who was more inclined to challenge the views of those around him, also moved beyond the accepted historical models of terrorism. The standard array of accepted terrorist heroes included members of *Narodnaia volia* in the nineteenth century and examples such as Ivan Kaliaev and Egor Sazonov from the early years of the twentieth century. Kaliaev and Sazonov were BO terrorists who threw the bombs which killed Grand Duke Sergei and the Minister of the Interior, Viacheslav von Plehve respectively. Instead, in the unpublished fifteenth issue of *Byloe*, Burtsev

[65] 'Leonid Emmanuilovich Shishko', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 5 (1910), pp. 9-22
[66] 'Leonid Emmanuilovich Shishko', p. 19, F. Volkhovskii, 'Vechnaia pamiat!', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 5, (1910), p. 25
[67] 'Leonid Emmanuilovich Shishko', p. 19. Shishko's *Razskazy* comprised three extended pamphlets, one of which was published in 1906 in Russia, as opposed to a single book.
[68] [Leonid Shishko], *Razskazy iz russkoi istorii. Chast vtoraia*. (1902), pp. 125-141. At this time the authorship of the pamphlet was not acknowledged either on the cover or in the list of ASL/PSR pamphlets on the cover.
[69] Morrissey, 'The "Apparel of Innocence"', p. 640

printed memoirs about the Maximalist leader Vladimir Mazurin. The SR's Maximalist faction believed terrorism could be used, and indeed did so, in a broader range of circumstances, particularly expropriations and economic terror.[70]

Byloe represented Kaliaev as being an intellectual leader and committed to self-development. Memoirs of Kaliaev written by another PSR BO terrorist Egor Sazonov printed in *Byloe* in 1908 depicted him in the role of an intellectual leader and teacher, referring to him throughout as 'the Poet'.[71] Representation of other terrorists in *Byloe* followed similar patterns, for example in Lev Gartman's memoirs of his education through revolutionary circles in the 1870s. Gartman noted that members of his circle even studied zoology, botany, physics, and chemistry alongside revolutionary ideas.[72] Sazonov's testimony about Kaliaev, written from exile in Akatui, was particularly powerful because of Sazonov's ability to provide first-hand testimony of his former comrade. This helped Burtsev to strengthen his representations in a way similar to his use of original documentation in *Byloe*, including reproducing a handwritten note from Kaliaev in prison in the eighth issue, alongside its transcription.[73] In addition to supporting their ability to act ethically, self-development through reading, self-education, and discussion was a practice that terrorists of the nineteenth century had committed to, as well as terrorists active at the same time as Kaliaev within the PSR's BO.

An anonymous article by 'a former revolutionary' in the fifteenth issue of *Byloe* gives an indication of what texts were considered canonical. It also illustrates how those involved in terrorism represented how they came to see it as a valuable tool of revolution. The author acknowledged three key texts in the development of their revolutionary ideas. The first was Andrei Argunov's '*Nashi zadachi*', the programme of the Northern Alliance, a predecessor organisation to the PSR. The author found Argunov's views, in the tradition of *narodnichestvo*, to be 'more familiar and understandable'.[74] Hildermeier has noted that this programme 'simply plagiarized from the programme of *Narodnaia volia*', as Argunov himself acknowledged.[75] The other two texts praised by the author were Stepniak's novel *Andrei Kozhukov* (titled in English *The Career of a Nihilist*) and his book *Podpolnaia Rossiia* (*Underground Russia*). The author wrote about Stepniak: 'And the revolutionary belletrist opened

[70] Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, p. 72 and p. 78
[71] Egor Sozonov, 'I.P. Kaliaev (Iz vospominania). Pamiati nezabvennago Mikhaila Rafailovicha Gotsa', *Byloe*, no. 7 (1908), p. 22
[72] 'Iz vospominanii Leva Gartmana', *Byloe*, no. 3 (1903), p. 181
[73] 'Avtograf I.P. Kaliaeva', *Byloe*, no. 8 (1908), p. 10
[74] 'Azef v nachale deiatelnosti (Zapiski byvshago revoliutsionera)', *Byloe*, no. 15 (1913), p. 42. Boris I. Nicolaevsky Collection, box 615, folder 7, HIA
[75] Hildermeier, *Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party, p.* 30

new, still unfamiliar world "of hearts of gold and steel", from which emerged heroic deeds and alluring adventures, stirring up youthful fantasy… It's memorable, I read through "*Underground Russia*" several times…'[76] This memoir followed the theme running throughout *Byloe* that terrorists were heroic figures in the nineteenth-century Russian tradition. The memoir was undated, though it referred to events in 1901, but suggests that these models of revolutionary virtue remained relevant in the early years of the twentieth century.[77] When Burtsev printed this article in *Byloe* the image of the idealised revolutionary had been discredited by the exposure of the police spy Evno Azef in the PSR's BO. Burtsev's use of framing articles discussing the primary sources for the study of the revolutionary movement illustrate his desire to shape the history and memory of the movement and the terrorist elements within it.

3.3.2 Tyrannicide and Revolutionary Justice

Representing terrorism as a response to the cruel and oppressive tsarist regime was a common theme in Russian revolutionary publications in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries across a variety of forums, including as discussed in Chapter One, English-language publications. In this interpretation of the regime, personal guilt and responsibility could be extended to bureaucrats and officials at all levels of the regime's operations. The illegitimate exercise of power was an important component of officials' perceived guilt. The *Sbornik*, for example, accused the tsar of relying on police and soldiers to rule, thereby betraying the trust of the people, and argued that assassinations were justified where officials had committed crimes against the Russian people. The journal specifically named some of those who had been victims of revolutionary assassinations and their crimes. They included Mezentsev, whom Stepniak had assassinated in 1878, and who was accused of carrying out the extra-judicial sentencing of revolutionaries to exile in Siberia; Sipiagin, the Minister of the Interior, assassinated by the SR Stepan Balmashev on 2 April 1902, and accused of cruelly exacerbating the effects of famine and sentencing protesting workers in St Petersburg to exile; and von Plehve, because he had previously worked in the secret police.[78] Individuals occupying high-level positions in the state, police, and military hierarchies were represented as the legitimate targets of revolutionary terrorism. The specific focus on the police showed terrorists' lack of confidence in the fairness of everyday interactions with the state.

[76] 'Azef v nachale deiatelnosti', *Byloe*, p. 42
[77] Ibid., p. 41. Referring to the student disturbances that year, the author described his position in 1901, before reading these texts, as being uncertain about joining the revolution.
[78] A. Bakh, 'Tsar i rabochii narod', *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik*, no. 1 (1909), p. 45 and pp. 48-50

Crimes perpetrated against the Russian people could also be attributed to the tsar himself by virtue of Russian imperial symbolism that depicted the autocratic tsar as the embodiment of the state. Burtsev portrayed the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 as a reaction to state violence, attributing to the tsar similar crimes to those detailed in the *Sbornik*. He imagined what the terrorist Grinevitskii might have said to the tsar as they both lay dying in the street in 1881, having been wounded by the bomb he had thrown under the horses of tsar's carriage from a close distance:

> «And here for you, a kite, a reward,
> For your thief's life...»
> ... for the ten revolutionaries you hanged, for the hundreds who died in prisons, for the thousands exiled, for Chernyshevskii, for those sent into exile without a trial, for all of your administrative reprisals, for your censorship, for Poland, for your Muravev-Veshatel, for Mezentsev, for Count Dm. [Dmitrii] Tolstoy...
> For that the Russian revolutionaries executed Alexander II at the hand of Grinevitskii.[79]

Grinevitskii is largely forgotten in the literature on Russian revolutionary terrorism. Norman Naimark has described him as having been '[i]solated from friends and family, this quiet student of uncertain nationality was virtually unknown even in radical circles.'[80] However, by focusing on Grinevitskii, Burtsev was able to elaborate on the moments of the assassination of tsar, as opposed to the planning and failed previous attempts covered by writers such as Stepniak (as discussed in Chapter Five). Similarly representing the tsar as the embodiment of the regime, the *Sbornik* argued that his assassination was simply the highest form of struggle against the regime, more so than other assassinations, because it seemed to *Narodnaia volia* one of the best means by which the autocracy could be overthrown.[81] As the tsar was seen to represent the state, his assassination could be seen as a legitimate reaction to everyday cruelty and oppression, the 'hundreds' and 'thousands' mentioned, as well as high-profile political executions and prison sentences.

The state's response to acts of terrorism and treatment of revolutionary terrorists was also used to represent further acts of terrorism as being legitimate. In his memoirs of Kaliaev in *Byloe*, Savinkov described the assassination of Grand Duke Sergei in 1905 as an act of direct revenge for the execution of the terrorist Stepan Balmashev, who had killed Sipyagin in 1902. Savinkov claimed Kaliaev had said: 'Blood calls for blood. They hanged Balmashev and will hand Gershuni. It is

[79] Vl. Burtsev, 'Pamiati Grinevitskago', *Byloe*, no. 1 (1900), p. 15
[80] Norman M. Naimark, 'Terrorism and the Fall of Imperial Russia', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1990), p. 173
[81] Petrovich, 'Revoliutsiia i gorodskie rabochie', p. 9

necessary and possible to avenge. It is shameful to wait and rejoice in life.'[82] By attributing these words to Kaliaev, whom SR publications also portrayed as a uniquely moral individual, Savinkov strengthened his argument that Grand Duke Sergei was guilty, and therefore his death justified.

As in the quotation from *Byloe* describing the assassination of the tsar in 1881 as an 'execution', *Za narod* also used the rhetoric of justice and sentencing in its representations of terrorism. An article about Egor Sazonov from 1910 portrayed him as carrying out the 'sentence' handed down by the PSR's 'just court' when he murdered the 'cruel' von Plehve.[83] Focusing on the victims' alleged crimes complemented representations of the terrorists as exercising ethical judgement and engaging in self-improvement to make the legitimacy of the act seem unquestionable. *Za narod* used similar language of tyrannicide to characterise the assassinations of local officials, contrasting their misuse of power and absence of the rule of law with the ethics of PSR, calling them 'government locusts' in one article.[84]

These accounts of assassinations of local officials appeared in lists of local acts of terrorism reported in early issues of *Za narod.* The lists included activities from beyond the cities of St Petersburg and Moscow, though focused on European Russia and Western Siberia. Examples included the assassinations of government officials, police agents and spies, and other individuals exercising power on a local level. These included the assassinations of the executioner general in Odessa 1907, the assistant chief of the prison in Astrakhan by a revolutionary named Pribylovskii on 9 March 1907, and the commandant of the outpost in Belostok (Białystock), also in 1907.[85] These lists included many different types of activities. Besides the political assassinations, there are also examples of attempts to free imprisoned revolutionaries, expropriations, and attempted expropriations. Geifman has argued that in the early years of the twentieth century expropriations were considered to be acts of revolutionary terrorism, for example, bank robberies destabilised society because people no longer wanted to keep their money in a bank.[86] These lists also omitted to mention the party affiliation of terrorists or claimed terrorists were PSR members when they were not, reflecting the evidence found by Geifman in other PSR publications.[87] All acts of revolutionary terrorism in Russia could be mobilised to

[82] Boris Savinkov, 'Iz vospominania ob Ivane Kaliaeve', *Byloe*, no. 7 (1908), p37
[83] 'Pamiati Egora Sazonova', *Za narod,* no. 35, December 1910, p. 35
[84] 'Revoliutsionnaia borba', *Za narod*, no. 1, 27 April 1907, p. 16
[85] 'Revoliutsionnaia borba', *Za narod*, no. 10, 25 October 1907, p. 15; 'Revoliutsionnaia borba', *Za narod*, no. 1, 27 April 1907, p. 16; 'Revoliutsionnaia borba v gorodakh i derevniakh', *Za narod*, no. 7, 25 August 1907, p. 16
[86] Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, p. 22
[87] Ibid., p. 59

show the PSR's activities in a positive light. *Za narod* reported on terrorist acts carried out by groups loosely affiliated with the PSR including the 'Flying Detachment of the Northern Region of the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries' (hereafter Northern Flying Detachment), the majority of whose members were not also members of the PSR.[88] The twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth issues of the newspaper contained two articles entitled 'About the terror', each preceding a part of the testimony of Albert Trauberg, known as 'Karl', the leader of the Northern Flying Detachment. Anna Geifman has noted that the PSR claimed notable political assassinations as its own and this tendency is certainly reflected in the pages of *Za narod*.[89] The inclusion of various forms of activity at different local and regional levels as revolutionary suggested the universalisation of the struggle. However, the focus on bringing all acts back to the party showed that the PSR wanted to control the sphere of activism. In *Byloe*, Burtsev also specifically noted that the activities of the Flying Detachment were 'wholly in line with the sentence and instruction of the party.'[90] They carried out the party's death sentences and did not act independently. Volkhovskii and Burtsev's writing and editing work aligned with these goals, meaning they could be more confident of party support for their work.

Lists of local and regional revolutionary activities continued to appear in *Za narod* until the fourteenth issue dated February 1909, after which they ceased without notice. This disappearance suggests that the revelation that Azef was a police spy played an important role in influencing PSR publications across various genres and audiences to change their representations of terrorism. However, discussion of terrorism did not cease entirely in *Za narod* and the representations of terrorism therein continued to reflect Volkhovskii's promotion of the image of the ethical terrorist. These later articles about terrorism consisted of three about Albert Trauberg and Egor Sazonov, replacing the lists of local and regional acts of terrorism. These lists of local acts did not have such ethical or brave individuals to attach them to, so it appears that they could no longer satisfy PSR demands for representations of ethical terrorism. Tyrannicide alone was not enough.

Unlike Volkhovskii, however, Burtsev did not avoid addressing uncomfortable aspects of the history of Russian revolutionary terrorism and controversial actions among contemporary activities. His descriptions of the assassination of the tsar, for

[88] Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, p. 59
[89] Ibid., p. 59
[90] 'Obvinitelnyi akt po delu ob Alberte Trauberge, Elene Ivanovnoi, Alvine Shenberge, Feder Masokine I drugikh, predannykh peterburgskomu voenno-okruzhnomu sudu pomeshchnikom glavnokomanduiushchago voiskami gvardii i peterburgskago voennago okkruga', *Byloe*, no. 9-10 (1909), p. 88

example, which emphasised the leadership of Perovskaia in ensuring the revolutionaries carried out a precise plan contrasted with his depiction of the chaos during the assassination of Colonel Sudeikin in 1884.[91] This assassination had been led by the police agent Sergei Degaev, who later fled and established himself as a mathematician in the US under the name Alexander Pell.[92] Burtsev printed from the trial testimony of *Narodnaia volia* member Vasilii Konoshevich, who declared himself guilty in court, recounting the events that took place in Degaev's flat on 16 December 1884.[93] Konoshevich described the events that took place in Degaev's kitchen as chaotic, noisy, clumsy, and ridiculous, for example with Sudeikin attempted to evade his assassins by hiding in the toilet.[94] Burtsev addressed these aspects of terrorism that some of his contemporaries, particularly within the PSR, would have wished he would have left alone, for example, in his fifteenth *Byloe*, Burtsev published correspondence between Azef and the head of the Moscow secret police 'borrowed from the archive of the PSR'.[95]

In addition to representing acts of terrorism as acts of tyrannicide, Burtsev and Volkhovskii both also emphasised how terrorist activities were supported by the majority of the population of the Russian empire. Appealing to an external, respected authority on the Russian condition, Burtsev used quotations from the poetry of the early-nineteenth-century Russian poet Alexander Pushkin to illustrate the Russian state's cruelty towards its population. Burtsev claimed that there had been widespread support among Russians and Poles for killing the tsar in the 1820s and 1830s and that these feelings were the same as those of Zheliabov in the period leading up to the assassination of the tsar in 1881.[96] Burtsev concluded his piece with the following extract:

> We will amuse the Russian people [*narod*],
> When at the pillory,
> With the gut of the last priest,
> The last tsar is strangled![97]

[91] Burtsev, 'Pamiati Grinevitskago', *Byloe*, no. 1 (1900), p. 12
[92] Richard Pipes, *The Degaev Affair: Terror and Treason in Tsarist Russia* (New Haven CT, 2003), p. 6
[93] 'Ubiistvo podp. Sudeikina. Kopia pokazanii Vas. Konoshevich, Nik. Starovodskii, zapis pokazanii Germ. A. Lopatina, protocol pokazanii V.A. Karpulova', *Byloe*, no. 15 (1913), p. 24. Boris I. Nicolaevsky Collection, box 615, folder 7, HIA. This section of the article was an excerpt from the 19 March 1885 testimony of Konoshevich.
[94] Ibid., p. 24
[95] 'Gershuni i Azef po ofitsialnym dokumentam', *Byloe*, no. 15 (unpublished 1913), p. 36. Boris I. Nicolaevsky Collection, box 615, folder 7, HIA
[96] 'Stikhovorenie Pushkina o russkom tsariszme', *Byloe*, no. 1 (1900), p. 4
[97] 'Stikhovorenie Pushkina o russkom tsariszme', p. 5. This extract comes from the poem

It was perhaps the case that Burtsev was using Pushkin's words instead of his own in an attempt to avoid another prison sentence in Britain for calling for the assassination of the tsar. However, his choice of the famous poet is also suggestive of his desire to illustrate how the need to kill the tsar was widely recognised in Russian society in the nineteenth century. He slightly altered the language from the original, which instead begins with the line 'We will amuse the good citizens'. Switching out the word for citizen [*grazhdan*] for the word meaning the people [*narod*], which was more widely used in a revolutionary context, is illustrative of Burtsev's control of the historical narrative. Interestingly, however, the Russian scholar V.D. Rak makes a compelling argument for the poem not having been written by Pushkin at all, having first been attributed to the poet in an émigré publication produced by the publicist Nikolai Ogarëv in 1861.[98] If this is indeed true, it is illustrative of the self-referential nature of Russian revolutionary publishing in this period. The celebration of Pushkin as a revolutionary and the appropriation of his work suggests his perceived importance as a commentator on Russian culture and politics, even though it stretched reality.

By representing acts of terrorism as supported by the wider population, Volkhovskii and Burtsev gave theoretical grounding to their concept of revolutionary justice. This was linked to the idea that terrorism could inspire mass revolution. When listing several high-profile assassinations that had been carried out by the Northern Flying Detachment, *Za narod* had proclaimed that these acts had 'aroused fear in the tsar's executioners', supporting the argument that acts of terrorism could induce the tsar, government, and officials to enact reform.[99] Though in the *Sbornik* an anonymous author wrote of the assassination of von Plehve that 'the death of this complete tyrant was met joyously everywhere', the journal did not argue for the use of terrorism as a method of inciting mass revolution.[100] In fact, the journal addressed the shortcomings of this method when discussing the assassination of the tsar in 1881, acknowledging that at the crucial moment, the people had failed to respond.[101] The idea that terrorism had mass support, therefore, did not rely on the idea that terrorism was intended to promote mass revolution, instead it could be an agent of change in itself by inducing the government to enact reforms.

[98] V.D. Rak, 'O chetverostishii, pripisannom Pushkinu', in V.D. Rak, *Dostoevskii i drugie (voprosy tekstologii, materiali k kommentariam)* (St Petersburg, 2003), pp. 42-63. Rak shows how the poem was similar to other poems.
[99] 'O terrore', *Za narod*, no. 27, March 1910, p. 8
[100] X., 'V borbe za zemliu i voliu', p. 184
[101] Petrovich, 'Revoliutsiia i gorodskie rabochie', p. 9

3.3.3 Real and Ideal Terrorists

Important themes in Volkhovskii and Burtsev's representations of terrorists were selflessness, a rational attitude in the face of danger, and the capacity for ethical decision-making. Embodying these qualities, terrorists' activities could be assumed to be legitimate and justified because they were not acting for selfish or personal reasons. Celebrating these values, as opposed to the acts of terrorism itself, aligned with representations of terrorists' place in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement, where those who used terrorism were seen to have been committed to revolutionary activism more broadly. These representations from the early years of the twentieth century shared elements with those in the RFPF's English-language work in the 1890s and wider nineteenth-century discourses, as seen in Chapter One. Similar themes can also be seen in the literary examples discussed in Chapter Five of this thesis.

Self-sacrifice was a theme much repeated in representations of terrorists and terrorism, not just in the publications Volkhovskii and Burtsev wrote for and edited. Focusing on Grinevitskii, the first long article in the first issue of *Byloe*, following a poem about tsarism, concluded with a lengthy quotation from Chernyshevskii's novel *What is to be Done?* suggesting that the *Narodnaia volia* terrorist Grinevitskii was similar to the novel's character Rakhmetov, one of the original literary models for the idealistic and self-sacrificing Russian revolutionary.[102] The article also described the members of *Narodnaia volia* who had been involved in the assassination of the tsar as living with 'with one foot in the grave' in the period leading up to the event.[103] The article also depicted Grinevitskii as behaving rationally even when facing death, including the moment when he temporarily regained consciousness in police custody after the explosion. Despite being mortally wounded, he answered 'I don't know' when asked his name in order to not endanger his comrades.[104] *Byloe* thus showed that terrorists practiced self-sacrifice in their daily lives and in the ultimate form of self-sacrifice, martyrdom. They approached self-sacrifice rationally and for good reason.

The special issue of the *Sbornik* dedicated to Shishko and the associated PSR pamphlet *Pamiati Leonida Emmanuilovicha Shishko* which, having very similar content was presumably also edited by Volkhovskii, represented the former RFPF member as being particularly self-sacrificing, abandoning an opportunity for a military career in order to serve the peasants. He wrote: '[h]e did not want command him [the

[102] Burtsev, 'Pamiati Grinevitskago', p. 17
[103] Ibid., p. 11
[104] Ibid., p. 16

peasant] and those under him, but wanted to do right by him'.[105] The theme of self-sacrifice among revolutionaries continued to be memorialised later after the revolutions of 1917. In his autobiography *Pered burei* (*Before the Storm*), Chernov wrote of Shishko that a 'stamp of selfless idealism' shaped his revolutionary career.[106]

As recognised by Morrissey, SR publications represented Kaliaev as having moral superiority, both as a terrorist as well as among terrorists. Kaliaev was responsible for aborting one attempt to kill Grand Duke Sergei in 1905 because he had noticed that there were children travelling in the same carriage. In his memoirs, Savinkov, who had led an earlier attempt to assassinate the Minister of the Interior von Plehve in 1904, in which Kaliaev had participated, described long periods of observation and planning that led to the setting up of each assassination attempt. The conspirators experienced frustration and barriers to progress when trying to observe the movements of von Plehve.[107] Abandoning such an attempt was, therefore, not a decision to be taken lightly. Kaliaev's decision contributed to his becoming, as Morrissey stated, 'a mythic figure for the Left' in addition to his martyrdom.[108] Through Sazonov's testimony in *Byloe*, Kaliaev was portrayed as having moral superiority among revolutionaries that made him the ideal bomb-thrower. Sazonov had reported that Kaliaev had told him that a terrorist should be without hatred, that he should remain emotionally detached from the act, that he should be pure, and a real victim.[109] Burtsev used a facsimile and transcription of a note written by Kaliaev from prison to further confirm that Kaliaev had embodied these qualities.[110]

As seen earlier, Burtsev used the voices of his revolutionary contemporaries to represent terrorism. He appears to have maintained a strong network of contacts among former terrorists and revolutionaries to supply material for *Byloe*. Another example where Burtsev had used the writing of fellow revolutionaries to comment on terrorists was when in *Byloe* in 1906 he had printed an article comprising a series of sketches written by the former *Narodnaia volia* member Vera Figner about her fellow revolutionaries. Figner had recently been released from prison after twenty years into Siberian exile, from where she had been permitted to go abroad. The fragments that

---

[105] Volkhovskii, 'Vechnaia pamiat!', p. 23
[106] Chernov, *Pered burei*, p. 126
[107] Boris Savinkov, *Memoirs of a Terrorist*, trans. Joseph Shaplen (New York, 1931), pp. 15-6
[108] Morrissey, 'The "Apparel of Innocence"', p. 607
[109] Sozonov, 'I.P. Kaliaev', p. 25
[110] 'Avtograf I.P. Kaliaeva', *Byloe*, no. 8 (1908), p. 10. The letter was reproduced as a copy of the original in Kaliaev's handwriting with a typescript version of the text underneath.

were compiled into the article were based around portraits of the *Narodnaia volia* members that had been printed in *Byloe* during the period in which it had been published in St Petersburg under Bogucharskii and Shchegolev. Though the sketches included references and page numbers for the original images, Burtsev did not reproduce them. The manner in which Figner wrote the articles suggested she had either been provided with copies of the portraits or knew the particular images well.[111] Figner focused on her subject's personalities rather than their terrorist activities, for example, writing that about the *Narodnaia volia* leader Sofia Perovskaia that people were unconsciously drawn to her whenever she spoke or laughed.[112] She also wrote about their other revolutionary activities, such as propaganda work among peasants.[113] Figner did refer to Iurii Bogdanovich's role in the planned operation to blow up the tsar that involved running a cheese shop on *Malaia sadovaia* street in St Petersburg and digging a tunnel to lay explosives, for which he was sent to prison and died in 1887. However, as with her other subjects she focused on her memories of his face, which she wrote had a 'soft and kind expression'.[114] This use of first-hand testimony on these issues was a strategy which had been embraced by writers such as Stepniak, as will be discussed in Chapter Five, to lend their accounts authenticity.

3.4 Representing and Negotiating with the PSR

Like Volkhovskii, Burtsev also mobilised the idea of *nepartiinost* (being non-partisan) and Saunders has argued that he tried to use the 'banner of terrorism' to unite revolutionaries across partisan and political divides.[115] Both Burtsev and Volkhovskii attempted to appeal to *nepartiinost* in this period through the framing of their writing, but also worked with the PSR in their publishing work.

On its front page, *Za narod* claimed to be the organ of the 'All-Russian Union of Soldiers and Sailors'. The newspaper continued to focus on issues affecting these groups, though this declaration decreased in size and eventually disappeared over time. Early issues also partially obscured links to the PSR and a programmatic article in the first issue stated that the Union was a 'non-party union' who only used party slogans when they aligned with their own views.[116] Despite these claims, however,

---

[111] V.N. Figner, 'Pamiati narodovolstsev (o portretakh Perovskoi, Zheliabova, Kibalchicha, Gelfman, Barranikova, Kalodkevicha, Sukhanova i Bogdanovicha.)', *Byloe*, no. 7 (1908), pp. 139-147

[112] Ibid., p. 140

[113] Ibid., p. 142

[114] Ibid., p. 145

[115] Saunders, 'Vladimir Burtsev', p. 56. Robert Henderson agreed with Saunders' argument that terrorism was an essential part of Burtsev's political programme. Henderson, Vladimir Burtsev, p. 10

[116] *Za narod*, no. 1, 27 April 1907, p. 16

the newspaper contained advertisements for other publications produced by the PSR's Central Committee.[117] According to a colleague in the PSR, Volkhovskii was the editor and main individual working on the paper, though, at least in the early issues, mentions of Volkhovskii and the PSR are notably absent and underplayed respectively.[118] Despite suffering greatly with illness, requiring bed rest, Volkhovskii also frequently travelled to meet with party figures in Paris.[119] *Za narod* reflected Volkhovskii's commitment to non-partisan propaganda, despite his close contact with the party leadership. Much of Volkhovskii's work, including the RFPF periodical *Letuchie listki*, claimed to be non-partisan and he and his London colleagues attempted to create unity within the revolutionary emigration.[120]

Though the paper may have claimed to be non-partisan, the majority of its funds came from the PSR's Central Committee or from PSR-affiliated groups across Europe. One example of how the party's involvement in the newspaper, alongside party-affiliated groups, was acknowledged was in the lists of donations received that were printed infrequently in later issues of the newspaper. A list in the twenty-third issue revealed that the newspaper received donations from the London, Paris, and Stockholm groups of the PSR as well as from the Transport Commission of the Central Committee of the PSR.[121] Records among Volkhovskii's personal papers also show direct payments from the PSR's Central Committee which between November 1908 and November 1909 were larger than any the published lists acknowledged.[122] Significantly, there is no evidence of income from sales of the newspaper, despite the price of three kopeks reflecting its apparent audience of soldiers and sailors. These large payments from the PSR's Central Committee, apparently providing the majority of the funds needed, do not appear to have been acknowledged in *Za narod*.[123] It is also notable that on surviving financial records for the newspaper, no income from

[117] *Za narod*, no. 1, 27 April 1907, p. 16
[118] In. Ritina [I.I. Rakitnikova], 'Feliks Vadimovich Volkhovskii', *Mysl*, no. 40, 1 January 1915. https://socialist-revolutionist.ru/component/content/article/82-public/1243-rakitnikova-ii-statya-feliks-vadimovich-volxovskij [accessed 13 June 2017]
[119] Ibid.
[120] Hamburg, 'London Emigration'
[121] 'Na podderzhanie gazety "Za narod"', *Za narod*, no. 23, December 1909, p. 16
[122] Denezhnyi otchet redaktsii ezhemesiachnika "Za narod!" s 1 noiabria 1908 do 1 dekabria 1909g. (v rubliakh i kopeikakh). Prikhod. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. Between 1 November 1908 and 1 December 1909, the Central Committee of the PSR made payments totalling 2141 rubles 79 kopeks, forming the majority of the total income of 2720 rubles 71 kopeks for the period.
[123] Lining up the above *otchet* with the article in the previous footnote by date.

sales was recorded.[124] The newspaper, therefore, appears to have been entirely reliant upon income from the PSR and its affiliates and other donations.

In the period for which there are these surviving records in the pages of *Za narod* it appears that the newspaper was well-funded. In later years, the newspaper's financial position became more precarious, despite Volkhovskii's efforts to keep production costs low and in 1910, notices began appearing in the newspaper announcing: 'Money is sorely needed' and publication became more irregular.[125] The last issue appeared just a few months before Volkhovskii's death, but it seems likely the newspaper would have soon closed due to a shortage of funds. As had been the case in Volkhovskii's other projects *Free Russia* and *Frei Russland*, it seems likely that this increasingly sporadic appearance was due to a lack of money.

The importance of illusion in Volkhovskii's propaganda work is also reflected by *Za narod*. Despite its apparent intended audience of soldiers and sailors, the newspaper's print runs never seem to have exceeded a few thousand copies, similar to most ASL and PSR pamphlets.[126] Difficulties in determining circulation and readership of revolutionary propaganda is demonstrated by discrepancies in evidence for the size of print runs, as K.N. Morozov has stated that in 1907, *Za narod* had a circulation of 30,000 copies in 1907 and 5,000 in 1910.[127] A printers' quote dating from October 1908 also suggests that many of the copies were not smuggled into Russia. The quote detailed costs for printing 1,000 copies on ordinary paper and only 200 on bible paper, which was more expensive but convenient for smuggling as it was thinner.[128] A quote dating from 12 February 1909 for a thirty-two page pamphlet also referred to the same quantities for the print run.[129] The printer sent the 200 copies on bible paper to 18 Augustus Road for onward smuggling through

---

[124] Various income and expenditure records can be found in a file held as part of Volkhovskii's personal archive in the following file: Various Manuscripts, Editorial Office of *Za narod*. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA

[125] W.A. Woodroffe to 'Comrade', 2 February 1910. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. Woodroffe noted that although his press was making 'practically no profit', he was willing to take account of a previous agreement and reduce the price from £2.0.0 to £1.17.6; '*Na podderzhanie gazety "Za narod"*', *Za narod*, no. 27, March 1910, p.16

[126] Estimate, 14 October 1908. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. Volkhovskii had enquired about a total of 1,200 copies; Guy Bowman to Mr F. Volkhovsky, 14 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. Volkhovskii had enquired about 1,000 copies of the paper; Guy Bowman to Monsieur A. Chevin, 31 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. 2,200 copies of the most recent issue had been printed.

[127] K.N. Morozov, *Partiia sotsialistov-revoliutsionerov v 1907-1914 gg.* (Moscow, 1998), p. 616

[128] Estimate, 14 October 1908. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA; Guy Bowman to Volkhovskii, 14 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. The extra cost of the bible paper was five shillings per thousand copies.

[129] Estimate, 12 February 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA

networks established by the RFPF.[130] Despite having a large intended audience of soldiers and sailors, it appears that the newspaper was never produced in print runs of more than a few thousand copies.[131] The numbers were similar to the majority of the print runs of ASL and PSR pamphlets in this period, but some pamphlets were produced in much larger numbers.[132] *Za narod* seems to have been produced for circulation among émigré communities as well as for smuggling into Russia, as suggested by the enquiries for printing copies on bible paper and ordinary paper. The small print runs, and even smaller print runs on bible paper, suggest that this newspaper probably did not reach its stated audience in large numbers.

The party's statement in the third issue also agreed with Burtsev that it was necessary to publish the journal regularly and acknowledged the history of publishing collections of historical documents and revolutionary materials within the PSR's predecessors, such as the *Gruppa starykh narodovoltsev* who published seven editions of materials in the mid-1890s.[133] Feliks Lure, in his study of the history of the journal *Byloe*, has noted that all of the individuals who worked as editors on *Byloe* at various times were involved in publishing historical documents in other forums, often reusing the same documents.[134] There was, it seems, a wide audience for this type of material. Burtsev's approach to using historical materials was recognised by the party as useful and they became involved in *Byloe*. As in *Za narod*, the PSR used *Byloe* to advertise its other publications, for example printing a list of ASL and PSR pamphlets in the back of the fifth issue.[135]

Shishko also helped found and supported Burtsev in the publication of *Byloe* in the period between 1900 and 1904. The third issue of *Byloe* carried an announcement from the PSR, noting that from this issue the journal was 'published by the Party in the closest partnership of V.L. Burtsev and L.E. Shishko'.[136] In a letter, dated only 18 January, Shishko informed Burtsev that he no longer lived in Geneva, including his new address in Alassio, a town in Italy near to the French border.

---

[130] Guy Bowman to Monsieur A. Chevin, 31 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA

[131] Estimate, 14 October 1908. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. This estimate shows Volkhovskii had enquired about ordering a total of 1200 copies; Guy Bowman to Mr F. Volkhovsky, 14 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. This letter suggests that Volkhovskii had enquired about producing one thousand copies of the paper; Guy Bowman to Monsieur A Chevin, 31 July 1909. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 7, folder 4, HIA. This letter shows that the press had printed 2200 copies in total of the most recent issue.

[132] 'Izdaniia', in D. Khilkov, 'Terror i massovaia borba' (1904), p. 49

[133] Ibid., p. 146

[134] Lure, *Khraniteli Proshlogo*, p. 6

[135] 'Izdanie Partii Sotsialistov-Revoliutsionerov', *Byloe*, no. 5 (January 1904), pp. 81-2

[136] 'Zaiavlenie ot Partii Sotsialistov-Revoliutsionerov', *Byloe*, no. 3 (1903), p. 146

However, despite Shishko having arranged for his post to be forwarded to him, his contact in Geneva had apparently received nothing, including documents he had asked Burtsev to send him. Among these were articles about the BO terrorist Mikhail Gots.[137]

As a member of the ASL and then the PSR, Volkhovskii was part of a transnational network of Russian revolutionary activists that spanned Europe in the early years of the twentieth century. Though he continued to work on the English-language *Free Russia* for the RFPF, albeit with a few years' break, he spent much of his time working on the Russian-language publications that we have seen were funded by the PSR and affiliated groups. Volkhovskii became increasingly ill as he grew older, suffering greatly from infections and incontinence, and he spent a long period in hospital in Lausanne in Switzerland in 1906.[138] His contemporaries, including Chernov and Chaikovskii, remarked upon his ill-health in their memoirs and believed his health had been undermined by the time he had spent in prison and in Siberian exile.[139] However, his commitment to promoting the revolutionary cause through his writing and publishing work does not seem to have diminished. He was, it seems, at any one time working on several different projects, including *Narodnoe delo* and the later *Sbornik* with the same name, *Za narod*, and in 1912 he became the editor of the PSR's main organ *Znamia truda*. On his death in 1914, the Russian revolutionary movement lost one of its longest-serving and energetic propagandists.

Volkhovskii's conciliatory nature characterised his relationships with other revolutionary émigrés. There were those in the ASL and PSR who, like Volkhovskii, supported terrorism. Ilya Rubanovich, who edited the PSR newspaper *Vestnik russkoi revoliutsii* (*Herald of the Russian Revolution*) with Nikolai Rusanov, was one of these. This paper had been begun by members of a group which Rubanovich and Rusanov had been a part of, the *Gruppa starykh narodovoltsev* (The Group of Old Members of *Narodnaia volia*) and had become an official theoretical organ of the PSR.[140] Among those who had written for *Vestnik Russkoi Revoliutsii* were the PSR terrorist Mikhail Gots, Volkhovskii's RFPF colleague Shishko, and Chernov. In 1902 Volkhovskii advised Ilya Rubanovich, editor of *Vestnik russkoi revoliutsii* alongside Rusanov, to play down theoretical disputes within the PSR in an open letter. Rubanovich, however, rejected his advice, writing: '[t]hese people, "the opponents of

[137] Shishko to Burtsev, 18 January [no year]. RGALI, f. 75, op. 1, d. 36, l. 1
[138] Volkhovskii to Robert Spence Watson, 20 January 1906. NCL, SW1/19/4
[139] Chernov, *Pered burei,* p. 126; Nikolai Chaikovskii described Volkhovskii as leaving his first period of imprisonment in poor health. Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky', p. 68
[140] Cherepakov and Fingerit, *Russkoi periodicheskaia pechat*, pp. 42-3

terror", want to terrorise their party opponents with slander; but I think, that they will not be successful'.[141]

Though Senese argued that other Russians found Volkhovskii 'acerbic and querulous', this is only rarely supported by surviving correspondence.[142] One example is a letter from Viktor Chernov, later leader of the PSR and author of the ASL programme, illustrating disagreements among the members. Chernov emphasised mass propaganda, whereas members of the older generation (including RFPF members) continued to support the use of terrorism.[143] It appears that Chernov and Volkhovskii disagreed on a theoretical level about the role of the emigration in the revolution and the progress of propaganda work in Russia during the period of the ASL. While the original letter from Volkhovskii does not seem to have survived in Chernov's archive, it appears from Chernov's reply that the former had written to him to express his disagreement with Chernov's approach of propaganda work among the peasants, believing organisations carrying out propaganda work among peasants were too weak and scarce. Chernov, on the other hand, opposed centralisation and believed the emigration should be subordinate to organisations in Russia, writing: 'even bureaucrats think to govern Russia from Petersburg, and not from abroad'. Chernov also accused Volkhovskii of attacking him personally, using 'bitter and unpleasant words'.[144] Chernov also hoped that people would not accuse the ASL of controlling the revolutionary movement as 'generals'.[145] What this letter suggests is that Volkhovskii saw the ASL as a potential leader of the revolutionary movement in Russia from abroad because of the ongoing weakness in the movement in Russia, whereas Chernov disagreed. In general, however, Volkhovskii maintained positive relationships with other revolutionary émigrés.

Though the ethics of terrorism became more contentious after the discovery that Azef was a police spy, Volkhovskii continued to avoid conflict on the issue. In 1912, Boris Savinkov, the former BO terrorist, wrote to Volkhovskii twice asking him to speak out on behalf of terrorists, writing: 'I always value your opinion'.[146] Savinkov

---

[141] I. Rubanovich to Volkhovskii, 22 October 1902. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 108, Houghton; The *Vestnik* had been founded by the *Gruppa starykh narodovoltsev*, another predecessor organisation to the PSR, and had become one of its official theoretical organs. Cherepakov and Fingerit, *Russkoi periodicheskaia pechat,* pp. 42-3

[142] Senese, 'Felix Volkhovsky in London', p. 74

[143] Hildermeier, *Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party*, p. 38

[144] B. Ole [B. Olenin, a pseudonym of Chernov] to Volkhovskii, no date. F. Volkhovskii Correspondence, 1878-1932 (MS Russ 51), 87, Houghton. Chernov quoted extensively from Volkhovskii's letter in his reply.

[145] Ibid.

[146] Savinkov to Volkhovskii, 9 April 1912. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 3, folder 9, HIA

disagreed with the approach the PSR's Central Committee was taking in judging the ethics of terrorism, accusing them of 'hairsplitting'. He believed that the '*S.S. Kom.'* elected to judge the actions of the BO was not equipped for the task and proposed that their decision should be challenged at the party congress. He also felt that the committee had personally attacked him and other BO members: 'When it smeared Karpovich, the *S.S.K*. smeared not only him, but in his name they smeared us all, members of the *B.O.*, alive and dead, Kaliaev, Sazonov, Dora Brilliant. The *B.O.*, like any community, is morally answerable to all of its members.' He was also angry the Central Committee planned to publish a collection of Sazonov's without informing any of the surviving members of the BO and believed that they would try to discredit his memory.[147] Kaliaev had been hanged for throwing the bomb which killed Grand Duke Sergei, Sazonov killed himself in a prison camp, and Brilliant had died in an asylum.[148] It was clearly important to Savinkov to preserve the memory of his fellow BO members. Savinkov turned to Volkhovskii in an attempt to influence debates about terrorism within the PSR, but Volkhovskii refused to intervene, feeling it would be ineffective, and, in any case, his own character prevented him from making such a protest. Despite agreeing that the committee had gone beyond its remit in judging the morality of terrorism instead of investigating how police spies had infiltrated the BO, Volkhovskii encouraged Savinkov not to see criticism as a personal attack.[149] This draft of Volkhovskii's reply is particularly rich in revealing Volkhovskii's ongoing attempts not to create division within the PSR and is another example where he advised others to follow his example. The examples of Volkhovskii's correspondence with Rusanov and Savinkov contrast with the example of his clash with Chernov over theoretical and programmatic issues.

Dmitrii Khilkov was another member of the PSR who advocated the use of terrorism. He wrote an article, 'Terror i massovaia borba' ('Terror and Mass Struggle') which was printed in *Vestnik russkoi revoliutsii* and then reprinted as a separated PSR pamphlet. Khilkov had an interesting revolutionary career, having left the military, become a follower of Tolstoy, and finally embraced terrorism as a tool of revolution. However, Graham Camfield has argued that Khilkov's attempts to

[147] Savinkov to Volkhovskii, 27 April 1912. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 3, folder 9, HIA

[148] Brilliant made explosives for the BO. She was imprisoned for her role in Plehve's assassination, where she was tortured by the guards, before being transferred to the asylum where she died. 'Dora Vladimirovna Brilliant', *Visions of Terror: The Death of Plehve through the Eyes of Savinkov*. http://petersburg.berkeley.edu/alexis/alexis_brilliant.html [accessed 22 November 2018]

[149] Volkhovskii to Savinkov, undated draft. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii papers, box 3, folder 9, HIA

persuade those in the PSR in opposition to adopt terrorism as a core party policy were ineffectual.[150] Volkhovskii's success in continuing to attract funds to publish positive representations of terrorists seems to have been a result of his efforts to neutralise conflicts within the party. He may not have persuaded the party's leadership to formally re-adopt terrorism as a tool of revolution, but he continued to promote it to the readers of party publications.

In contrast to Volkhovskii's relationship with other revolutionary émigrés, Burtsev's appears to have been less collegial and more antagonistic towards others. His activities frequently revealed some inconvenient and uncomfortable truths about the revolutionary movement and the PSR, particularly in his work uncovering spies. Frederic Zuckerman referred to him as a policeman of the emigration because of his activities, arguing that he was as equally responsible for the development of modern policing and investigation techniques as the Russian secret police abroad. He needed to uncover evidence in order that other revolutionaries would accept his accusations.[151] One of the things that made him most unpopular was his habit of making accusations against individuals he suspected of being spies, destroying their reputations, and then refusing to apologise or admit he was wrong when the allegations were proven to be false.[152] In addition to exposing Azef in the BO, Burtsev also exposed the Spy Evalenko who had collaborated for a time with the London RFPF.[153]

Saunders has argued that Burtsev was controversial figure among Russian revolutionary émigrés, as an isolated figure whose work was disliked but seen as necessary.[154] Evidence from the drafts of outgoing letters surviving in Burtsev's personal archive suggests that he quite forcefully expressed his opinions in debates about the revolutionary movement. For example, in an undated letter to Bogucharskii, who at the time was working on *Byloe* in St Petersburg, he argued that the Kadet journal *Osvobozhdenie* (*Liberation*) was not revolutionary because it did not recognise that violent struggle was necessary to achieve political reform in Russia.[155] Burtsev objected to the representation of *Osvobozhdenie* as revolutionary in Bogucharskii and Shchegolev's *Byloe*. Though he referred to their content in later issues of his own *Byloe* after resuming the journal in Paris in 1908, he did not

[150] Graham Camfield, 'From Tolstoyan to Terrorist: The Revolutionary Career of Prince D.A. Khilkov, 1900–1905', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1999), pp. 21-2 and pp. 35-6
[151] Zuckerman, *Tsarist Secret Police Abroad*, p. 195
[152] Fredric S. Zuckerman, 'Vladimir Burtsev and the Tsarist Political Police in Conflict, 1907-14', *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1977), p. 203
[153] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, p. 78 and p. 155
[154] Saunders, 'Vladimir Burtsev', pp. 51-5
[155] Burtsev to Bogucharskii, undated draft. RGASPI, f. 328, op. 1, d. 70, l. 5

account for the St Petersburg issues when numbering his new issues, simply resuming with number seven.

In addition to Burtsev expressing his disagreements with other revolutionary publicists' work, he too received letters from revolutionaries that suggest others disagreed with his representations of terrorism, or at least wanted to shape the representations appearing in his publications. In 1904, Nikolai Morozov wrote to Burtsev offering his opinion on an account of the history of *Narodnaia volia* that had been written by Goldenberg and others. He wanted to add some information that he felt had been left out, primarily relating to the events of 1879, when *Narodnaia volia* was planning an attempt to blow up the tsar's train. Morozov argued that they had obtained good information from the railway authorities, not that they were mistaken. However, they realised their mistake when they saw the baggage train approaching first instead of the tsar's train, and Shiraev, tasked with connecting the wires, had decided that it was best to blow something up than to do nothing at all.[156] Morozov appears to have wanted to refute the idea that the wrong train was blown up simply by accident and to emphasise the professionalism of *Narodnaia volia* in planning and carrying out the operation. He casts the bombing of the baggage train as a success, though obviously a lesser one than the death of the tsar. Morozov's letter also suggests that old members of *Narodnaia volia* were aware of how they were being represented in new revolutionary publications and tried to influence these representations. Like the example of Savinkov's letter in which he felt that the PSR had denounced the entire membership of the BO as immoral, Morozov did not want himself and his comrades to be remembered as unprofessional bunglers. The letter does not suggest that Burtsev sought out Morozov's opinions, but rather that he was simply offering them in response to reading a recent article.

3.5 Conclusion

Tracing Volkhovskii and Burtsev's work in the period after 1900 by focusing on the twin themes of the legacies of the nineteenth century, the infrastructure of the RFPF and their representations of terrorism, has provided an important analysis of pro-terrorist publishing in this period. Volkhovskii and Burtsev both made use of the new opportunities that being part of the PSR's wider networks offered. Most importantly, these networks enabled them to raise the funds to publish their own publications. However, the PSR, in turn, utilised the contacts that Volkhovskii and Burtsev had made in emigration, particularly the smuggling networks established by the RFPF, to increase their profile and sell other publications. Tracing their political activism in this

[156] Morozov to Burtsev, 21 Feb 1904. RGASPI, f. 328, op. 1, d. 60, l. 1

way has also highlighted the importance of other individuals, such as Goldenberg and Shishko, whose voices at first glance do not echo so loudly in the archives, but whose work in perpetuating representations of terrorism was important and whose networks underpinned the production and distribution of pro-terrorist publications. This, in turn, has highlighted the importance of personal and local networks in underpinning transnational political activism and the transfer of networks, such as those for smuggling, from one organisation to another. It further raises the question of the work of other individuals whose voices are silent in the archives. Personal relationships were also clearly central to the operations of these networks. However, it was clear that by 1914, enthusiasm for these projects was waning.

Both Volkhovskii and Burtsev's representations of terrorism follow similar patterns, relying on the image of the heroic and self-sacrificing revolutionary and drawing links between the terrorists of *Narodnaia volia* and those of the BO in order to create a historical legitimacy for the use of revolutionary terrorism. Volkhovskii and Burtsev's contemporaries who had backgrounds in these terrorist groups also fiercely defended the memories of their fallen comrades. The memory of terrorism was contested. Many different individuals and groups laid claim to this memory and shaped it for their own purposes. For Volkhovskii and Burtsev, the memory of terrorists supported their arguments for the continuation of terrorism as a policy of the PSR, even after the exposure of Azef.

Not only has this chapter illustrated more examples in which Volkhovskii and Burtsev were involved in debates about terrorism in this period, but it has shown how differently they approached their relationships with the Central Committee of the PSR and other members. Volkhovskii was more conciliatory, as had been his long-term behaviour, whereas Burtsev was more confrontational, though he did make some efforts towards conciliation. Together they demonstrate that debates on the issue of terrorism within the PSR were not limited to the party's central organs or principal theorists, such as Chernov. These debates played out in the peripheries and were fed back in to the party machine.

Chapter Four: Peter Kropotkin: The Terrorist Who was Not

4.1 Introduction

In March 1909, an article in the *Washington Post* announced that organised terrorist activities in Russia had come to an end, suggesting that if terrorists had not decided to change their tactic, then it was certainly 'a ruse to silence criticism until the scandal connected with the Azeff affair shall have blown over.' Russian revolutionary terrorism once again had acquired a negative public image abroad as a result of Azef's infiltration of the Socialist Revolutionaries' *Boevaia organizatsiia*. Additionally, the article illustrated the significance of imagined connections to terrorism in revolutionaries' public images abroad, naming the leaders of revolutionary terrorist activities as 'Prince Kropotkin, Sessulich [Zasulich], Fregner [Figner], and Lopatin'.[1] Though Zasulich, Figner, and Lopatin had all been involved in terrorism in their early revolutionary careers, in 1909 they were certainly not masterminding terrorist plots in Russia. Zasulich had entirely rejected terrorism in the 1880s, and Figner and Lopatin had only recently been freed from many years imprisonment in the infamous Shlisselburg fortress. Figner, Lopatin, and Kropotkin had, in late 1908, been part of the special judicial committee that had judged Burtsev's accusations against Azef.[2] However, this article illustrates how external views of Russian revolutionary terrorism were not always informed by knowledge of revolutionaries' real attitudes towards terrorism or their involvement in it. It also shows that Western newspapers and readers continued to be interested in Russian revolutionary terrorism, were aware of the identities of important revolutionaries, and that their interpretations of revolutionary events centred on certain key individuals.

Despite the claims of the *Washington Post*, Kropotkin could hardly be called a terrorist leader in 1909, or indeed at any point in his life. In ideological terms, Kropotkin is traditionally understood to have favoured collective action over revolutionary terrorism, though he did not rule out the latter.[3] Oleg Budnitskii has argued that among anarchists, terrorists favoured Bakunin, whereas theorists favoured Kropotkin.[4] As Budnitskii points out, defining Kropotkin's views on terrorism is not straightforward.[5] Kropotkin nowhere opposed the use of terrorism outright and

---

[1] 'Terrorist Activity Ended: Russian Revolutionists are Said to Have New Plans', *Washington Post*, 14 March 1909

[2] Geifman, *Entangled in Terror*, p. 111. They sat on the tribunal alongside PSR members Natanson, Savinkov, and Chernov.

[3] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 146; Caroline Cahm, *Kropotkin and the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism, 1872-1886* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 125

[4] Budnitskii, *Terrorizm v rossiiskom osvoboditelnom dvizhenii*, p. 223

[5] Ibid., p. 225

he called for agrarian and industrial terror.[6] Historians disagree, however, on his understanding of terrorism as propaganda. Budnitskii argued that Kropotkin believed terrorism should be a form of propaganda understood by the masses, whereas Caroline Cahm has argued that Kropotkin felt all revolutionary acts needed to contribute to the progress of the revolution themselves, rather than simply acting as propaganda.[7] Acknowledging the complexity of Kropotkin's ideas and comments on political violence, Cahm had argued that Kropotkin supported 'propaganda by the deed' where it had an immediate effect upon the lives of the oppressed.[8] Cahm's analysis takes much further this argument than Miller's which focuses on Kropotkin's autobiography, in which he was more critical of terrorism, in which, reflecting on terrorism, he wrote that it could never be revolutionary as the only legitimate revolution was mass revolution.[9] Kropotkin's writing on terrorism was founded on his ideas of the existence of an 'anarchist morality', one that was distinct from the bourgeois moralities of contemporary society.[10] He disagreed with terrorism on principle as he believed that revolution should be based upon mass action, therefore propaganda was a more appropriate sphere of activism for revolutionaries.[11] On his death, the *Manchester Guardian* reported that 'he was prepared to justify not merely revolt but even assassination if it were properly directed and had "an idea behind it."'[12] While reporting of Kropotkin's views on or links to terrorism was rare in obituaries in British and American newspapers, this article suggests an enduring association of Kropotkin with terrorism.

This chapter asks several important questions regarding Kropotkin's relationship with revolutionary terrorism in transnational perspective. Firstly, it will explore how Kropotkin's public image first emerged outside of his control in the foreign press. Secondly, it will look at what Kropotkin really said, or was alleged to have said, by English-language newspapers and periodicals about terrorism. Then, it will explore Kropotkin's work associated with the Russian Free Press Fund and further expand on this by exploring his book *Memoirs of Revolutionist*, which was published in Russian by the RFPF. The next section will illustrate the importance of the work of émigré women associated with the RFPF by exploring the lecturing work carried out by Sofia Kropotkina, who was married to Kropotkin. It will also then look at

[6] Budnitskii, *Terrorizm v rossiiskom osvoboditelnom dvizhenii*, p. 230
[7] Ibid., p. 230; Cahm, *Kropotkin*, p. 92
[8] Cahm, *Kropotkin*, p. 125
[9] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 151
[10] Ibid., p. 146
[11] Ibid., p. 151
[12] 'Peter Kropotkin', *Manchester Guardian*, 31 January 1921

Kropotkin's links to the Parliamentary Russian Committee, which itself was also closely linked to the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom. The chapter will conclude by exploring the image of Kropotkin as a terrorist later in his life. It will examine how his image was linked to ongoing revolutionary events in Russia, including during the years after his return to Russia before his death in 1921. From these questions, I will draw broader conclusions about Western perceptions of the Russian revolutionary movement and Russia in this period as well about the nature making of popular misconceptions about terrorism in mass media. Significantly, as Kropotkin was not a terrorist, examining representations of him as a terrorist facilitates exploration of the fluidity and various meanings of this term across the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Exploring representations of Kropotkin and his ideas in transnational contexts enables greater understanding of how foreign audiences responded to terrorism across the period between his first appearances in the British and American press in 1881 and his return to Russia in 1917. Kropotkin was more famous than either Stepniak, Volkhovskii, or any of the other members of the Russian Free Press Fund. He also lived longer than any of his revolutionary colleagues, until 1921, and lived in emigration between 1877 and 1917. Despite not having a personal history of involvement in terrorist activities, Kropotkin was represented at various times throughout his life as a dangerous terrorist or terrorist leader. Unlike Stepniak and Volkhovskii, Kropotkin's main theories of revolution did not incorporate elite terror. Therefore, this thesis importantly considers the external factors shaping images of Kropotkin as a terrorist. British and American newspapers and periodicals offer new sources to explore how Kropotkin represented terrorism for foreign audiences as well as evidence for how he was constructed as a terrorist by journalists and writers frequently hostile to the Russian revolutionary cause and broader anarchist movements. Kropotkin's long life and political involvement also make it possible to explore continuities in transnational representations of revolutionary terrorism across a much longer period. Equally, his connections to foreign anarchists mean investigating representations of Kropotkin enables greater exploration of how transnational terrorist identities were formed in this period. Several historians have agreed that among Russian revolutionary émigrés, Kropotkin was one of those that made the greatest impression.[13] Without Kropotkin, it seems unlikely that the activities of Stepniak, Volkhovskii, and RFPF members would have been as

[13] Paul Avrich, 'Kropotkin in America', *International Review of Social History*, vol. 25, no. 1 (1980), p. 1; Hughes, 'British Opinion and Russian Terrorism', p. 264

successful, wide-reaching, or long-lived. Kropotkin already inhabited the intellectual, political, and social spaces they took advantage of on their arrival in England. His contacts were also important for them in building their networks.

Representations of Kropotkin as a terrorist or terrorist leader with either neutral or negative connotations appeared in response to events in Russia and abroad in which Kropotkin was not involved. Kropotkin seems to have been linked to these events because of his prominence as a Russian revolutionary theorist. The fluctuating meanings attached to these representations illustrate foreigners' emotional responses to terrorism and their own perceived distance from it as well as their perceptions of the tsarist regime. Kropotkin's own representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism also influenced British and American responses to events in Russia including famine, the revolutionary events of 1905, the First World War, the Revolutions of 1917, and the Civil War. Equally, Kropotkin remained a respected commentator on Russian domestic issues that reflected poorly on tsarist rule, including its brutality. As in Stepniak's case, the essence of revolution in Russia, and particularly terrorism, became closely associated with individual revolutionaries. This chapter incorporates study of both Kropotkin's own writing, and reports of his speeches and public comment, on terrorism as well as depictions of him that appear to have no real basis in reality.

Kropotkin developed his theories of anarchist communism in his extensive writings during his life in emigration, including numerous articles, pamphlets, and books. The development of Kropotkin's political ideas occurred within transnational spaces, exchanges, and networks. He wrote extensively in English and French, for a variety of newspapers, including *Le Révolté*, which he edited in Geneva, and *Freedom*, the London-based anarchist newspaper. Kropotkin also drew on the ideas of his contemporaries, other anarchists. Cahm argues that Kropotkin took from Élisée Reclus the idea that individual action could be legitimate if it derived from the desire not to stand by while others suffered.[14] Unlike many Russian revolutionaries, Kropotkin also focused on the universality of his revolutionary theory, as opposed to focusing solely on the Russian situation of autocratic tsarist rule. He drew comparisons between the ideas of different revolutionary thinkers, the conditions and development, and labour movements in different countries.[15] The transnational nature of Kropotkin's ideas cannot be ignored when considering foreigners'

[14] Cahm, *Kropotkin*, p. 131

[15] P. Kropotkin, *The Conquest of Bread* (London, 1913), vii-xvi (This English edition followed an earlier French edition and a series of articles published in French and English in the 1890s.)

responses to them. It also means that foreigners' responses to these ideas were much more complex and sometimes contradictory, as they struggled to reconcile their support for Russian freedom with the anarchist, socialist, or communist ideas held by the revolutionaries which threatened to change their own lives.

New technologies were developed in the late nineteenth century that enabled the faster transmission and wider diffusion of news and other media. Representations of Kropotkin spread quickly, reflecting the conditions that sociologists have described as 'homogenous and uniform space' and 'time-space compression' created by these new technologies.[16] The expanding global telegraph network, including the line across Siberia surveyed by George Kennan in the 1860s, enabled the fast transmission of information across nations and continents. Newspaper circulation and readership expanded, increasing the spread of information to all parts of society. Indeed, the sociologist Ken Ward sees the foundation of the *Daily Mail* in 1896 as a signifier of a 'watershed in social and political life'.[17] As was the case more broadly with news reporting, the multiplication of local newspapers reflected homogeneity in and replication of representations of terrorism, but local variations were also evident. The transnational diffusion of news did not necessarily engender the same responses. Regarding Kropotkin, newspaper reports differed in their portrayals of Kropotkin as a terrorist in different locations. Homogeneity and replication can be identified in the use and reuse of specific language to describe Kropotkin, anarchists, and terrorism. Local variations can also highlight the factors which shaped how foreigners responded to terrorism and Kropotkin, such as the perceived fear of terrorism in a given area or a sense of safety and distance. Scholars of twenty-first century terrorism have also identified media technologies as playing an integral role in transforming acts of violence into symbolic acts of terrorism and ascribing to them new meaning.[18] In this sense, the representations of Kropotkin as a terrorist were different to the real person because they signified different things.

4.2 Becoming the 'Nihilist Prince'

Reporting on Kropotkin's arrest in Thonon in the French Alps in December 1882, the *Manchester Guardian* described the revolutionary theorist as 'one of the most active

[16] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extension of Man* (London, 1964), p. 92; David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge MA, 1990)

[17] Ken Ward, *Mass Communication and the Modern World* (Basingstoke, 1989), p. 49. For Ward, the equally important was the emergence of cinema around the same time.

[18] Nacos, *Mass-Mediated Terrorism* and Moeller, *Packaging Terrorism*

and dangerous and revolutionary spirits in Europe.'[19] At the moment of his arrest, many contemporary journalists depicted Kropotkin as dangerous, with the British weekly journal *The World* calling him a 'firebrand' and a 'professional provoker of *emeutes* [riots] and uprisings' and lamenting the 'false sentiment and sympathy' for the Russian revolutionary.[20] Though Kropotkin's arrest was an important element of these representations, they were also a product of Kropotkin's past actions, associations, and printed and published comment. Another significant component was contemporary misconceptions about the nature of Kropotkin's thought, as well as anarchist thought in general. This was based on the existence of strands of more violent anarchism described and practised by others. Where Kropotkin chose to publish contributed to these negative associations with violence. At the time of his arrest the *Manchester Guardian* claimed that Kropotkin only published his writings in anarchist journals exactly matching his beliefs, preferring *Le Révolté*, the anarchist-communist journal of which he was one of the founders, as a result of its promotion of 'reconstruction side by side with destruction.' The article recognised that Kropotkin had well-developed plans for the organisation of post-revolutionary society and did not believe only in destruction. However, it also noted that he was 'quite mad, and by far the simplest thing to do with him would be to confine him – he is not in the least deserving of punishment.'[21] Acts of terrorism and speeches or writings in support of terrorism might be considered to be 'scandals', the study of which Judith Surkis has argued 'interrupted ideas of both the social and intellectual *longue durée*.'[22] Therefore, terrorism and Kropotkin's association with it appeared particularly threatening to the social and political order.

Kropotkin's image as a dangerous terrorist in Britain and the US had emerged in 1881 as a result of two events. The first was a political meeting of socialists and anarchists in London in July, often referred to as the 'Anarchist Congress', at which Kropotkin spoke. By attending the congress, Kropotkin became associated with the speeches made at the meeting and other attendees who reportedly called for acts of violence and promulgated the idea of 'propaganda by the deed'. The French Communard Louise '[Michel] announced a second golden age, and urged her

[19] 'The Arrest of Prince Krapotkine', *Manchester Guardian*, 28 December 1882. Thonon-les-Bains sits on the southern shore of Lake Geneva, under 30km from Geneva.
[20] 'Society Gossip', *Tamworth Herald*, 30 December 1882 [reprinted]
[21] 'The Arrest of Prince Krapotkine', *Manchester Guardian*, 28 December 1882. Kropotkin had been one of the founders of *Le Révolté* in Geneva in 1879. In 1883, the French Anarchist Jean Grave took over the editorship.
[22] Judith Surkis, 'Of Scandals and Supplements: Relating Intellectual and Cultural History', in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (eds), *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (Oxford, 2014), p. 96

hearers not to spare their blood in bringing it about.'[23] Another speaker condemned the recent conviction of Johann Most for 'justifiable expression of opinion, and declared that if any one were to be hanged for inciting to murder it should be the editors of these English journals which called for the murder of the people.'[24] Association with Michel, whom the *Manchester Guardian* called 'a conspicuous preacher of the gospel of destruction', and Most only made Kropotkin's speech at the meeting seem more threatening.[25] According to the *Daily Telegraph*, Kropotkin gave a speech at the meeting in which he 'applauded the assassination of several Russian generals'.[26] The *Manchester Guardian* focused on calls for future violence and terrorism at the meeting, noting that one delegate 'deprecated peaceful agitation' and reporting that participants had 'primarily decided to substitute action for speech' according to one Parisian delegate.[27]

Whereas some anarchists associated propaganda by the deed with indiscriminate violence, Kropotkin limited his association with terrorism to specific acts against political figures, as he did at the 1881 Congress. Kropotkin's writing on terrorism for readers in English followed a pattern similar to Stepniak's in that he praised or avoided condemning past acts of Russian revolutionary terrorism and simultaneously refused to call for new acts of terrorism in these forums. Though it does not appear Kropotkin called for new acts of terrorism in his speech at the 1881 Congress, being associated with those who did clearly had a negative impact upon his moral and political acceptability in the West. Unlike Stepniak's association with noble, selfless, and idealistic terrorists, especially Sofia Perovskaia and *Narodnaia volia*, in the early 1880s foreigners frequently linked Kropotkin to terrorists with more negative associations. His link to revolutionaries of other nationalities made him, to some observers, appear dangerous in an era that was suspicious of those challenging the established social, economic, and political order.

The next event which contributed to this image of Kropotkin, was his expulsion from Switzerland in August of the same year. The *New York Times* reported that 'Switzerland has ceased to be a safe retreat for Nihilists and other political agitators of the violent and murderous type.'[28] The article noted that Switzerland had followed the example of France which had the previous year

---

[23] 'Meeting of Revolutionary Delegates', *Daily Telegraph*, 19 July 1881
[24] Ibid.
[25] *Manchester Guardian*, 20 July 1881
[26] 'Meeting of Revolutionary Delegates', *Daily Telegraph*, 19 July 1881; The same phrase appeared in 'A Revolutionary Congress', *New York Times*, 20 July 1881 and in the *Manchester Guardian*, 20 July 1881.
[27] *Manchester Guardian*, 20 July 1881
[28] *New York Times*, 29 August 1881

expelled the *Narodnaia volia* member Lev Gartman. Kropotkin's associations with *Narodnaia volia* also contributed to his public image as a terrorist in 1881. In March 1881, the French journalist and founder of the left-wing *L'Intransigent* Henri Rochefort interviewed Kropotkin about the assassination of Alexander II, his printed article suggesting that Kropotkin was well-informed about the planning of the assassination.[29]

The difficulty of studying terrorism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is often one of language and terminology. In this period, the terms 'anarchist' and 'nihilist' (both capitalised and not) could be used to signify different things. In the early 1880s, these terms were used to refer to Kropotkin's political beliefs as encouraging or supporting terrorism. For example, the *New York Times* reported in 1883 that Kropotkin had been convicted of 'Nihilism'.[30] Reporting on the charges, the newspaper had made accusations illustrating what they meant by Nihilism:

> One thing, however, you do not know, and none except the leaders of the anarchist party know it – Prince Krapotkine was not merely charged with incitations to rebellion on French soil; when he and the Princess were searched at the railway station two or three days previous to their arrest, several very compromising letters were discovered written by Nihilists in Russia which established the complicity of an uncle of the Czar and of a certain Ambassador, once high in imperial favour, although he has been frequently denounced at St. Petersburg as disloyal.[31]

The article did not specify in what activities Kropotkin, the tsar's uncle, and ambassador were implicated but described a further recent incident in which Kropotkin had supposedly written a letter declaring his intention to kill the tsar. The article illustrates that Nihilists were assumed to be terrorists at this time and that the author believed Kropotkin's arrest to have been deserved.

Reporting on Kropotkin's arrest and trial, many newspapers equated both anarchism with terrorism and terrorism with nihilism. This was one example of a widespread lack of distinction in news reporting between different political views among Russian revolutionaries throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On Kropotkin's arrest, the *Daily Telegraph* noted that he was a 'violent Nihilist' and connected to the 'party of anarchy and dynamite'.[32] Another claimed that 'anarchism is nothing but Nihilism under another name'.[33] Similarly, a report of Kropotkin's trial openly associated anarchists with terrorists, calling them the 'Party of

[29] 'The Murder and Its Results', *New York Times*, 20 March 1881
[30] 'Current Foreign Topics', *New York Times*, 21 April 1883
[31] 'Timely European Topics: A Fair at Amsterdam, Art in Paris, and Nihilism', *New York Times*, 8 January 1883
[32] 'Prince Krapotkine', *Daily Telegraph*, 22 December 1882
[33] 'The Arrest of Prince Krapotkine', *Manchester Guardian*, 28 December 1882

Dynamite'. Illustrating the reach of caricatured images of political radicals, the *Manchester Guardian* noted that all anarchists were also 'hairy'.[34] James Green in his study of the Haymarket bombing of 1886 has also discovered anarchists were commonly seen as caricatured terrorists.[35] In the 1880s, there appears to have been little recognition of the multiplicity of attitudes towards violence among anarchists and this lack of distinction between anarchism and terrorism endured across the period covered by this chapter. For example, in 1902, the *Washington Post* printed the comments of a Russian nobleman travelling in the US, calling Kropotkin an 'Anarchist', without irony as this was a term Kropotkin claimed for himself, accusing him of 'trying to act the part of the assassin' without justification in Russia, where he had been treated fairly. He also questioned whether Kropotkin had 'made anarchists out of the Chicagoans', insinuating Kropotkin might have had some connection to the Haymarket bombing in 1886.[36]

Responding to news of his arrest, a series of articles printed on 22 December 1882, in Britain and the US, accused Kropotkin of being a member of a society involving Frenchmen and foreigners in France 'formed for the overthrow of society by the means of murder and pillage' (*Daily Telegraph*) and 'the object of which is the overthrow of social order by means of pillage and assassination' (*Washington Post*/*New York Times*).[37] Local newspapers across Britain and the US then replicated the phrase 'murder and pillage' or 'pillage and assassination' when describing Kropotkin's supposed intentions.[38] The duplication and syndication of news reporting resulted in repetition of such phrases and associations with Kropotkin. Here Kropotkin was associated with terrorism in the form of both assassinations and economic terror. Adding 'pillage' to the association with assassination that Kropotkin already had from 1881 shows the perceived threat of economic terror in this period. As Geifman illustrated, economic terror threatened stability in Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as, for example, robberies discouraged

[34] 'The Party of Dynamite', *Manchester Guardian*, 12 January 1883
[35] James Green, *Death in the Haymarket: A Story of Chicago, the First Labor Movement, and the Bombing that Divided Gilded Age America* (New York, 2006), pp. 11-2
[36] 'Condemns Kropotkin: Prince Engalitcheff Says he is an Anarchist', *Washington Post*, 14 January 1902
[37] 'Prince Krapotkine' *Daily Telegraph*, 22 December 1882; 'The Arrest of Prince Krapotkine', *Washington Post*, 22 December 1882; 'Prince Krapotkine's Arrest', *New York Times*, 22 December 1882
[38] For example: 'Prince Krapotkin's Arrest', *York Herald*, 23 December 1882, 'The Charges Against Prince Krapotkine', *Star* [Saint Peter Port, Guernsey], 23 December 1882, 'Prince Krapotkine's Arrest', *Atlanta Constitution*, 24 December 1882

people from keeping their money in banks.[39] This example illustrates that Russian terrorism was perceived in the West as dangerous for similar reasons.

Kropotkin was perceived as being particularly dangerous as he was believed to be sharing the knowledge required to make explosives with members of the lower classes. As seen in the case of Irish revolutionaries, terrorism by bombings was seen as a method of equalising the conflict against a militarily superior state actor. The *Boston Daily Globe* drew links between Kropotkin's speaking activities in France, during which he was reported to have encouraged unrest, and the French police's seizure in November 1882 of a number of revolutionary manifestos declaring that all forms of revolutionary activity, therefore including terrorism and political violence, were permissible in the pursuit of the destruction of the bourgeoisie and providing the 'minutest description of the manufacturing of dynamite, lithofractor, picrate, nitro-glycerine and ammoniacal powder'. Articulating the specific danger of spreading such information among workers, the newspaper noted that 'a discarded workman or servant might take it into his head to take summary vengeance on his employer by destroying his premises and himself by dynamite, nitro-glycerine or gun-cotton'.[40] The enduring concern that the lower classes might be provided with the means to overthrow the state was repeated in 1892 when Valerian Gribayedoff described how in famine districts in Russia, pamphlets that were the product of Russian Nihilists in Geneva were being distributed, appealed to a 'brotherhood of man' and contained detailed instructions for the manufacture of explosive devices, including one known as the 'tsar's pancake'. The pamphlet supposedly used 'the simplest possible language so that it may be comprehended by the most unsophisticated peasant'.[41] Whereas at this time Stepniak's book *Underground Russia* was beginning to encourage foreigners to sympathise with Russian revolutionary terrorists, the furore around Kropotkin's arrest illustrates the negative associations of working-class terrorism. Alone, 'Prince Kropotkin' was a curio, as Matthew Adams has described, 'the incongruity of Kropotkin's princely status and intemperate political views' brought him much attention.[42] Foreigners respected him for abandoning his inherited wealth in order to help improve society. The *Daily Mail* in 1912 described him as 'one of the most remarkable men', untroubled by losing his wealth, and happily working to

[39] Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill*, p. 22
[40] 'Over the Ocean', *Boston Daily Globe*, 12 November 1882
[41] V. Gribayedoff, 'The Anarchists: Something about its Leading Advocates in Europe', *Atlanta Constitution*, 6 March 1892. Gribayedoff was a Russian journalist and illustrator.
[42] Matthew S. Adams, *Kropotkin, Read, and the Intellectual History of British Anarchism: Between Reason and Romanticism* (Basingstoke, 2015), p. 24

support himself.[43] However, when they believed he was encouraging and enabling the lower classes to enact revolution, he was perceived to be dangerous. An important accusation at his trial seems to have been the fact that he had spoken at a public meeting at Lyons.[44] This image of Kropotkin as being particularly dangerous soon dissipated as foreign journalists laid out his political views, scientific expertise, and good manners in greater detail. This certainly helped individuals such as Stepniak and Volkhovskii avoid such negative associations in their émigré activities. They were not seen to be working with the working classes.

Kropotkin was accused of abusing the right of asylum in France and Switzerland, having been expelled from the latter in 1881.[45] In 1881, the *Manchester Guardian* similarly suggested that British MPs should not have permitted Kropotkin or Michel the opportunity to address audiences in Britain or offer them expressions of support.[46] Supposedly fomenting revolution abroad attracted criticism for Russian émigré revolutionaries. An equally important and connected issue was the imagined existence of a transnational terrorist conspiracy, which was supposedly operating in England under the name the 'National Revolutionary League'. It was associated with Kropotkin, Michel, and Rochefort, and had an anonymous but supposedly famous 'Radical' leader, who was reported to have declared:

> There are circumstances under which political assassination is justifiable and necessary, and when murder is no crime. We must have anarchy before we have peace and order; we must have revolution before we can have law; we want to do away with all existing institutions and overthrow all Governments, because they are opposed to the wishes and welfare of the people.[47]

The idea that Kropotkin had imported into Western Europe the threat of terrorism was one source of negative perceptions of him. This was only compounded by beliefs that he was a leader of an international terrorist conspiracy and these were already well-established before his arrest in December 1882.[48] Throughout his trial, newspapers

[43] 'The Man of the Week: The Anarchist', *Daily Mail*, 14 December 1912
[44] 'The Trial of Socialists at Lyons', *Western Gazette* [Yeovil], 12 January 1883. This article gives a detailed report of the trial.
[45] For example: 'Prince Krapotkine', *Daily Telegraph*, 22 December 1882 and 'Prince Krapotkine' and *Daily News*, 26 August 1881. The *Daily News* described Kropotkin's work on *Le Révolté* as 'such as no Government could tolerate'.
[46] *Manchester Guardian*, 20 July 1881
[47] 'A Revolutionary League in England', *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent*, 2 December 1882
[48] The following articles, among others, referred to Kropotkin as a 'Nihilist leader': 'Meeting of Revolutionary Delegates', *Daily Telegraph*, 19 July 1881, 'Summary of News: Foreign', *Manchester Guardian*, 5 July 1882, and 'Over the Ocean: The Labor Troubles in France and their Cause', *Boston Daily Globe*, 12 November 1882.

continued to refer to him as a 'Nihilist leader'.[49] Though Kropotkin could hardly have been called a terrorist leader in practice, as in later periods, he was ascribed this role in the press as a result of his connections with revolutionaries using these methods. In contrast to Stepniak, who had in English forums denied his connections with terrorists of any other nationalities, particularly Irish revolutionaries, Kropotkin's revolutionary ideas were transnational in scope and he maintained many friendly and working relationships with revolutionaries of other nationalities, including importantly for his image, Louise Michel.

Kropotkin's trial and subsequent imprisonment served as catalysts for changing attitudes towards him and his political views in this British and American press. There was great interest in Kropotkin's comments on terrorism, violence, and 'dynamite' during the trial. He denied advocating 'revolution by violence in France', claimed to use the word dynamite 'metaphorically', and gave a long speech in his own defence denying the existence of an international terrorist conspiracy. [50] However, another report noted that he had said: 'When his party had to choose between extinction or a resort to dynamite, he would, he declared, employ the latter.'[51] Reports of the trial indicate that journalists began to take a greater interest in uncovering what Kropotkin really thought about violence and anarchism, among other things, instead of simply regurgitating tired stereotypes. One newspaper described French perceptions of Kropotkin as 'criticism mingled with romance' and 'absurd' and referred to Stepniak's recently published Italian edition of *Underground Russia*, to argue that Kropotkin had played no role in terrorist conspiracies.[52] The *Daily News* even despatched a correspondent to interview Kropotkin on his anarchist principles and the 'evolution' of political systems.[53] Stepniak's writing provided some evidence to prompt changing views on terrorism in this period, but this altering of views occurred within a broader reorientation of views against the tsarist regime.

Representations of Kropotkin's trial and conditions of imprisonment as unjust illustrate the importance of images of the state in forming views on terrorism in this

[49] For example, in: 'The Arrest of Prince Krapotkine', *Boston Daily Globe*, 22 December 1882, 'The Nihilist Leader in Prison', *Edinburgh Evening News*, and 29 December 1882, *Evening News* [Portsmouth], 29 December 1882 (this last article used the term 'Nihilist chief').

[50] 'The Party of Dynamite', *Manchester Guardian*, 12 January 1883; 'The Lyons Anarchists', *Manchester Guardian,* 16 January 1883

[51] 'Anarchists on Trial: Prince Krapotkine makes a Bold Declaration of his Principles', *New York Times*¸ 10 January 1883

[52] 'Prince Kropotkine and Nihilism', *Galveston Daily News*, 18 January 1883. The newspaper article named the 'Zurich Post' as a source.

[53] 'An Aristocratic Nihilist: A Visit to the Russian Prince Krapotkine in His Home at Thonon', *Washington Post*, 7 January 1883. Many contemporary articles about Kropotkin reprinted or referenced articles from the *Daily News*.

period. American journalists depicted the trial as unjust: 'It will show how heavily the hand of authority can be laid upon men for opinion's sake in the French Republic.'[54] An article in the *Boston Daily Globe* printed a comment from Sofia Kropotkina, stating that it was laws created by French imperialism making communism and belonging to the International illegal and which enabled the court to convict him 'on a shadow of evidence'.[55] The article continued, suggesting Kropotkin was 'sentenced solely to give pleasure to a Russian czar.'[56] In 1897, the RFPF and SFRF similarly promoted the idea that pressure from the tsarist regime had led to Burtsev's prosecution and conviction.[57] During Kropotkin's subsequent imprisonment, the British and American press closely followed reports about Kropotkin's poor health and poor treatment in prison.[58] The French right-wing newspaper *La liberté* advised public figures in Britain campaigning for Kropotkin's release 'to devote their sympathy to the Irish Fenians, and other newspapers ask what reception England would give to Frenchmen petitioning clemency for the perpetrators of the Westminster explosion, some of whom perhaps are chemists as distinguished in the profession as Prince Krapotkine.'[59] There was some international tension over foreign support for terrorists of different nationalities, but at the point of Kropotkin's conviction, it appears American journalists were more in sympathy with him than British journalists.

The image of Kropotkin the terrorist was to some extent based on the actual content of his speeches and the fact that he closely associated with other revolutionaries of various nationalities who promoted the use of terrorism and political violence as means of revolution. However, broad misconceptions about the nature of anarchist thought and violence's place within it would also prove important factors in the first few years of the 1880s. Kropotkin's trials and imprisonment proved to be an important factor in altering popular perceptions of Kropotkin, but this was not necessarily a result of proving that he was not a terrorist. Changing attitudes towards the tsarist regime influenced this process. However, these views were not universal and there remained significant voices calling Kropotkin a threat to the social and political order.

Throughout his life, Western journalists often referred to Kropotkin as the 'Nihilist prince' and, as time passed, his association with Nihilism or Russian

---

[54] 'The Lyons Anarchists', *New York Times*, 14 January 1883
[55] 'Princess Kropotkine on her Husband's Conviction', *Boston Daily Globe*, 22 January 1883
[56] 'Princess Kropotkine on her Husband's Conviction'
[57] Henderson, *Vladimir Burtsev*, p. 91 and p. 92
[58] For example: 'Prince Krapotkine. The Great Anarchist Dying in Jail', *Boston Daily Globe*, 23 April 1883, 'The Health of Prince Krapotkine', *Edinburgh Evening News*, 8 February 1883, and 'From Our London Correspondent', *Manchester Guardian*, 19 October 1883.
[59] 'Foreign Telegrams', *Manchester Guardian*, 29 March 1883

revolutionary terrorism came to be seen less negatively. Despite the fact that term Nihilism continued to be associated with terrorism, which remained controversial, Kropotkin's association with it began to be dominated with discussion of his personal sacrifice on behalf of the revolutionary movement.[60] Kropotkin's support for terrorism would continue to be linked by observers to his royal status as a means of illustrating how individuals from all parts of Russian society had come to oppose the despotism and brutality of tsarist rule. In 1897, the *Boston Daily Globe* reported that Kropotkin hated using his title.[61] Nevertheless, newspapers continued to do so.

4.3 Kropotkin's Voice and Terrorism

Despite publishing extensively throughout his life in emigration in several languages, Kropotkin only infrequently approached the issue of terrorism. From the late-1880s, Kropotkin's own articles and letters began to appear more frequently in British and American newspapers and journals. These writings cover a great range of topics.[62] Kropotkin was seen as an expert in many fields. He entered into extensive correspondences with revolutionaries and radicals, Russians and foreigners, geographers and scientists, who looked to him in search of the answers to their problems.[63] Kropotkin also felt it necessary to continue with the important task of illuminating the principles of anarchism and explaining his political thought.[64] British and American journalists called on his expertise in various areas, including the economics and sociology of as farming, industrial organisation, and the prison system.[65] Kropotkin also lectured widely on political, social, and economic topics and the content and reception of his speeches were reported in newspapers.[66] When

---

[60] 'A Nihilist Prince', *Daily Evening Bulletin* [San Francisco, CA], 23 December 1886

[61] 'Worker in the Cause of Humanity: Prince Krapotkine, Royal by Birth, has had a Career Rivalling Anything in Fiction', *Boston Daily Globe*, 26 October 1897

[62] Iain McKay, 'Sages and Movements: An Incomplete Peter Kropotkin Bibliography', *Anarchist Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, (2014), p. 78. McKay noted his bibliography was 'comprehensive, but incomplete'.

[63] For example: John Slatter, 'The Correspondence of P. A. Kropotkin as Historical Source Material', *SEER*, vol. 72, no. 2 (1994), pp. 277-88

[64] Kropotkin to William Morris, 11 April 1886. William Morris Papers, Vol. VIII, ff. 109-10. British Library, Add MS 45345

[65] For example: 'What Small Farmers Can Do', *Atlanta Constitution*, 7 July 1888, 'Industrial Villages', *Huddersfield Daily Chronicle*, 2 October 1888 [quoting from Kropotkin's article in the *Nineteenth Century*], and 'Russian and French Prisons', *Morning Post*, 20 May 1887 [reviewing Kropotkin's book *In Russian and French Prisons*]. Several newspapers even printed his musings on his experiments in prison in Clairvaux, which included his investigations into whether a cat could identify its own reflection. 'Prince Krapotkin's Cat', *New York Times*, 1 September 1884

[66] For example: 'Prince Krapotkin on Socialism', *Leeds Mercury*, 2 April 1887 [giving a detailed description of the content of his recent lecture at Bradford and his responses to questions], 'Prince Krapotkine on Socialism', *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, 4 December 1886 [marking the regular applause he received during his recent lecture in Edinburgh], and

published in English, his books on literary and historical topics, *Russian Literature* (1905) and *The Great French Revolution* (1909), were equally widely reviewed and praised.[67] Kropotkin's books on social and economic theory were also widely read and discussed by journalists and reviewers. His *Fields, Factories, and Workshops* (1899) discussed emerging technological innovations in agriculture and industry, including the use of greenhouses in the Netherlands, and while one reviewer noted that '[n]inety-nine readers in a hundred will smile at Prince Kropotkin's picture of a coming Eden for the individual worker', they nevertheless believed it would be of interest to readers with its discussion of these new technologies.[68] Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* (1902), in which he proposed that humans as well as animals were predisposed towards helping each other, met with particularly great interest among readers in English. The *Chicago Daily Tribune*, for example, described it as 'a most interesting contribution to the literature of sociology'.[69] Kropotkin's political and sociological thought was therefore widely respected in Britain and the US.

Kropotkin's comments on terrorism therefore circulated in this context. British and American journalists regularly called on Kropotkin to provide first-hand insight into social, political, and economic life in Russia and the activities of the revolutionary movement, despite his distance in time and space in emigration. Kropotkin helped establish narratives of an evil autocracy and oppressed society which encouraged foreigners to campaign against the tsarist regime. Around the time of his trial, Kropotkin's article in the *Nineteenth Century* periodical on Russian prisons helped to direct international attention towards the cruel and unhygienic treatment of prisoners and exiles in Russia, which Kropotkin described as displaying a 'cynical contempt for human dignity'.[70] Even where he did not openly condone the use of terrorism, his sympathy for those practicing it and memorialisation of terrorists contributed to these narratives. For example, in 1882 he decried representations of the Russian terrorist in the West as a 'mythical and psychologically impossible personage', using terrorism in response to a minor perceived slight.[71] He also noted that 'one year ago, the aims

---

'"Profit, Profit, Profit," The World's Cry: Prince Kropotkin, the Great Anarchist, Lectures to Appreciative Audience, *Boston Daily Globe*, 11 March 1901.

[67] For example: 'Prince Krapotkin's Socialism', *Atlanta Constitution*, 23 July 1905 [commenting favourably on *Russian Literature*] and Paul Ferdinand Willert, 'Prince Kropotkin on the French Revolution', *TLS*, 9 December 1909 [noting Kropotkin's 'honesty' and 'sincerity' in his approach to his subject].

[68] 'Fields, Factories, and Workshops', *Daily News*, 10 April 1899

[69] 'Mutual Aid and Evolution', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 22 December 1902

[70] P. Krapotkine, 'Russian Prisons', *The Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, vo. 13, no. 71 (January 1883), p. 27

[71] P. Kropotkin, 'The Russian Revolutionary Party', *Fortnightly Review*, vol. 31, no. 185 (1882), p. 654

and tendencies of the "Terrorists," [were] supported by many Russian revolutionary organisations, and, in fact, by the majority of the educated men of wealthy classes'.[72] Kropotkin contributed to the discourses of legitimisation of Russian revolutionary terrorism abroad and as a result of his participation in other social, political, economic, and scientific discourse, came to be highly respected over time.

Kropotkin commented on terrorism in English-language forums in articles and letters he wrote to newspapers. Journalists also reported on his speeches and lectures and mentioned him in articles about ongoing terrorist activities in Russia. Kropotkin did write about terrorism in other languages such as French, including a pamphlet about the terrorist Alexander Soloviev who attempted to assassinate the tsar in 1881 by shooting him. Cahm has argued that Kropotkin represented Soloviev's action as a 'self-sacrificing act of revolt which would build up the spirit of revolt among the people.'[73] However, this pamphlet does not appear to have been translated into English. Sources from British and American newspapers offer further insights into his views and understanding how he chose to present them for British and American audiences, as well as how journalists reinterpreted and misinterpreted his views in light of current events and their own perceptions about anarchism, violence, and society.

Digital tools for searching and storing large numbers of newspapers, local and national, make it possible to ask new questions about Kropotkin's image as a terrorist and terrorist propagandist.[74] Due to his personal fame, Kropotkin's voice echoes loudly in the archives, and is perhaps only amplified by the use of digital tools.[75] Therefore, exclusively looking for Kropotkin may somewhat obscure the roles of other important individuals in establishing narratives of terrorism. However, digital archives enable the study of local and specific phenomena alongside cross-cultural and cross-border phenomena, reflecting Saunier's emphasis that transnational history is a methodology allowing historians to reconsider how geographical units functioned, not simply an additional unit of analysis.[76]

Through a transnational approach using digital archives, local factors influencing news reporting can be identified in representations of Kropotkin as a supporter of terrorism, as well as transnational similarities such as in reporting on his arrest and trial. Kropotkin's links to annual commemorations of the Chicago Martyrs

[72] Kropotkin, 'The Russian Revolutionary Party', p. 670
[73] Cahm, *Kropotkin*, pp. 122-3
[74] Lara Putnam, 'The Transnational and the Text-Searchable: Digitized Sources and the Shadows They Cast', *American Historical Review*, vol. 121, no. 2 (2016), p. 380
[75] Ibid., p. 391
[76] Ibid., pp. 385-6

are one example of this. Local and international labour activists have commemorated the executions as Chicago's labouring community quickly came to see the trial and verdict as a serious miscarriage of justice. Contemporaries and historians have widely believed they were not responsible for the deaths and injuries caused by the bomb.[77] The local *Chicago Daily Tribune* seems to have been the only mainstream British or American newspaper to have reported on a meeting that look placed in London in November 1891 commemorating the hanging of the four men convicted of carrying out the Haymarket bombing. The *Tribune* reported with horror that at the November 1891 meeting, '[t]he language of the speakers was of the bitterest and most incendiary character' and that Kropotkin had 'urged the universal adoption of Nihilist methods, such as are in vogue in Russia' in addition to translating for Louise Michel, who 'declared that every means that could be adopted to fight capitalism was justifiable.'[78] According to the article, an audience member had called for 'Three cheers for the Queen' with 'valor', but disappeared when the crowd attempted to find him.[79] The *Tribune* paired this article on the same page as one suggesting that the commemoration of the Martyrs in Chicago represented a danger to public order.[80] When Kropotkin was due to travel to Chicago in 1893 to speak at a meeting commemorating the Martyrs, this again does not seem to have been reported in other newspapers. Ultimately, however, Kropotkin decided not to travel.[81]

It seems unlikely that Kropotkin called for further acts of violence in his speech and it seems equally likely that, had he done so, such calls would have attracted the attention of the British press. In this example, it appears that Kropotkin was used to represent anarchism and anarchist violence as something being imported from abroad. Fears of immigrants bringing revolutionary violence with them were especially strong in American cities with large immigrant communities such as Chicago. Although Chicago's immigrant population was dominated by those of German descent, the largest Russian community in the US was in San Francisco. In November 1887, as the date of the execution of the Chicago Martyrs approached, the San Francisco *Daily Evening Bulletin* responded to Kropotkin's recent comments on the affair:

---

[77] Green, *Death in the Haymarket*, p. 230; Avrich, *Haymarket Tragedy*. Examining testimony of related individuals, Avrich also concluded that none of the men hanged for the crime were likely to have thrown the bomb (p. 443).

[78] 'Foreign Anarchists Meet: They Remember the Haymarket Riots at a Noisy and Excited Gathering', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 12 November 1891

[79] Ibid.

[80] 'Made to Honor the Flag: Police Force Chicago Anarchists to Hoist the National Colours', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 12 November 1891

[81] 'For the Ceremony at Waldheim: Preparations Made for Dedicating the Anarchist Monument', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 29 May 1893

> The Nihilists of Russia and the Anarchists who have come to this country from various parts of Europe hold essentially the same principles. They believe in the destruction of all who stand in their way, not in the gradual dissemination of their doctrines by argument and the complete exposition of their principles by means of printed publications. The father of the present Czar of Russia was murdered by Nihilists. The fatal bomb did the work. It was the fatal bomb that destroyed the lives of several policemen in Chicago. A more diabolical murder was never committed in this country. No sympathy for these Anarchists can obscure that fact.[82]

This article also reflected the idea that anarchism was an imported phenomenon and linked terrorism, anarchism, and Russian Nihilism, attributing the bombing to 'foreign inspiration', not referring to Kropotkin as an anarchist, but instead classifying his ideas as 'Nihilistic'.[83] As a visible symbol of foreign revolutionary movements in this period, Kropotkin was mobilised to represent terrorism.

Green noted that Parisian newspapers had regularly reported on the Haymarket trial, reflecting the more visible anarchist movement there, though Green's research primarily focused on socialist and radical newspapers. [84] Interest from a mainstream newspaper in Chicago in foreign commemorations and Kropotkin's role in them illustrates their local significance. British newspapers' coverage of Kropotkin's activities in 1887 mainly focused on his speaking tours and recently-completed book on prison life and peaked in the first half of the year.[85] In contrast, references to Kropotkin in US newspapers peaked in the final months of the year in connection with the anniversary of the execution of the Chicago martyrs.[86] An article did however appear in the *Edinburgh Evening News* in March claiming that Kropotkin had attended a meeting of Russian refugees in London, along with Stepniak, to celebrate the anniversary of the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. At the meeting, it was reported that in speeches 'the doctrine of assassination was strongly defended.'[87] Interest in Kropotkin's links to the Chicago martyrs or their commemoration by anarchists in the US appears to have been limited in Britain. However, it appears that there may have been some upswing in interest in Russian terrorist activities that year possibly linked to commemorative activities in the US.

Kropotkin was at least reported to have, on several occasions, called for further acts of terrorism either against the tsarist regime or against governments more broadly. Kropotkin previously appealed to the moral uncertainty surrounding Russian revolutionary terrorism in the West that Stepniak later exploited in his

---

[82] 'Prince Krapotkin and the Anarchists', *Daily Evening Bulletin* [San Francisco], 4 November 1887
[83] 'Prince Krapotkin and the Anarchists'
[84] Green, *Death in the Haymarket*, p. 253
[85] These included articles in the *Edinburgh Evening* News, *Leeds Mercury*, and *Manchester Guardian*.
[86] These included articles in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* and the *Boston Daily Globe*.
[87] 'Russian Refugees in London', *Edinburgh Evening News*, 15 March 1887

writing, by questioning why those who had expressed support for Vera Zasulich did not support him during his trial.[88] Kropotkin played an important role in establishing the image of moral ambiguity in the West that enabled Russian revolutionary émigrés to establish broad support bases and raise significant sums of money, some of which was spent on supporting revolutionary violence and terrorism. Just as sympathisers with Stepniak, such as Mark Twain, declared that they would have become terrorists had they been in his position, British socialists who had encountered Kropotkin did the same. In a lecture illustrating the differences between different strands of socialism, anarchism, and communism, Tom Mann, the British socialist and trade unionist, declared that had he been a Russian, 'he would have gladly burnt his boats and become a physical force revolutionist.'[89] This enduring sentiment illustrates the importance of representations of the tsarist regime in forming foreigners' views of Russian revolutionary terrorists and terrorism. Therefore, Kropotkin's association with terrorism in France was more heavily criticised and perceived as more dangerous at the time of his trial. Similarly, Kropotkin's associations with Louise Michel, commemorations of the Paris Commune of 1871, and her views on violence were more frequently perceived of as being more dangerous that his associations with Russian revolutionary terrorists.[90]

Examining Kropotkin's comments on terrorism in the mainstream media illustrates how he was not always in control his public image. Kropotkin published a small number of articles and gave several speeches in which he expressed his support for Russian revolutionaries' use of terrorism in limited circumstances. However, the case of the Chicago martyrs in particular suggests journalists were drawn to any comments he made of terrorism and often depicted him as being dangerous as a result. These representations echoed earlier negative portrayals of Kropotkin during his trial. Kropotkin's especially high profile abroad and his irregular public comment on terrorism may have produced these types of representations, which are in contrast to more favourable depictions of Stepniak and Volkhovskii who wrote more regularly for English-language forums about terrorism and had perhaps less prominent public profiles.

---

[88] 'The Trial of Anarchists: Prince Krapotkine's Defence', *Manchester Guardian*, 10 January 1883

[89] 'Mr. T. Mann on the Socialist Groups', *Manchester Guardian*, 9 November 1896

[90] Michel had spoken at the same meeting at the Anarchist Congress in London in 1881 at which Kropotkin was supposed to have called for new acts of terrorism in Russia. They both spoke at a meeting commemorating the anniversary of the Paris Commune in London in 1894, which received negative attention in the American press. 'Anniversary of the Commune: The Demonstrations were more Rabid in London than in Paris', *Washington Post*, 19 March 1894.

4.4 Kropotkin and the Russian Free Press Fund

Shortly after his early release from prison in 1886, Kropotkin travelled to England where he lived until his return to Russia after the February Revolution. In Britain, Kropotkin was instrumental in the formation and sustaining of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and Russian Free Press Fund, though he was officially not a member of the Fund as lists of members do not include his name. On 18 December 1889 he met with Robert Spence Watson, John Falk, and Stepniak to discuss the formation of the SFRF. In the absence of other émigrés or future Fund members then living in London, Kropotkin's presence was significant. According to Taratuta, Kropotkin 'did not share the hopes and enthusiasm of the participants of the meeting, but, of course, he was full of sincere sympathy towards their intentions'.[91] However, two surviving letters from Kropotkin to Robert Spence Watson suggest that, at least at first, Kropotkin was enthusiastic about the potential of the SFRF's activities. In January 1890, he requested more copies of the circular and pamphlets to send out, commenting that he believed Russians suffering under tsarist oppression would be 'thankful' for their work. He also offered to help smuggle copies of both documents into Russia through his contacts to spread the news of their anti-tsarist activism abroad.[92]

Kropotkin supported the work of the RFPF and SFRF as a result of his close personal relationships with their members. He had first become friends with future Fund members in the Chaikovskii Circle.[93] Slatter described Kropotkin's relationship with Volkhovskii as 'not the best: for Kropotkin the *narodnik-dogmatik* Volkhovskii was a figure from the past, lacking in political sensibility such as was necessary in émigré life. But on personal terms their relationship was imbued with the warm and profound friendship of old revolutionaries, united in the struggle against tsarist autocracy.'[94] Kropotkin enjoyed a similarly friendly relationship with Stepniak, commenting on his work and offering suggestions.[95] Kropotkin had known Robert Spence Watson for a number of years, presumably through Joseph Cowen, the Newcastle MP and proprietor of the *Newcastle Chronicle*, whom Spence Watson

---

[91] Taratuta, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 410

[92] Kropotkin to Robert Spence Watson, 28 January 1890. SW1/10/18, Spence Watson Weiss Papers, NCL

[93] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 90. Dmitrii Klements, the subject of one of Stepniak's profiles in *Underground Russia* and a close friend of the future terrorist, had first introduced Kropotkin to the circle.

[94] John Slatter, '"Chto eto ty, rodnoi, vse khrovaesh?". Pisma P.A. Kropotkina F. V. Volkhovskomu. 1894-1905 gg.', *Istoricheskii Arkhiv*, no. 5-6 (1997), pp. 157-8. Here Slatter published annotated transcriptions of Kropotkin's letters to Volkhovskii from LSE Special Collections Coll Misc 530, Folder 4.

[95] Kropotkin to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 322, ll. 12-12ob.

knew well. Cowen had printed articles by Kropotkin in the *Newcastle Chronicle*. The Kropotkin and Spence Watson families seem to have had a friendly relationship. After the February Revolution, Elizabeth Spence Watson wrote to Kropotkin and he thanked her for her 'kind words', expressing his regret that they could not share the 'joy' with Robert Spence Watson who had worked for the cause.[96] Despite disagreements with RFPF members and maintaining a distance from SFRF campaigns, Kropotkin remained on friendly terms with these people. The RFPF and other elements of the Russian revolutionary emigration in London relied upon informal relationships and personal networks as much as they did on formal organisations. Though the Kropotkins were not officially members of the RFPF, they assisted the SFRF in sending funds to Russia through their own contacts. Sofia Kropotkina also played a role in this, which historians have often overlooked. She reported news about these remittances to Robert Spence Watson alongside information about arrests and the seizure of illegal publications from Russia.[97]

However, at times, Kropotkin disagreed with Fund members as to the form and role of revolutionary propaganda abroad. In February 1905, he wrote to Chaikovskii, and copied the letter to David Soskis, returning an appeal sent by Volkhovskii. Kropotkin decided that he could not sign it because Volkhovskii had emphasised the importance of raising money to send to Russian workers, whereas Kropotkin felt that the most important outcome of the appeal should be to obtain expressions of solidarity and moral support with the Russian revolutionary movement.[98] Soskis had arrived in London in 1898, having escaped persecution in Russia for his revolutionary activism and struggled to make a living in Switzerland and Paris.[99] He took over the editorship of *Free Russia* when Volkhovskii moved to Geneva in 1904 and remained involved in the work of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and *Free Russia* until they closed.[100] However, similar to Volkhovskii's pragmatism in working with those he disagreed with on a theoretical level, Kropotkin's work with the RFPF and SFRF had mutual benefits. He worked collaboratively with the RFPF to build support for anti-tsarist and revolutionary

[96] Kropotkin to Elizabeth Spence Watson, 10 April 1917. SW1/10/24, Spence Watson Weiss Papers, NCL

[97] Sophie Kropotkin to Robert Spence Watson, 3 January 1908. SW1/10/25, Spence Watson Weiss Papers, NCL

[98] Kropotkin to Chaikovskii, 15 February 1905, in John Slatter, '"Reaktsiia solidarna vo vsem mire": Pisma P.A. Kropotkina D.V. Soskisu, 1901-1916 gg.', *Istoricheskii Arkhiv*, no. 1 (2001), pp. 56-7. Here Slatter published annotated transcriptions of Kropotkin's letters to Soskis from the Stow Hill Papers at the UK Parliamentary Archives.

[99] Barry Hollingsworth, 'David Soskice in Russia in 1917', *European Studies Review*, vol. 6 (1976), p. 77

[100] Ibid., p. 78

activity. He suggested sending extracts from the texts of two documents received for publication in *Free Russia* to the *Times* in 1895 as a way of reaching a larger audience.[101] Kropotkin also co-ordinated his public comment on Russian issues with Volkhovskii, seeing his own role as commenting on workers and Volkhovskii's as commenting on students.[102] Kropotkin's attitude towards working with the RFPF and its members seems to have been generous and comradely, bringing both parties benefits despite their differences in opinion.

4.5 Memoirs of a Revolutionist

When the RFPF published Kropotkin's memoirs *Zapiski revoliutsionera* in 1902, it was mutually beneficial for both the Fund and the author. The English-language edition *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* had been published in Britain and the US in 1899. Publishing through the RFPF meant that Kropotkin could take advantage of Goldenberg's network of customers, including bookshops and institutions such as the British Library. Equally, as a famous theorist and writer, Kropotkin's work elevated the status of the RFPF's stocklist and was an example of the members' attempts to offer a broad and non-partisan selection of publications. [103] If the book also offered the RFPF an opportunity to make some money to support their other activities, then that would certainly have been welcome. Around the same time, Kropotkin also supported the efforts of Fanni Stepniak to publish her late husband's literary works by editing them.[104] The RFPF's edition of Kropotkin's memoirs followed a successful English-language edition, published by Smith, Elder, and Co. in 1899 and by Houghton Mifflin in the US in 1899. The book was popular, a French edition was published in 1902, and Swan Sonnenschein published two further English-language editions in 1906 and 1908. The first English edition featured an introduction by Kropotkin's friend George Brandes, which the Russian edition reproduced, and added to for the 1906 edition in light of recent revolutionary events in Russia. In 1900, *Free Russia* printed a very favourable review of the English-language edition of Kropotkin's *Memoirs*.[105]

---

[101] Kropotkin to Volkhovskii, [30 or 31 January 1895], in Slatter, '*Chto eto ty*', p. 158. The documents were *zemstvos*' appeals to the tsar to increase popular representation in government.

[102] Kropotkin to Volkhovskii, [June or July 1901], in Slatter, '*Chto eto ty*', p. 162

[103] Hamburg, 'The London Emigration', pp. 321-339

[104] Kropotkin edited the translation of *Career of a Nihilist* (*Andrei Kozhukov*) and edited *Shtundist Pavel Rudenko*, which Stepniak had written in Russian.

[105] A. B. D., 'Bibliography', *Free Russia*, vol. 11, no. 1, February 1900, p. 11 [the identity of A. B. D. is unclear]. Though Francis Jackson Garrison worked at Houghton Mifflin but does not seem to have had a role in its publication of Kropotkin's work.

The repeated re-publication of Kropotkin's *Memoirs* is evidence for its popularity, as are plans that Kropotkin made with his agent for a cheap edition of the book in 1911-12 which also suggest that the publishers saw the potential for high sales.[106] Miller has argued that Kropotkin's *Memoirs* are a problematic source for information about his life as there were two principal versions, one in Russian and one in English, with significant differences between the two, and that some published versions do not contain the complete autobiography or contain revised sections.[107] Kropotkin was under pressure to make significant cuts for the cheap edition, though he thought it would be impossible to cut it by a third, as the publishers had requested.[108] Despite major differences between editions, the passages on terrorism appear broadly unchanged between editions of the *Memoirs*. This consistency in the text suggests that Kropotkin did not edit these representations for his different audiences or substantially revise his views on this over time. Though Miller argues that Kropotkin distanced himself from terrorism through his autobiography, the representations of terrorism within it clearly fed into contemporary narratives among Russian and foreign audiences of the justifications for terrorism.[109]

Through his memoirs, though it was not their focus, Kropotkin contributed to pre-existing narratives about Russian revolutionary terrorism then circulating in the West. He sought to correct misconceptions about terrorism in Russia and reinforced the idea that it was a product of specific historical circumstances:

> The revolutionary disturbance which broke out in Russia toward the close of the reign of Alexander II., and ended in the tragical death of the Tsar, is constantly described as Nihilism. This is, however, a mistake. To confuse Nihilism with terrorism is as wrong as to confuse a philosophical movement like Stoicism or Positivism with a political movement, such as, for example, republicanism. Terrorism was called into existence by certain special conditions of the political struggle at a given historical moment. It has lived, and has died. It may revive and die out again. But Nihilism has impressed its stamp upon the whole of the life of the educated classes of Russia, and that stamp will be retained for many years to come.[110]

Foreign journalists continued to refer to Kropotkin as a Nihilist throughout his life and he embraced the universality of the term's meaning in reference to the Russian

---

[106] Kropotkin to Cazenove, 5 December 1911. RP 7435, British Library Manuscripts. Cazenove worked at the Literary Agency of London, alongside the SFRF member G H Perris. Kropotkin queried selling the copyright for five years or 100,000 copies, asking what would happen if sales did not reach that level in five years.

[107] Miller, *Kropotkin*, vii

[108] Kropotkin to Cazenove, 2 November 1912. RP 7435, British Library Manuscripts. Kropotkin agreed the book was 'rather too big' but did not think it possible to shorten it by so much.

[109] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 151

[110] P. Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, vol. 2 (London, 1899), p. 84. This passage corresponds to *Zapiski revoliutsionera* (London, 1902), p. 280

revolutionary movement but rejected the idea that all Russian revolutionary thought had terrorism at its core. This aspect of his use of the term 'Nihilism' differed to that of Stepniak, who characterised terrorism as an essential product of Nihilism and embraced foreigners' use of the terms interchangeably. In the early years of the twentieth century, particularly after the Russian Revolution of 1905, such narratives equating Nihilism with terrorism and characterising Russian mentalities as violent and chaotic endured. Some foreign journalists seemed to have understood that Nihilism encompassed a broader range of political and revolutionary ideas than terrorism but seem still to have believed that the two were inherently connected.[111]

Kropotkin's depictions of the actions and motivations of Russian revolutionary terrorists broadly correlated with those in Stepniak, Volkhovskii, and other RFPF's members' writings. He suggested that the revolutionaries limited their use of violence and assassinations in response to political circumstances. He described members of *Narodnaia volia* agreeing to suspend attempts to assassinate Alexander III in return for political concessions that included Chernyshevskii's return from exile in Siberia, a special commission to investigate cases of exiles in Siberia, and a promise that no more revolutionaries who had participated in plots during Alexander II's reign would be sentenced to execution.[112] This supported Stepniak's core argument that Russian revolutionaries only used terrorism in certain limited circumstances where they had no other recourse to effect political change. Considering the debates among members of the Chaikovskii Circle, Kropotkin concluded that it was ironic those whom the regime had imprisoned and sentenced to hard labour 'protected' the tsar, proposing to bring about change through mass peasant uprisings. Specifically, they wanted to avoid a repeat of Karakozov's attempt to assassinate the tsar in 1866.[113] Principally, however, Kropotkin represented the use of terrorism as a direct result of the violence inherent to autocratic rule:

> People could not understand how it was possible that a Tsar who had done so much for Russia should have met his death at the hands of revolutionists. To me, who had the chance of witnessing the first reactionary steps of Alexander II. and his gradual deterioration, who had caught a glimpse of his complex personality, and seen in him a born autocrat, whose violence was but partially mitigated by education, a man possessed of military gallantry, but devoid of the courage of the statesman, a man of strong passions and weak will it seemed that the tragedy developed with the unavoidable fatality of one of Shakespeare's dramas. Its last act was already written

[111] Alexei, 'Nihilism: Its Moral Justification and Political Necessity', *Monthly Review*, vol. 18, no. 53 (February 1905). This article also reproduced the letter from *Narodnaia volia* to Alexander III.
[112] Kropotkin, *Memoirs*, pp. 256-7
[113] Ibid., p. 106

> for me on the day when I heard him address us, the promoted officers, on June 13, 1862, immediately after he had ordered the first executions in Poland.[114]

The representations of terrorism in Kropotkin's *Memoirs* were among the most popular and commented on elements of the book. A significant proportion of the book had originally appeared as a series of articles in the American magazine *The Atlantic* and prior to the publication of the memoirs as a book, the above passage about the assassination of Alexander II was reproduced in several American newspapers, both local and national.[115] The reviewer for the *Chicago Daily Tribune* received the book both as a source on the history of the Russian revolutionary movement but also as a story of a 'romantic and eventful life', noting that: 'While few will agree with his economic views, none can deny the charm of his work.'[116] Stepniak's enduring fame is also illustrated by the review in the *New York Times* which took an extensive quotation from Kropotkin's description of how the two revolutionaries met.[117]

The reviewer in the *Glasgow Herald* was clear about what he thought of Alexander II and *Narodnaia volia*:

> It must be added that Prince Kropotkin does full credit to the character of Alexander II., who was a despot, but a benevolent one, and whose duplex personality is well and vividly escribed in many pages of this book, which dwell on his freeing of the serfs and his relations to the later Nihilist movement, which he ultimately managed to convert into the campaign of terrorists at whose hands he fell.[118]

Reviewers clearly received positively Kropotkin's representation of the despotic tsar against the noble and self-sacrificing revolutionaries. Edward Garnett, publishers' reader, good friend of the Russian émigré community in London, and husband of Constance Garnett, heaped praise upon Kropotkin's blend of idealism and activism, as well as upon his various other books, in his review for *The Outlook*.[119] The *Glasgow Herald*'s reviewer similarly concluded that it was

> the expression and the picture of a singularly pure, candid, and unselfish soul. As the memoirs of a man who has given up all, and risked all for the good of the people, and tells his story without asking for praise or abusing his opponents, Prince Kropotkin's book ought to take an honoured place on the shelves of all who admire courage and ability united with modesty, benevolence, and entire forgetfulness of self.

Reviews of the book illustrate that readers engaged with Kropotkin's representations of revolutionaries as selfless and working on behalf of the people, and that terrorism

---

[114] Kropotkin, *Memoirs*, p. 244. This passage corresponds to *Zapiski revoliutsionera*, p. 411.
[115] For example: 'A Russian Tragedy', *Atchison Daily Globe*, 6 September 1899 and 'Assassination of Alexander II.', *New York Times*, 27 August 1899
[116] 'Among the New Books: Prince Krapotkin's Life and Views Make a Good Book', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 13 December 1899
[117] 'Kropotkin: Memoirs of a Revolutionist', *New York Times*, 30 December 1899
[118] 'Prince Kropotkin's Autobiography', *Glasgow Herald*, 15 November 1899. Noting that it was published the same day, this review provides an accurate publication date.
[119] Edward Garnett, 'Kropotkin-Revolutionist', *The Outlook*, no. 99, 23 December 1899, pp. 674-5

in particularly remained an important element of foreign observers' conception of revolutionaries' sacrifice for the cause. In this way, Kropotkin's *Memoirs* sustained the narratives put forward in Stepniak's work and that of the other members of the RFPF. He did so as a famous writer and, thus, kept these narratives at the forefront of popular conceptions of Russian revolutionary terrorism into the twentieth century.

4.6 Sofia Kropotkina

Sofia Kropotkina (1856-1941), formerly Ananeva, played an important role in popularising anti-tsarist narratives in Britain between 1907 and 1909, yet is largely absent from biographies of Kropotkin's life and work. As Miller points out, 'Kropotkin passed over his marriage in his autobiography and in general did not discuss his wife much throughout his life'. However, Miller's claim that Kropotkina was 'a dedicated and subordinate companion' oversimplifies her role in the campaign against tsarism abroad.[120] Reclaiming Kropotkina's role in the campaign against tsarism in Britain in these years highlights some of the ongoing themes among foreigners' interests in the Russian revolutionary cause. Kropotkina lectured regularly across Britain on Russian social and political issues and was known as 'Princess Sophie Kropotkin'. As was the case with her husband, her royal status was often referred to in juxtaposition to her revolutionary activism.[121] This was a little ironic, given that her actual socio-economic background was quite different.[122]

In Kropotkina's case it was also significant that she had turned to revolutionary activism because she was a woman. Foreign audiences became fascinated with Russian revolutionary women, particularly Sofia Perovskaia and Vera Zasulich, through news reporting of terrorists' trials in Russia and Stepniak's *Underground Russia*. Audiences responded to Kropotkina as an expert in her own right – her suffering and the slight misconception about her abandoning wealth in order to live as an exile were both important.[123] An article in the Dundee *Evening Telegraph and Post* about Kropotkina's upcoming visit and lecture in November 1907, though focused primarily on her husband's *Memoirs*, also acknowledged the role played by women in the revolutionary movement. It reported that they: 'are often

---

[120] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 297

[121] For example: 'Princess Kropotkine on her Husband's Conviction', *Boston Daily Globe*, 22 January 1883, 'A Princess in Dundee: Evils of Russian Autocracy', *Courier and Argus* [Dundee], 2 November 1907, and 'Princess Kropotkin: Russian Village Communities', *Manchester Guardian*, 10 October 1910

[122] Sofia Grigorevna Kropotkina was born Sofia Grigorevna Ananeva, Ananeva being the revolutionary name adopted by her father, a Polish Jew exiled to Siberia. Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 297

[123] 'A Princess in Dundee: Evils of Russian Autocracy', *Courier and Argus* [Dundee], 2 November 1907

selected for the most difficult and dangerous tasks, tasks which, whether successful or not, are bound to issue in death.'[124] Though representations of her husband remained an important element of representations of Kropotkina, she established her own public identity.

Kropotkina spoke independently for organisations such as the Ancoats Recreation Committee, giving lectures such as 'Russian history and the causes of the present discontent' on 20 October 1907, 'Siberia: Its riches and poverty' on 15 November 1908, and 'Russia: Its present political and social position' on 7 November 1909.[125] In 1907, Kropotkina was also invited to Dundee to speak as part of the Armitstead Lecture Series, established in 1882 for the benefit of people of the area.[126] In Dundee, Kropotkina spoke to a crowded hall about the history of autocracy and the tsars in Russia, arguing that 'Every oppression had been answered by revolt, and no nation had shed so much blood for liberty as the Russian nation. Russians were not cowards.' She also said that 'not much had been expected of [Tsar Nicholas II], because he was a man of very limited brain power.' The reporter noted that many of her remarks about the tsars and their behaviours had been met with laughter.[127] Kropotkina's words echo representations of Russian revolutionary terrorists as selfless and brave and committed to the cause.

Kropotkina was clearly valued as a speaker in her own right and her work in popularising narratives of the despotic tsar must not be ignored. Searching for the political activism of Peter Kropotkin in English language forums highlights the important work of Sofia Kropotkina in creating narratives about the tsarist regime and revolutionary movement, including terrorism. This case illustrates the urgent need for further investigation into women's roles in transnational Russian revolutionary activism.

4.7 Kropotkin and the Parliamentary Russian Committee

Kropotkin and his writing played an important role in the revival of campaigning against the tsarist regime in Britain in 1908 and 1909. In Britain, Kropotkin's anarchist

[124] Marguerite, 'A Princess on the Platform', *Evening Telegraph and Post* [Dundee], 1 November 1907

[125] 'Russian History and Literature', *Manchester Guardian*, 21 October 1907, 'Wealth and Misery: Princess Kropotkin on Siberia', 16 November 1908, 'The State of Russia: Mme. Kropotkin at Ancoats', 8 November 1909

[126] 'Baron George Armitstead of Castlehill, 1824-1915: Merchant, Politician and Philanthropist', Armitstead Lecture Trust. http://www.armitstead.org.uk/about.html [accessed 2 January 2018]

[127] 'A Princess in Dundee: Evils of the Russian Autocracy. Thrilling Tales of the Czars', *Courier and Argus* [Dundee], 2 November 1907

thought was no longer universally closely associated with terrorism, as a review of his book, *The Conquest of Bread* illustrates:

> The anarchists of the newspaper and the novel, who occasionally murder a Sovereign or a President, but more often kill a number of innocent bystanders, are either weak-minded fanatics or common criminals who have picked up a theory spun by more ingenious brains that their own and use it as a justification of their criminal acts. The real anarchists never do anything of the kind, or, indeed, anything at all, except talk and write; they theorize and lead blameless or harmless lives, at least in act.[128]

However, this review also illustrates the ongoing fear of terrorism and bombings as well as the popular characterisation of those carrying them out in Europe at the time.

In 1908, Kropotkin wrote two letters to *The Times* newspaper protesting the harsh conditions within the Siberian exile system and the rising numbers of executions in Russia.[129] Kropotkin included with the first of these letters an account of the exile system written by 'An Escaped Exile' and a reminder that the Committee for the Relief of Russian Exiles in Siberia and Northern Russia was collecting money to help them.[130] Members of the Committee included some members of the co-temporal Parliamentary Russian Committee.[131]

Kropotkin also supported the work of the Parliamentary Russian Committee (PRC) that campaigned against the brutalities of tsarist rule. A successor to the House of Commons Russian Committee, formed in 1908, the PRC's membership included MPs and two members of the House of Lords, as well as representatives from the fields of journalism, university education (mainly historians), social reformers, and both the Church of England and un-established churches. The PRC was linked to the SFRF through two members: the Liberal MP WP Byles and the journalist LT Hobhouse and the composition of both organisations was broadly similar. A list of PRC members, apparently reflecting members' status before the January 1910 General Election, includes 18 Liberal MPs, one member for the Irish Parliamentary Party, and 5 Labour MPs. Two other individuals listed, not as MPs, became MPs in the January and December elections, both for the Liberal Party, and the two members of the House of Lords were also former Liberal MPs. Though the Committee declared itself to be 'non-party', the absence of any Conservative MPs and dominance of Liberal MPs illustrates how closely the campaign against tsarism was associated with Liberal Party politics, as the SFRF had been. The geographical

---

[128] 'The Gentle Anarchist', *Times Literary Supplement*, 1 March 1907

[129] P. Kropotkin, 'Russian Administrative Exiles in Siberia', 11 January 1908 and P. Kropotkin, 'Executions in Russia', 14 August 1908

[130] Kropotkin, 'Russian Administrative Exiles'

[131] Members of both included the MP George Peabody Gooch. Frank Eyck, *G.P. Gooch: A study in History and Politics* (London, 1982), p. 462

spread of Liberal MPs was much broader than that of those associated with the SFRF under Robert Spence Watson, showing the growth in importance and attention paid to the issue. The non-parliamentary members of the PRC were dominated by liberal and social reformers, including for example Joseph Seebohm Rowntree. Of the other members, some others had prior experience of working with the Russian revolutionary cause. Despite his arrest and association with terrorism, the journalist HN Brailsford was a member. So too was Charles Theodore Hagberg Wright, Secretary and Librarian of the London Library, who was also Trustee of the Russian Library in Whitechapel.[132]

In 1909, the PRC campaigned against the planned visit by the tsar to Britain and published a pamphlet by Kropotkin titled 'The Terror in Russia'. The pamphlet and Kropotkin's contemporaneous writings emphasised the links between the violence of Russian despotism and the violence carried out by revolutionary terrorists. In a letter to *The Times* in 1909, Kropotkin wrote: 'You thus see, Sir, that the terrorism of the Government was not an answer to the revolutionary terrorism. The latter was a reply to the former.'[133] While his contemporary published writings rarely addressed terrorism, Kropotkin contributed to popular narratives of terrorism as liberating terrorists fighting a despotic tsar through his other criticisms of various aspects of tsarist rule. After the 1905 revolution, Tsar Nicholas II promised a constitution in the October Manifesto of 1906, however, any illusions of liberalisation were short-lived. Richard Pipes has argued that Russia would never have been able to achieve meaningful reform as lived experience and the theory of autocracy persuaded the tsar that authoritarianism was the only practicable and possible form of government for Russia.[134] Kropotkin linked despotism to the regime's cruel and barbaric treatment of its people, in prisons, in exile, and in the army.[135]

4.8 War, Revolution, and Death

The historian Matthew Adams has argued that by 1922, representations of Kropotkin as a terrorist illustrated little more than a caricatured stereotype of anarchism as 'a creed of deranged villainy', rather than any real engagement with it as a political philosophy. Adams argued that Kropotkin's actions during the First World War,

---

[132] Henderson, '"For the Cause of Education"', p. 83; Wright's appeal for funds to support the library (undated) survives among David Soskis' papers. 'The Russian Library', STH/DS1, box G-L, folder H-LAT, Subfolder H-HYN, Parliamentary Archives. The library was formerly known as the Free Russian Library and had been set up by the Russian émigré Teplov.

[133] P. Kropotkin, 'The Tsar's Visit', *The Times*, 29 July 1909

[134] Richard Pipes, *Russian Conservatism and its Critics: A Study in Political Culture* (New Haven NH, 2005), p. 184

[135] Kropotkin, *The Terror in Russia*. First ed. (London, 1909), p. 75

supporting the Allies against Germany had split the anarchist movement and weakened it.[136] Adams argued that the outbreak of the war was principally interpreted as being the fault of anarchists assassinating the Archduke Franz Ferdinand.[137] Kropotkin came to support the war and alliance with Russia as a means to oppose German militarism, despite his opposition to war in general.[138] However, during the war, sympathisers of Russian émigrés and refugees continued to criticise the tsarist regime, for example suggesting that Russian Jews should not be sent back to Russia as their persecution there was common knowledge and acknowledging Kropotkin's criticism of the proposed policy of deportation of Russian Jews who refused to enlist in the British Army.[139] Kropotkin even suggested that Britain should not rely on Russia as an ally after the war had ended, arguing that the Russians looked to Germany in the long term.[140] Relations with Russia continued to be influenced by narratives of revolutionary struggle of the tsarist regime which had preceded the Bolsheviks. For example, the American journalist Herman Bernstein reported that many Russian people 'prefer the devil to the bolsheviki' and had anticipated the German army saving them from the revolution. He used an article written by the former revolutionary terrorist Boris Savinkov that had been smuggled out of Russia.[141] Alexander Kerensky, the former head of the Provisional Government which had led Russia between the two revolutions in 1917, described the White forces as trying to reinstall a dictatorship in Russia in an interview with the *Manchester Guardian*. But not all Russian émigrés agreed that the forces fighting the Bolsheviks were worse than the Bolsheviks themselves.[142] Tensions therefore remained as a legacy of entrenched narratives of evils of tsarism and dictatorship in Russia which influenced foreign opinion about intervention in the Russian Civil War.

On his death, Kropotkin was in part remembered for his links to Russian revolutionary terrorism. The image of the self-sacrificing and brave Russian revolutionary terrorist in contrast to the cruel and oppressive tsarist regime clearly remained a dominant representation of Russian revolutionaries and Kropotkin, as the most prominent of revolutionary émigrés remained associated with it. Chapter Five will examine in more detail responses to such representations in Russian fiction in

---

[136] Adams, *Kropotkin, Read, and the Intellectual History of British Anarchism*, p. 101
[137] Ibid., p. 102
[138] Miller, *Kropotkin*, p. 220
[139] 'The Deportation of Russian Subjects', *Manchester Guardian*, 1 July 1916 and 'A Russian View', *Manchester Guardian*, 1 July 1916
[140] 'A Russian View', *Manchester Guardian*, 1 July 1916
[141] Herman Bernstein, 'Russia Betrayed to Germany, Asserts Kerensky's War Head', *Washington Post*, 16 May 1918
[142] V. Issaiev, 'Koltchak and Reaction', *Manchester Guardian*, 22 May 1919. Issaiev was a Professor of Chemistry from Warsaw.

English translation in the early years after the Revolutions of 1917. In contrast to the representations of Kropotkin in the early-1880s, at the time of his death these representations were less critical. The *Manchester Guardian*, which had roundly denounced Kropotkin as a dangerous terrorist at the time of his trial, instead looked upon his comment on terrorism more favourably:

> As a philosophic Anarchist he did not stand with Tolstoy, relying upon moral forces alone for social reform, but believed with Marx in the occasional necessity of physical violence or the "propaganda of the deed." He was prepared to justify not merely revolt but even assassination if it were properly directed and had "an idea behind it." In the destructive work of Anarchism force had its place as "the midwife of reform," though the constructive work of society was to be entrusted to the peaceful affectional instincts of mankind alone. The historical conditions of modern Russia visibly reacted upon his social philosophy.[143]

Much of this change in attitude towards Kropotkin might be attributed to the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, Charles Prestwich Scott, who had become an ardent supporter of the Russian revolutionary cause as a member of the SFRF and Parliamentary Russian Committee. Scott was the editor of the newspaper from 1872 until 1929 and after 1907 was also its owner. In these comments on terrorism and Russian society, the legacy of the work of the SFRF and *Free Russia* is visible.

British and American newspapers commemorated Kropotkin as a great hero of the revolutionary movement who had played a part in liberating Russia from the tsarist regime, problems with Bolshevik rule notwithstanding.[144] In 1921, foreign sympathisers could still celebrate the positive changes that had come about with the end of the tsarist regime. In 1926, even when it was clear the path of the revolution in Russia was quite different to the one promoted by Kropotkin, the *Manchester Guardian* remembered his old friend and revolutionary comrade Nikolai Chaikovskii as a 'social and humanitarian' activist, as opposed to a 'political' one, noting his opposition to the Bolsheviks.[145] The remnants of Chaikovskii's memory as one of the last members of the RFPF were encapsulated in J Frederick Green's speech at his funeral:

> He was almost the last left of that glorious band of heroes and heroines, many of whom it has been my privilege to know and to work with, Stepniak, the Bayard of Russia, Felix Volkhovsky, the dear friend with whom I worked so closely for many years on "Free Russia," Peter Kropotkin, the world-renowned man of science, Shishko, dear old Lazarus Goldenberg, that well-beloved man, Tcherkesof, the heroic Georgian – all are gone…May we not say of them as was said of old, of others, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen

[143] 'Peter Kropotkin'. *Manchester Guardian*, 31 January 1921
[144] 'Death of Prince Kropotkin: A Famous Revolutionary', *Daily Telegraph*, 31 January 192 and 'Death of Prince Kropotkin: Revolutionary and Scientist', *Observer*, 30 January 1921
[145] 'N. Tchaikovsky: A Great Russian Liberal', *Manchester Guardian*, 4 May 1926

them afar of them and were persuaded if them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth"'[146]

In 1921, it appears it was still possible to justify Russian revolutionaries' use of terrorism in the West as the memories of the evils of tsarism endured. However, as time passed, attitudes towards revolutionaries' use of terrorism, justified by their aims, seemed less comprehensible, as will be explored further in Chapter Five. All that remained of the representations of Russia and Russian revolutionaries were the powerful humanitarian discourses as promoted by members of the RFPF and their associates abroad since the 1880s.

4.9 Conclusion

Taking a new approach to Kropotkin not only by focusing on representations of him as a terrorist or terrorist propagandist but also by focusing on these in English-speaking forums, has revealed new aspects of the context in which transnational Russian revolutionary propaganda production operated in this period. Complementing the findings of Chapter Two, it illustrates that Russian revolutionaries' links to potential terrorist activities in the West were an important element of their reputation as being dangerous. Looking at the change in attitudes towards Kropotkin and his supposed terroristic views has revealed the extent to which changing perceptions of the tsarist regime and the activities of organisations such as the SFRF and Parliamentary Russian Committee altered views of Russian revolutionary terrorism across this period. Examining Kropotkin's own voice in representing Russian revolutionary terrorism for foreign audiences across this period, in alignment with the work of the SFRF and RFPF, has also illustrated that he represented this form of revolutionary activity as just. This contributes to wider understanding of Kropotkin's views on the nature of revolution. Focusing on English-language forums has also highlighted the previously obscured role of Sofia Kropotkina as a political activist in her own right.

[146] Barbara Tchaykovsky, 'Nicholas Tchaykovsky', *Manchester Guardian*, 31 May 1926. Barbara, his daughter, quoted from Green's speech in her letter which was printed in the newspaper.

Chapter Five: Sergei Stepniak, Boris Savinkov, Leonid Andreev and their English-speaking audiences, 1882-1926

5.1 Introduction

Reading fiction was an important element of foreigners' interactions with Russian culture, society, and politics between the 1880s and 1920s. Alongside his propaganda work, the Russian émigré terrorist Sergei Stepniak wrote and translated works of fiction for English-speaking audiences. Beginning in the early 1880s, Stepniak's work was a significant catalyst for a surge in interest among readers in Russian revolutionary terrorism that would persist until the Revolutions of 1917 and beyond. Readers and reviewers similarly received novels and stories written by the Socialist Revolutionary terrorist Boris Savinkov (1879-1925) and the Russian writer Leonid Andreev (1871-1919). In addition to increased interest in fiction by Russian writers, concurrently, British and American writers frequently used Russian revolutionary terrorism as a plot device or set their novels against the background of the Russian revolutionary movement. The popularity of these works demonstrates the broad appeal of such plots, themes, and settings. The specific appeal of work by Russian writers about terrorism requires further investigation, particularly regarding the relationship between representing authenticity and terrorism. Stepniak wrote sketches, novels, stories, and plays in English, Italian, and Russian. Savinkov and Andreev's fiction was translated into English by a variety of individuals, only some of whom were personally connected to the Russian writers and several years often passed between the publication of the work in Russian and translated editions. One aspect that unites these works, however, is that they were primarily written in emigration, which in Stepniak and Savinkov's case was forced by their revolutionary activities and, in Andreev's case, the belief that he was involved in revolutionary activities.

The use of Russian themes in fiction written in English grew alongside increasing interest in translations of Russian literature. Authors followed existing narratives of the despotic Russian empire. Edna Lyall's *Autobiography of a Slander* (1887), depicted the absence of the rule of law through unjust arrests and imprisonment, J.E. Muddock's *For God and Czar* (1892, new edition 1900) showed the persecution of Jews and Frederick Whishaw's *Sons of Freedom, or The Fugitives from Siberia* (1897) recounted the horrors of the Siberian exile and prison system. Russian topics also featured prominently in adventure fiction and this featured in a popular combination with representations of the evil tsarist regime to form a significant sub-theme depicting foreigners being mistaken for Russian terrorists and

revolutionaries and transported to Siberia alongside depictions of the horrors of life there.[1] Choi Chatterjee has argued that '[t]he American protagonist in Russia is engaged on a dual quest, one in which he has to outwit the omniscient secret police in Russia, and more importantly, redeem the nihilist and neutralize the power of violent revolution.'[2] This theme appears to align with the concerns of foreign humanitarians hoping to impose their notions of civility on Russia, as seen in Chapter One. Carol Peaker has argued that Stepniak formed the basis for many terrorist characters in fiction written in English, including in Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes*.[3] Contemporary terrorism influenced fiction, though aspects were exaggerated, for example, in reality the only death from an anarchist bomb in England in the 1880s and 1890s was the Greenwich bomber Martial Bourdin himself. The spread of revolutionary political ideas, particularly anarchism, among the lower classes also became a significant source of anxiety, as seen in Chapter Four.

There were also numerous examples of fiction showing foreigners being drawn into terrorist plots.[4] Julie Buckler has argued that British melodramatic fiction used Russia as a setting because it offered a new imaginary and conceptual space onto which specifically British and imperial cultural concerns could be explored.[5] The unknown and misunderstood aspects of Russian life, such as the revolutionary movement, provided the opportunity to explore the fears of revolutionary threats in Britain. Keith Neilson has also recognised the use of exaggerated stereotypes of Russia, including images of peasant suffering and the harsh winters.[6] Novels and stories about terrorist plots involving Russians taking place in places such as Britain reflected contemporary anxieties about imagined transnational terrorist conspiracies.[7] The Anglo-French writer William Le Queux used this in *The Great Plot* (1907). Neilson argues that these stereotypes and caricatures of Russia endured in British

---

[1] Examples include: Andrew Hilliard's *Under the Black Eagle* (1897), William Murray Graydon's *With Cossack and Convict* (1903), G.A. Henty's *Condemned as a Nihilist* (1907), and Tom Bevan's *Runners of Contraband* (1908).

[2] Choi Chatterjee, 'Transnational Romance, Terror, and Heroism: Russia in American Popular Fiction, 1860–1917', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 50, no. 3 (2008), p. 769

[3] Peaker, 'Reading Revolution', p. 49

[4] For example: William Le Queux's *The Great Plot* (1907), Isabel Meredith's [Helen and Olivia Rossetti] *Girl Among the Anarchists* (1903), and Joseph Conrad's *Secret Agent* (1907).

[5] Julie Buckler, ''Melodramatizing Russia: Nineteenth Century Views from the West', in Louise McReynolds and Joan Neuberger (eds), *Imitations of Life: Two Centuries of Melodrama in Russia* (2002), p. 56

[6] Keith Neilson, 'Tsars and Commissars: W. Somerset Maugham, Ashenden and Images of Russia in British Adventure Fiction, 1890-1930', *Canadian Journal of History*, vol. 27(1992), p. 485

[7] Barbara Arnett Melchiori, *Terrorism in the Late Victorian Novel* (London, 1985), p. 9

fiction until the publication of W. Somerset Maugham's novel *Ashenden* in 1928.[8] This chapter will suggest that the reception of Russian fiction about terrorism also changed significantly in the mid-1920s, rejecting the former enthusiasm for novels about terrorism as adventure stories.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, foreigners' views of Russia consisted of what Choi Chatterjee and Beth Holmgren described as 'contradictory responses of outrage and admiration'.[9] Anti-tsarist sentiments shaped Russophilia in this period. The threat the tsarist regime posed to the British Empire in Asia and the Far East also motivated much interest in Russian culture in Britain.[10] Translations of Russian literature appeared frequently, and there was wider intellectual and cultural interest in a variety of fields, including art, ballet, and the Christian pacifist anarchist philosophy of Lev Tolstoy.[11] Foreigners found in Russian literature ways of explaining their own social problems, including poverty.[12] Readers' enthusiasm for fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism across this period broadly coincided with rising interest in Russian literature, culture, and society among foreigners that developed in the mid to late nineteenth century. The popularity of Russian literature abroad also gradually increased across this period, though the pattern of the increase was specific to different countries. Rachel May has characterised the changing reception of Russian literature in America as a steady rise in popularity in contrast to that in Britain where interest fluctuated considerably in response to various political, diplomatic, and military events.[13] In the 1880s, Russian literature was increasingly valued for its aesthetics, in contrast to what May refers to as 'informational' translations that perpetuated negative stereotypes about Russia in earlier decades.[14] Turgenev became popular as a result of demand for novels focusing on social customs and values, his style, and his 'personal charisma', whereas Lev Tolstoy's work was well-received because of his 'moral example'.[15] In addition, towards the end of the nineteenth century, Constance Garnett became important as a translator of Russian literature, including prominent works that fused

[8] Neilson, 'Tsar and Commissars', p. 500
[9] Choi Chatterjee and Beth Holmgren, 'Introduction', in Choi Chatterjee and Beth Holmgren (eds), *Americans Experience Russia: Encountering the Enigma, 1917 to the Present* (Abingdon, 2013), p. 4
[10] Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock, 'Introduction: Against Influence: On Writing about Russian Culture in Britain', in Beasley and Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain*, p. 5
[11] Slatter, 'Bears in the Lion's Den', p. 37
[12] Chatterjee and Holmgren, 'Introduction', p. 3
[13] Rachel May, *The Translator in the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English* (Evanston IL, 1994), p. 12 and p. 17
[14] Ibid., pp. 13-4
[15] Ibid., p. 23 and p. 30

literary and political activism, such as Ivan Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons*, which she published in 1895. Interest in Russian literature in translation fluctuated in response to geopolitical and internal Russian upheaval, waning during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 but increasing after the 1905 Revolution in Russia.[16] During the First World War, publishers also began to bring out more translations, including by lesser-known Russian writers.[17] The reception of Stepniak, Andreev, and Savinkov's work must be seen within this context of growing interest in Russian literature and culture and in the context of enduring sympathy for Russian revolutionary and opposition movements.

Reading fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism was an important context in which ideas about the phenomenon were received, interpreted, and distorted. The national context in which culture is consumed and its views of the spaces and places from which it originates shape responses and interpretations. For example, the 'Russian soul' as seen by British observers draws on British, as well as other, intellectual traditions.[18] Russia also represented 'otherness' in British culture and offered the opportunity to explore new political ideas.[19] Exploring the reception of Russian fiction about terrorism in English translation therefore offers the opportunity to study a further aspect of the transnational phenomenon that was Russian revolutionary terrorism.

Whereas chapters one, two, and three primarily considered the representation of terrorism in propaganda work such as journalism, pamphlets, and non-fiction books, and Chapter Four considered between ideas, representations, and lived experience as mediated through the newspaper press across a similar period, this chapter explores the role played by fiction in mediating the relationships between terrorists and their audiences. The purpose of the fiction of each of these writers was different. Like Chapter Four, this chapter will explore how messages and symbols in fiction were distorted and undermined. Reviews offer an important way of reading contemporary responses to such works. Each of Stepniak, Savinkov, and Andreev all produced fiction about terrorism that may be classified as literary realism. Their plots, characters, and settings were informed by real-life terrorist activities. In this case, the works in translation did not directly inform ongoing terrorist activities in Russia, however, as in Chapter Four, we can see how representations of Russian terrorism in literature and views of the Russian other were mutually reinforcing in this period.

---

[16] May, *Translator in the Text*, p. 30
[17] Ibid., p. 34
[18] Beasley and Bullock, 'Introduction', pp. 7-8
[19] Ken Hirschkop, 'Afterword: A Time and Place for Everything: On Russia, Britain, and Being Modern', in Beasley and Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain*, p. 266

Though scholars have paid significant attention to fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism both in Russian and English, this chapter analyses models of ethical terrorism, particularly as part of representations of terrorists as individuals. This chapter adopts a comparative approach to these writers and their work, in order to draw broader conclusions about how such works came to be published in English and how successful they were, both critically and commercially. Equally, comparing their reception in Britain, Ireland, and the USA highlights the cultural specificity of reading Russian revolutionary terrorism in this period. This chapter also draws some conclusions about the impact of revolution on interpretations of Russian terrorism, and broader Russian culture, politics, and society, which is possible as the majority of these books by Savinkov and Andreev first appeared in English translation in the period after the February Revolution of 1917.

Reviews in newspapers and journals provide an important source for the reception and interpretations of these works among English-speaking audiences. In Stepniak's case, letters in his personal archive provide evidence for the reception of his novel among his sympathisers in political and social campaigns. Archival records among publishers' archives relating to these books have rarely survived, but publishers' introductions and advertisements offer an alternative insight into why they had chosen to publish these books and how they hoped audiences might receive them. Records relating to the sales performance of the books can give some indication as to their broad appeal, or lack thereof.

5.2 Sergei Stepniak

Sergei Stepniak's writing spanned a variety of genres. Not only was he involved in journalism, as discussed in Chapter One, he also wrote a number of books and translated works by other authors. His most popular book *Underground Russia* appeared in English translation for the first time in 1883, which helped establish the image he and his close revolutionary colleagues relied upon to facilitate the work of the Russian Free Press Fund and the Societies of Friends of Russian Freedom. This chapter will consider *Underground Russia* in tandem with Stepniak's first novel, written in English, *Career of a Nihilist* (1889). Although *Underground Russia* was very successful, despite publishers' requests, he chose a more instructive style for his subsequent books *Russia Under the Tzars* (1885), *The Russian Storm Cloud* (1886) and *The Russian Peasantry* (1888).[20] Reviewers praised these books for their insights into Russian society, politics, and economics, but none were as commercially successful as *Underground Russia* and readers compared his later

[20] Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 28

work to his first book *Underground Russia*, first published in English translation in 1883.[21] His novel, *Career of A Nihilist*, later published in Russian translation as *Andrei Kozhukov*, was published by Walter Scott published the novel in London in 1889, followed by a second edition the next year.[22] It was his only novel written or published in English during his lifetime.[23] The novel followed its protagonist Kozhukov, his terrorist cell, and their activities, concluding with Kozhukov's failed attempt to assassinate the tsar. Similar to Stepniak's three informative books from 1885-8 was his final book written in English, *King Stork and King Log: A Study of Modern Russia* (1895), which was more successful, going through three editions (subsequently 1896, 1905). However, even Stepniak's best efforts to shape his own image seem to have been somewhat unsuccessful. His fiction and related work established his reputation as a commentator on Russian revolutionary terrorism and his narratives of heroic and ethical terrorists. *Underground Russia* will be examined here together with Stepniak's novel and translation work as, as this section will argue, it shares common themes, readers' responses, and publication processes with these other works.

Stepniak's books established popular narratives and popular memories of Russian revolutionary terrorism among foreigners, who had gained some knowledge of terrorism in Russia through sensationalist newspaper reporting. British and American newspapers widely reported on the assassination of Tsar Alexander II and the subsequent trial of the terrorists, creating new symbols and meanings of the events as media lives and afterlives.[24] Lynn Patyk has called *Underground Russia* a

---

[21] His book *The Russian Peasantry* (1888) was a complete commercial flop and its publishers were still trying to recoup the advance they had paid on his death in 1895. *The Archives of Swan Sonnenschein & Company, 1878-1911*, ed. Brian Maidment (Bishops Stortford, 1973), Microfilm reel 14, vol. 27, p. 636; 'New Books and Reprints', *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 1 March 1890, p. 274

[22] David Saunders has discovered the firm distributed books from their Paternoster Square office in London but printed them in Felling, near Newcastle. Saunders, 'Tyneside and the Making of the Russian Revolution', p. 274.; According to John Turner, Walter Scott mainly produced cheap reprints of popular books However, they also published works by Tolstoy and Fabian Society tracts, alongside scientific works, literature, biography, and poetry. John R. Turner, 'Title-Pages Produced by the Walter Scott Publishing Co Ltd', *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 44 (1991), p. 323; 'List of Walter Scott's Publications: September 1890', in Sergei Stepniak, *The Career of a Nihilist*, 2nd ed. (London, 1890).

[23] Fanni Stepniak organised the Russian translation after his death and published his novels written in Russian, *Domik na Volge* (*The Little House on the Volga*) and *Shtundist Pavel Rudenko*, in Geneva in 1896 and 1900. The books were labelled 'Fanni Stepniak's Edition'. Kropotkin and George Brandes respectively edited and wrote the foreword for *Andrei Kozhukov*, published in Geneva in 1898, and it seems likely they assisted in the efforts partly to help Fanni Stepniak secure an income. The *York Herald* serialised an English translation of *Domik na Volge* from December 1896 but did not identify the translator.

[24] For example, 'The Emperor of Russia', *The Times*, 4 December 1879, reporting the attempted bombing of the tsar's train.

lieu de mémoire as it reinforced terrorism's impact by increasing its visibility.[25] By engaging with memory-making, Stepniak participated in the explicitly modern aspect of terrorism that was modern media culture. However, Senese has also suggested that Stepniak's 'tendency to write what he felt his audience expected, and hence to oversimplify and romanticize, grew stronger with the passage of time'.[26] The articles that were collected together to form *Underground Russia* first appeared in 1881 as a set of articles in *Il Pungolo,* the most popular Milanese daily newspaper of the time, the articles were collated and published as a book in 1882.[27] Reproducing and recirculating this material suggests Stepniak was aware of the commercial appeal of this type of work, indicating that it is necessary to consider the tensions between what he wanted to portray and what he recognised his audiences wanted to read in his representations of terrorism. *Underground Russia* therefore functioned as a lieu de mémoire, but it was also created in the overlapping space of different cultures.

Stepniak represented his stories of terrorists and terrorism as authentic and unique. Recounting the story of the failed attempt to assassinate the tsar in 1879, Stepniak wrote: 'I will not relate what is already known from the newspapers of that date. I simply propose to draw attention to two circumstances, as they were related to me by a friend who took part in the undertaking, and for whose veracity I can unhesitatingly answer.'[28] Stepniak promised something more, framing his accounts as personal observations and stories heard first-hand from the revolutionaries involved.[29] This technique was used by other writers writing about revolutionaries at the time, including by Sofia Kovalevskaia in her novel *Nigilistka* (*The Female Nihilist*) which Stepniak translated into English and which will be discussed later in this section.[30] Despite the fact that absolute secrecy was unnecessary as most of those involved in terrorism had been arrested or killed or had emigrated, accounts of real

---

[25] Lynn Patyk, 'Remembering "The Terrorism": Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinskii's "Underground Russia"', *Slavic Review*, vol. 68, no. 4 (2009), p. 76; Nora, Pierre, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Representations*, no. 26 (1989), pp. 7-24

[26] Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 9

[27] Bruno Rosada, 'Journalism', in Gaetana Marrone (ed), *Encyclopedia of Italian Literary Studies* (New York, 2007), p. 978. Collecting together his published articles before adding additional material was the approach Stepniak took to writing his other books.

[28] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 155; Newspapers at the time had reported on the bomb's effects and reasons why the terrorists had failed to kill the tsar. 'The Emperor of Russia', *The Times*, 4 December 1879. *The Times* described how they had dug a tunnel from a neighbouring house to lay dynamite under the tracks and noted that they failed because the tsar's train unexpectedly travelled along the line first, instead of following the train carrying servants and baggage.

[29] He described hearing the stories of the escapes recounted in 'Two Escapes', including Kropotkin's, first-hand at a meeting of revolutionaries in 1880. Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, pp. 161-2

[30] Sophia Kovalevsky, *Vera Barantzova*, trans. Sergius Stepniak and William Westall (London, 1895)

revolutionary activities in *Underground Russia* contained few concrete details such as names, locations, or dates. This made it possible for Stepniak to idealise terrorists with a sense of authenticity, but without necessarily celebrating their terrorism. Stepniak also memorialised failed terrorist acts, including the attempt by *Narodnaia volia* to blow up the tsar's train in 1879, representing them as equal to all activities aiming to contribute to the downfall of the tsarist regime:

> In Moscow alone, the Terrorists were fortunate enough to make at least an attempt. Yet it was precisely there that the undertaking seemed most difficult, and the probabilities of success much less, owing especially to the cyclopean labour, which required many men, whom it was difficult to keep concealed, and to the vicinity of the capital, where the surveillance was so strict. [31]

Stepniak also did not claim authenticity as a participant in terrorism. He concealed that he had assassinated Mezentsev, writing about the incident in the passive, and presented himself as a sympathetic observer of, rather than a participant in, terrorism.[32] This ambiguous aspect of his identity, as it seems likely that many knew the truth, helped him to gather support among foreign sympathisers. Stepniak's carefully constructed image of authenticity was removed from the truth so as to attract foreign sympathisers.

Advertisements for *Underground Russia* claimed Stepniak's authenticity, attesting to popular demand for such information about the Russian revolutionary movement.[33] The book's perceived authentic insight into Russian revolutionary terrorism was especially popular with reviewers. Even before the English translation had been published, a review of the Italian edition appeared in the *Saturday Review*.[34] Later, reviewers of *Career of a Nihilist* would also praise Stepniak's authentic insight into the revolutionary movement.[35]

One reviewer welcomed Stepniak's new insights into details about the Russian revolutionary movement and in particular praised the accounts of attempts on the tsar's life: '[i]t is the description of these attempts at regicide, and of the leading persons that took part in them, which renders the present work so full of interest.'[36] Though acknowledging Stepniak's explanation that terrorism in Russia

---

[31] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 155
[32] Ibid., p. 77
[33] 'Underground Russia', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 3 April 1883
[34] 'Subterranean Russia', *Saturday Review*, 12 August 1882, pp. 214-5. Senese suggested this encouraged Stepniak's move to England as, believing this publication to be a 'hostile critic', saw new opportunities for propaganda work, instead of the risk of extradition from other European capitals being the primary factor. Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 27 and p. 26
[35] 'Novels of the Week', *The Athenaeum*, 30 November 1889, p. 739
[36] 'Subterranean Russia', *Saturday Review*, 12 August 1882, pp. 214-5. It is possible that this anonymous reviewer was, or was associated with, George Saintsbury, a literary critic for the *Saturday Review*, who had worked with W.E. Henley, who had introduced Chaikovskii to

was the product of conflict between 'enthusiasm and officialism [sic]', or the will for change against an oppressive bureaucracy, the reviewer denounced the revolutionaries as morally deficient:

> although we may feel sorry for their misfortunes, we must not the less lose sight of the fact that they were assassins, and that those of their number who were sent out of the world by the hangman met with a fate which, in our own country, is meted out to men and women alike, if these chose deliberately to destroy human life without official sanction. A murder is not rendered a venial offence by the fact that its victim wears an Imperial crown. A woman who explodes a mine, utterly reckless as to how many inoffensive passers-by she may blow unto atoms along with the Royal personage to whom she objects, cannot fairly be held up to admiration as a species of saint, even if she has an attractive face or fine eyes…[37]

Though this reviewer did not find Stepniak's justifications for terrorism acceptable in 1882, Stepniak's justifications for terrorism in *Underground Russia* contributed to growing sympathy for the Russian revolutionary movement abroad. This process followed a similar timelines to growing acceptance of Kropotkin as not dangerous in the 1880s, as explored in Chapter Four.

Representations of terrorists in Stepniak's fiction and related work reflected his faith in the importance of individual action in the revolutionary process. His beliefs had led to accusations of Jacobinism among his Russian critics, who argued that even a constitution would simply be a new form of oppression for the peasantry.[38] Some revolutionaries saw his assassination of Mezentsev as vengeance and not an action on behalf of the *narod*.[39] Senese has identified some inconsistencies in Stepniak's revolutionary thought, with tensions between individualism and collective action, but this section will argue that Stepniak's representations of ethical terrorism remained consistent and shared common themes, incorporating the individualist terrorist with collective action, as seen in the analysis of Volkhovskii's work across his later life in Chapter Three.[40] Hardy has argued that terrorism offered a psychological escape from the failure of the 'going to the people' movement and identified in revolutionaries' memoir literature representations of an 'irresistible force' drawing them to terrorism.[41] However, Stepniak memorialised terrorism as a rational and ethical choice. Stepniak also transformed terrorists into symbolic figures through his use of allegory and separation of the terrorist from the act.

Smith Elder. Saintsbury became editor of the *Saturday Review* in 1883. Dorothy Richardson Jones, *"King of critics": George Saintsbury, 1845-1933, critic, journalist, historian, professor* (Ann Arbour MI, 1992), pp. 87-8; Alan Bell, 'Saintsbury, George Edward Bateman (1845–1933)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35908?docPos=1 [accessed 10 August 2016]

[37] Ibid., pp. 214-5

[38] Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, p. 663; Ulam, *Prophets and Conspirators*, p. 325

[39] Bachman, 'Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii', pp. 122-3

[40] Ibid., pp. 2-3

[41] Hardy, *Land and Freedom*, p. 157

In two essays in the first section of the book, Stepniak related the history of the revolutionary movement at home and abroad. He explained that Russian revolutionaries used terrorism after propaganda activities had failed because the propagandists were 'too ideal to withstand the fierce and imminent conflict.'[42] He depicted terrorists as self-sacrificing and committed to the people and represented their struggle as a fight for something concrete, freedom, not abstract ideas. His Terrorist 'fights for himself. He has sworn to be free, and he will be free, in defiance of everything. He bends his haughty head before no idol. He has devoted his sturdy arms to the cause of the people. But he no longer deifies them. And if the people, ill-counselled, say to him 'Be a slave,' he will exclaim 'No;' and he will march onward, defying their imprecations and their fury, certain that justice will be rendered to him in his tomb.'[43]

The second section of the book comprised eight profiles of revolutionaries, though not all had been involved in terrorist activities. Foreign readers would have recognised many of the individuals from newspaper reports, including Sofia Perovskaia, leader of the Executive Committee of *Narodnaia volia*, who had been prominent among the defendants in news reporting in Britain and the US of the trial of the conspirators who assassinated Alexander II.[44] Iakov Stefanovich and Dmitrii Klemens were former members of the *Zemlia i volia* movement, Stepniak having worked closely with Klemens on the movement's eponymous newspaper.[45] When the movement split over the issue of terrorism, Stefanovich had joined *Chernyi peredel.*[46] Franco Venturi described Stepniak's third subject, Valerian Osinskii, as 'the first man to organize terrorism on a wide scale in Russia'.[47] Kropotkin, who the foreign press had only recently recognised as harmless, was another. Dmitrii Lisogub was a propagandist who was arrested in 1880 for financing terrorist activity; he had given his inherited fortune to *Narodnaia volia*.[48] Three profiles of women followed those of the five men. Gezia Gelfman was a member of *Narodnaia volia* involved in the plot to assassinate Alexander II.[49] Vera Zasulich came next and Stepniak's final subject was

[42] Stepniak, *Underground* Russia, p. 31
[43] Ibid., p. 45
[44] A lack of agreement on transliteration and a fashion for Latinising Russian names means that in *Underground Russia* they appear as Jacob Stefanovich, Demetrius Clemens, Valerian Ossinsky, Peter Krapotkine, Demetrius Lisogub, Jessy Helfman, Vera Zassulic, and Sophia Perovskaia. Contemporary newspapers used various transliterations.
[45] Venturi, *Roots of revolution*, pp. 476-8
[46] Hardy, *Land and Freedom*, pp. 120-2.
[47] Venturi, *Roots of revolution*, p. 600. Osinskii was hanged for resisting arrest using a weapon. (p. 548)
[48] Ulam, *Prophets and Conspirators*, p. 320
[49] Ibid., p. 352. Gelfman ran a safe house for terrorists.

Sofia Perovskaia. The profiles emphasised the sacrifices the revolutionaries had made to the cause, including Lisogub giving up his fortune and Gelfman refusing to take time to grieve for her husband, another revolutionary who had been sentenced to death, instead continuing with revolutionary work.[50]

In addition to the essays, profiles, and stories in the English edition of *Underground Russia*, the second American edition of the book from 1883 also included Stepniak's short work 'A Female Nihilist', which the English publishers of *Underground Russia*, Smith Elder, had published in their *Cornhill Magazine* in 1884.[51] 'A Female Nihilist' was also then published as a separate short volume in 1886 in Boston, further illustrating its popularity. This account of the life of Olga Liubatovich is an example of Stepniak's writing drawing on real events and personalities, as included in the original edition of *Underground Russia*, although it was much longer than the profiles in the original book and recounted Liubatovich's life story in much more detail. Liubatovich was a member of *Narodnaia volia*, who in 1883 was in internal exile in Siberia and this work shared many themes with parts of *Underground Russia*.[52] In both *Underground Russia* and 'A Female Nihilist', Stepniak contrasted revolutionaries' boldness with police incompetence. For example, in the middle of 'A Female Nihilist', Stepniak revealed that Liubatovich had faked the suicide described at the beginning.[53] He also described how she had escaped her building being searched by buying a bag of nuts to eat while she walked past the police who did not recognise her, despite having seen her photograph.[54] Similarly, on an occasion where police searched Liubatovich and Nikolai Morozov's rooms, they did not arrest them, so the pair escaped in what Stepniak called a 'comedy they had improvised'.[55] His account of Kropotkin's escape from prison similarly represented revolutionaries, seemingly against all odds, outwitting police.[56]

In addition to receiving praise from critics, *Underground Russia* was also a commercial success. Published in Britain and the US in 1883, Nikolai Chaikovskii, representing Stepniak, arranged for the publication of the English translation by

---

[50] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 104 and p. 114

[51] The *Cornhill Magazine* published a variety of short and serialised fiction as well as true stories.

[52] Ulam, *Prophets and Conspirators*, p. 375. Liubatovich was arrested for the second time in 1881.

[53] Stepniak, 'A Female Nihilist', *The Cornhill Magazine*, vol. 3, no. 17 (1884), p. 491 and p. 485

[54] Ibid., p. 500

[55] Stepniak, 'A Female Nihilist', p. 507

[56] He recounted Kropotkin's escape from a prison hospital, including how the guards disregarded the advice of an 'old crone' who told them which route the revolutionaries would use to escape. Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, pp. 161-71

Smith, Elder, and Co. in London in 1883.[57] Chaikovskii introduced Stepniak to his contacts in the British labour and socialist movements and had previously shown the book to Henry Hyndman, Edward Pease, and Joseph Cowen, all of whom had expressed an interest in it. Hyndman offered to translate it from Italian into English to raise money for the Red Cross of *Narodnaia volia* fund for refugees and Chaikovskii negotiated to serialise the book in Cowen's newspaper, though, ultimately, nothing came of these plans.[58] Despite these early difficulties, the book went through four English and four American editions.[59] Each of the first two English editions consisted of a thousand copies.[60] *Underground Russia* was Stepniak's bestselling book and it continued to make a profit, though ever dwindling, until 1903.[61]

Reflecting the initial lack of commercial interest in the book, Smith Elder paid only twenty-five pounds for the exclusive rights to publish *Underground Russia* in English translation in Britain and the US and granted Stepniak a five per cent commission on sales.[62] This sum seems quite small when compared to estimates for Stepniak's living costs. For example, in 1895, the house where Volkhovskii lived at 56 Rylett Crescent, in the same area of London as Stepniak's home at that time, commanded a rent of seven pounds per quarter. Therefore, despite the thirteen-year

[57] Chaikovskii was introduced to the firm by William Earnest Henley. Chaikovskii probably translated Stepniak's note confirming he held the copyright into English as it was not in Stepniak's handwriting. Stepniak to Chaikovskii, 20 October 1882.Copyright agreements with Smith Elder and Company, Names beginning, Sp-Sy. John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, MS43148; W.E. Henley to [unknown recipient] 15 November 1882. Copyright agreements with Smith Elder and Company, Names beginning, Sp-Sy. John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, MS43148

[58] Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p, 25 and p. 27. Cowen had supported other political refugees in Newcastle, including the Hungarian revolutionary Lajos Kossuth in 1851. Unfortunately, no letters about Stepniak survive in Cowen's archive.

[59] Smith Elder printed four English editions in 1883, 1883, 1890, and 1896. Scribner printed two editions in 1883 and another labelled 'Second Edition' in 1892, and Harper & Brothers produced a new American edition in 1899, having published Stepniak's *Russian Storm-Cloud* in 1886 and *Career of a Nihilist* in 1889.

[60] John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, MS43148; Publication Ledger Number 18, pp. 481-2 and pp. 498-500 and MS43217. The English editions were exact copies of the original, this being the cheapest method of printed new editions.

[61] Records end in 1903, presumably because the copyright expired at the end of 1902, seven years after the author's death.

[62] Receipt from N. Tchaykovsky, 23 November 1882. Copyright agreements with Smith Elder and Company, Names beginning, Sp-Sy. John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, MS 43148; Publication Ledger Number 18, pp. 481-2 and pp. 498-500. John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, MS43217; Senese claimed Chaikovskii secured a large advance for the book, apparently basing this on evidence from contemporaries' memoirs, he did not state how large and evidence for a payment in addition to the twenty-five pounds is not clear in archives belonging to Stepniak or Smith Elder, suggesting the real total may have been this less impressive sum. Senese also believed there were three editions, but access to Stepniak's archive and copies of *Underground Russia* in various libraries has clarified some details. Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 27

difference in dates, it appears this sum could not have covered Stepniak's living costs.[63] It was also very small in comparison to the six thousand dollars Kennan was promised in his 1885 contract with the *Century* magazine for a series of twelve articles.[64] Kennan's personal fame seems to have been an important factor here.

Despite *Underground Russia*'s success and the renewed attention new books brought to his it, Smith Elder did not publish any further books by Stepniak and rejected his novel because 'the story seems to us to lack the dramatic interest which might have been expected from such a subject, and we fear would have little attraction for English readers.'[65] Stepniak also seemed unwilling to reproduce the format of *Underground Russia*, although as Senese has suggested, Stepniak's 'translator' William Westall encouraged Stepniak to write this type of book.[66] Westall brought Stepniak to the publishers Ward and Downey for whom they worked together over a number of years, including several works of translation.[67] War and Downey published *Russia Under the Tzars* in 1885 and arranged for Charles Scribner's Sons, the American publishers of *Underground Russia*, to publish it.[68] Stepniak created this book by expanding on his published articles. He then published his *Russian Storm-Cloud* the following year and his 1888 book *The Russian Peasantry* with Swan Sonnenschein and Co. These books also consisted largely of his journalism without alteration alongside varying amounts of additional material. The advance of £150 paid by Swan Sonnenschein for the completed manuscript for *The Russian Peasantry* suggests Stepniak's fame had increased.[69] However, Swan Sonnenschein

---

[63] Receipt for Payment of Rent, 16 April 1895. Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii Papers, HIA, box 18, folder 3

[64] Travis, *George Kennan*, p. 95

[65] William Westall to Stepniak, 21 May 1885. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 462, ll. 3-2ob; Smith Elder & Co to [Stepniak], 18 October 1888. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 433, l. 1

[66] Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 28. Senese believed Westall's role was to 'English' Stepniak's writing, though at the time Westall did not want to be listed as the 'translator' of *Russia Under the Tzars*, preferring co-author. He believed his name would help sales because of his novel *Red Ryvington*, published the same year. William Westall to Stepniak, 4 June 1885. RGALI, f. 11588, op. 1, d. 462, ll. 6ob-9ob

[67] Edmund Downey, *Twenty Years Ago: A Book of Anecdote Illustrating Literary Life in London.....* (London, 1905), pp. 111-114. Downey recalled Westall asking him to meet Stepniak at Charing Cross on his arrival, Westall having invited him to come to England as 'he was beginning to grow uneasy about his safety on any part of the European continent' (p. 111).; Westall met Stepniak in Geneva in 1883. Senese, *Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 28

[68] Downey, *Twenty Years Ago*, p. 113. Scribner's' archive may illuminate the circumstances of publication, though it is likely they were similar to other transatlantic sales of copyright discussed in this chapter. *Underground Russia* was similarly popular in the US, also going through two editions in 1883. Scribner printed another edition labelled 'Second Edition' in 1892.

[69] Ibid., reel 5, vol. 9, p. 932; Records surviving relating to the publication of underground Russia suggest Stepniak had only received twenty-five pounds in return for the exclusive rights to publish the novel. Ledger, MS43217, p. 481. Smith Elder Archive, John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland.; *Archives of Swan Sonnenschein*, reel 4, vol. 7, p.

were still trying to recover the very large advance they had paid for *The Russian Peasantry* on Stepniak's death in 1895, having become increasingly frustrated with him as the book failed to earn any money.[70] In an attempt to recover some of the funds, the firm asked Stepniak to publish another book with them, but rejected his suggestion in 1890 for a book on Russian Jews.[71] This type of book does not appear to have been particularly commercially successful, when compared to *Underground Russia* or *Career of a Nihilist*.

In 1889, Stepniak frustrated David Gordon, the manager at Walter Scott's publishing house, with his inexperience in preparing a book for publication and his efforts to make more money. For example, W.H. Dircks, the publisher's reader at the firm, politely requested he retain his copies of the proof for at least a day so Dircks could go over his copy too.[72] Later, sending Stepniak's requested 25 author's copies, Gordon warned him to be careful distributing them before the publication date of 15 November.[73] Stepniak asked for a higher percentage royalty than he was offered and Gordon did promise a higher royalty if more than 1500 copies sold, but also reminded Stepniak that booksellers also needed to make a profit from the selling price too.[74] Stepniak similarly wanted to make money from the American copyright. Gordon agreed he could keep the French copyright, but suggested Stepniak misunderstood the relationship between the British and American markets. He also suggested it might not benefit Stepniak to sell it to an American publisher as it would 'spoil the sale' of the Walter Scott edition there. In any case, an American publisher would want to buy plates to save the cost of setting up the type, so Gordon suggested Harpers could buy the American rights for the book included in the cost of the plates at 2s per page.[75] In the end, Gordon recommended Stepniak negotiate with Harpers himself.[76] Exasperation with Stepniak was, perhaps, not the sole cause. This arrangement satisfied the firm as it secured them payment at a time when their books were not selling well in the US, though Dircks noted that he divulged this 'non-

---

216 and reel 4, vol. 6, p. 424. The amount was reduced from £200, but no reason is apparent from the outgoing letter books of Swan Sonnenschein, and Co. why this reduction occurred. The initial offer was suggested before the manuscript and publishing agreement were ready, so it seems that some negotiations took place in this process and were perhaps influenced by the final book not being quite as the firm expected or increasing evidence that his previous book *The Russian Storm Cloud*, was not selling as well as expected.

[70] *Archives of Swan Sonnenschein*, reel 14, vol. 27, p. 636

[71] Ibid., reel 9, vol. 16, p. 450

[72] Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 7ob

[73] Gordon to Stepniak, 4 November 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 22

[74] Gordon to Stepniak, 11 May 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 6 and Gordon to Stepniak, 15 May 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, ll. 7-7ob

[75] Gordon to Stepniak, 30 May 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251., ll. 10-11

[76] Gordon to Stepniak, 24 June 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, ll. 13-13ob

officially'.[77] Publication was delayed twice between September and November at Harpers' request, although Stepniak also accused Gordon of delaying the publication.[78] Nevertheless, the book proved popular and Gordon approved a twenty-five pound advance on the new editions and promised to send royalty payments more regularly than annually if sales were good.[79]

When considering the success of *Career of a Nihilist*, it is important to consider the process of revision and editing that perhaps contributed to this success. Edward Pease undertook major revisions to the manuscript unpaid and Walter Scott's reader, W. H. Dircks, also made suggestions. Both initially responded positively and their suggestions for changes illustrate their differing interests in the novel. After reading the manuscript, Pease felt the novel was 'intensely exciting in places, + almost too painful' and praised its insight into the 'methods + customs of the Revolutionary Party' as well as 'their relations with the outside world, + with each other'.[80] He suggested that the story would be more realistic if Stepniak showed where the conspirators got their money from, was concerned that Kozhukov and his fellow revolutionaries showed no remorse for the tsar who they planned to assassinate or their comrade who blew himself up, and thought Stepniak should either omit or expand on Vulitch's unrequited love for Kozhukov.[81] Dircks was similarly enthusiastic about the novel, but conversely seemed concerned that it was too dense with detail:

> I read it very rapidly – sat up pretty nearly all one night to finish it. The later scenes I found profoundly interesting and moving. It is certainly a novel on that fire scale of conception and performance which give solidity to literature; and as an achievement in an alien tongue quite overwhelmingly, - if I may say so! My general impression of what seemed to me its defects, are that it was a trifle prolonged in evolution, that there were rather too many plots which resulted in nothing, and that there was too much iteration of the terms Revolution and Revolutionist, and rather too much presentation of the quite minor and insignificant details of conspiracy and propagadism [sic].[82]

After the novel was revised for publication, Dircks and Pease were both very pleased with how it had turned out. On seeing the chapter proofs, Dircks wrote: 'I did not tell

---

[77] Dircks to Stepniak, no date, RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 8

[78] Gordon to Stepniak, 10 September 1899. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, ll. 17-17ob, Gordon to Stepniak, 17 October 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 19, and Gordon to Stepniak, 21 [October 1889], RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 20

[79] Gordon to Stepniak, 24 September 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 24

[80] Untitled document following letter of 10 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 50-50ob

[81] Ibid., l. 53, Pease to Stepniak, 10 March [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 48ob-49, and Pease to Stepniak, 10 March [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 48ob-49

[82] Pease to Stepniak, 10 March [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 48ob and Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, ll. 2-3

you, I think, how much I was moved on re-reading the later chapters in proof; they made me quite bad. I hope that the miserable British public will be equally affected!'[83]

While Stepniak was certainly a competent linguist, having written *Underground Russia* in Italian, a language he had learned while in prison, and having written his later books in English, the process by which his novel was revised for publication reveals much about the editorial intervention which contributed to his success. Pease and Dircks made the text easier to read in English, making grammatical corrections, removed excessive adjectives and adverbs, and replaced words used in strange ways. These actions also helped to reduce the novel's length.[84] Both Pease and Dircks also suggested working with a native English speaker in person during the process.[85] Pease was, however, generous in his praise for Stepniak's writing:

> Your style or rather your English is certainly improving. Only once now + then one comes across a phrase which reminds one of your origin: sometimes a good phrase which the language is the richer for: sometimes very rarely the reverse…
>
> As to the novel…What do the critics mean by "a bad style"? Your style is good; we know that. Your English might be bad; that is the utmost. I mean this.
>
> The way you put things is sure to be good: but you may use phrases in connection, wh. are not colloquial. But your story is of Russians, + foreign ways of speech are as permissible as a French accent in a play located in France.[86]

Pease claimed most of his changes separated 'an easy + a clumsy sentence, altho' they can't be called mistakes'; he removed 'redundancies' but hoped to 'leave a foreign flavour'.[87] Even with Dircks' and Pease's work, Stepniak's writing retains its recognisable qualities of his flamboyant language, tortuous phrasing, odd uses of words, and mixed metaphors. This contributed to Stepniak's appearance of authenticity. Pease also suggested changing some of the characters' names: 'Do you think that the very long names are necessary to be given? They are annoying to the English reader accustomed to Jack + Tom + Joe +Kate + Mary + Rose. I have taken out the middle name of the friend of Repin. Two jawbreakers are surely enough.'[88] Dircks also requested changing '"bloody" ocean'; though he did not oppose using 'the

[83] Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 25ob and Pease to Stepniak, 18 November [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 73-73ob

[84] Pease to Stepniak, 4 June 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 66ob, Pease to Stepniak, 1 June [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, 63ob, Pease to Stepniak, 23 June [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, 64-64ob, Pease to Stepniak, 10 March [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 49, and Pease to Stepniak, 26 May [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 60-61ob

[85] Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 10

[86] Pease to Stepniak, 11 May 1888. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 36ob-37

[87] Pease to Stepniak, 4 June 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 65ob-66

[88] Pease to Stepniak, 23 June [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 64-64ob

strongest terms where necessary', he thought it unnecessary.[89] Stepniak relied upon Pease as he had on Westall, the only difference being that Pease went unpaid. It is clear his work was essential in preparing the novel for publication. Senese has argued that Westall's interest in Stepniak's writing was purely financial, referencing a letter from Westall to Stepniak demanding a larger share of the payment from the publisher. However, other letters illustrate that Stepniak also frustrated Westall by trying to obtain a larger share of money made.[90]

Stepniak had already changed the novel's title when he proposed it to Walter Scott, having originally offered it to Smith Elder as *The Enthusiasts* in October 1888.[91] Using 'Nihilist' instead of 'Enthusiasts' anchored the novel to contemporary Russian revolutionary activities and made the characters in the novel seem more serious. While editing, Pease changed some other terms of reference; removing the repeated 'the young man' to mean Kozhukov and questioning Stepniak's use of 'people', which he thought 'peculiar'. Pease felt many of the changes were 'necessary' but thought Stepniak should reject others as he saw fit.'[92] While not entirely understanding Stepniak's notes on the changes, he also believed any disagreements were minor.[93] Dircks and Pease also agreed it was necessary to reduce the occurrence of the words 'Revolution' and 'Revolutionist', as Dircks wrote, 'it is soon understood that it is conspiracy and conspirators that the story is concerned about, and it becomes needless to emphasise the fact by a continued calling-attention-to-it by the process of actual frequent designation.'[94] Additionally, Dircks removed flamboyant phrases such as 'dazzling beauty' and 'harmonious soul' and objected to 'a champion in the cause of their country' to describe Kozhukov because it read like a political pamphlet.[95] This correspondence suggests translators and editors influenced the published versions of Stepniak's works in important ways.

Pease and Dircks also edited the text to improve the pace of the action. Pease cut whole sentences he felt did not contribute. Though he reassured Stepniak he was not 'cutting out any passages', he later did, including a passage about a 'drunk man in a drosky seen by Andrey', as did Dircks with a passage discussing

[89] Dircks to Stepniak, 15 July [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 13
[90] Westall to Stepniak, 8 June 1885. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 462, ll. 12-13ob
[91] Smith, Elder & Co. to Stepniak, 18 October 1888. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 433, l. 1
[92] Pease to Stepniak, 26 May [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 62-62ob and Pease to Stepniak, 1 June [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 63
[93] Pease to Stepniak, 23 June [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 67ob
[94] Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, ll. 2-3 and Pease to Stepniak, 4 June 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 66ob
[95] Dircks to Stepniak, 10 August [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, ll. 24-24ob

'Repin's opinions'.[96] Dircks also suggested some changes to the first chapter to show how 'passion for the cause gradually dominates Andrey more and more until it leads him to what he absolutely knows will be destruction…It is alien to the admirable method of your story, to the artistic outcomes you show you know so well how to apply, to crudely entrust this special fact into prominence in the very beginnings [sic].'[97] Pease similarly criticised the revelation in the middle that Andrei and Tanya were destined to be separated.[98] Together these alterations suggest they were made with the reader in mind, who might want more suspense and fewer rambling discussions of political ideas. These changes made with the reader in mind, illustrate how these concerns influenced the final version of the text, which was received by some as an adventure story.[99]

Also focusing on the commercial potential of the novel, Gordon suggested Stepniak write a preface explaining the reasons behind the revolutionary activity: 'In the novel itself there is no exposition of the state of things against which the revolutionists contend; and without an indication of this the action of the personages of the story remain for the reader imperfectly motivirt. You have the struggle of the revolutionists against the officials but no sufficient statement of the reason of this struggle.'[100] Though Gordon felt this necessary, the widespread diffusion of Stepniak's justifications for terrorism meant that perhaps it was not. The first edition sold well regardless. Stepniak wrote a preface at Gordon's request for the second edition.[101] Widespread advertising surely contributed, consisting of advertisements in major newspapers and the distribution of 30,000 announcement slips.[102] Dircks advocated more extensive advertising, including distributing 100,000 slips, and increasing the book's price to 5s to increase the advertising budget.[103]

The editing and alterations done by Pease and Dircks notwithstanding, the representations of terrorism in *Career of a Nihilist* shared many characteristics and readers and critics responded to them in similar ways. Pease praised Stepniak's portrayal of revolutionary psychology, including 'the innermost feelings + thoughts of a typical member of the Nihilist party' and that Kozhukov was 'a mind freed from the cobwebs of conventional superstition + everyday ethics, + possessed by the new

[96] Pease to Stepniak, 26 May [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 61ob-62 and Pease to Stepniak, 4 June 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 66
[97] Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, ll. 7-7ob
[98] Untitled document following letter of 10 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 52
[99] 'A Nihilist's Novel', *New York Times*, 29 December 1889
[100] Gordon to Stepniak, 12 September 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, ll. 18-18ob
[101] Gordon to Stepniak, 20 September 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, ll. 23-23ob
[102] Dircks to Stepniak, 13 January [1890]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 31
[103] Dircks to Stepniak, no date. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 3 and Dircks to Stepniak, 20 February 1890. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 269, l. 32ob

gospel of devotion to the cause of the people', but that he was not a 'fanatic' and recognised life was 'precious'.[104] Despite his sympathies with the revolutionary cause, he felt the novel needed more 'shadow' in contrast to praise for revolutionaries:

> We can hardly think that all the Nihilists are as purely heroic as our author generously paints them…That the Nihilists as a party, are heroic + unselfish to the last degree, we do not doubt. But our experience of small fighting organisation of a more peaceful sort, leads us to suspect, that the people of strong character + intense convictions who naturally join such bodies, frequently develop various faults, + manage to get thro' a good bit of quarrelling amongst themselves.[105]

Pease praised the novel for being exciting and for its study of psychology. His suggestion that it was 'not a study of dynamite psychology', indicates he thought it had appeal beyond its representations of terrorism.[106] Pease's response, despite his broader interest in Russian revolutionary terrorism, illustrates how responses to Russian terrorists had changed in Britain since the first review of *Underground Russia* in 1882. Ernest Belfort Bax, reviewing for the British periodical *Time*, praised Stepniak for putting art before writing a 'polemical, didactic work' and believed Stepniak wrote 'objectively', without advocating terrorism.[107] However, there were negative responses to the work too. One negative response, from the *Saturday Review*, compared it unfavourably to *Underground Russia*, attesting that '[t]he Nihilist as hero has seldom been presented in novels in less impressive form than here'.[108]

As with *Underground* Russia, Readers also saw Stepniak's novel *Career of a Nihilist* as a reflection of real life. One reviewer suggested: 'if Stepniak does not comprehend the Nihilist situation, then no one else does. He may be too clever to disclose some of the methods in vogue by the terrorists, but it is supposable that he does tell what, commonplace to him, is very curious to those who most happily have no cause to resort to such measures.'[109] However, Stepniak's preface to the second edition of his novel suggests that he had hope it would be received as a literary triumph, as opposed to simply an exposition of the operations of the Russian revolutionary movement: 'my sole care was to draw truthfully a certain type of modern humanity.'[110] This dialogue between Stepniak and his readers suggests Stepniak hoped to correct their interpretations:

---

[104] Untitled document following letter of 10 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 50-51
[105] Ibid., ll. 51-51ob
[106] Ibid., ll. 53-53ob
[107] Ernest Belfort Bax, 'Literature Notes', *Time*, January 1890, p. 110. Bax was at the time then editor of this periodical, which was published in London.
[108] 'New Books and Reprints', *Saturday Review*, 1 March 1890, p. 274
[109] 'A Nihilist's Novel', *New York Times*, 29 December 1889
[110] Stepniak, 'Preface', in Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, x

> I have nothing but thanks to offer to my English and American critics, whose reception of my novel as a novel was so cordial, whose censure was so mild, and whose praise so free and generous.
>
> But almost all of them have persisted in viewing my novel as a sort of political pamphlet in the guise of fiction. They assumed it to be the summing up of the Nihilists' programme,
>
> both theoretical and practical, and very naturally reproached it for being exclusively negative in theory, and narrowly violent in practice.[111]

Despite Stepniak's assertions, even his publisher appealed to popular demand in advertisements around the time of the release of the second edition, asserting that the novel would 'correct not a few of the impressions gathered from who only know that society by hearsay and at second-hand'.[112]

Walter Scott also described *Career of a Nihilist* as a 'Nihilist Romance' in their lists.[113] This illustrates similar tensions which can be observed between Stepniak's literary aspirations and the popular appeal of his work as representing adventure stories. These responses to *Underground Russia* highlight the utility of studying this book alongside Stepniak's fiction. One advertisement for *Underground Russia* quoted reviews stating that the book could 'hardly be too highly recommended, whether as history or as actual romance' and was '[m]uch more interesting than the best sensational novel'.[114] However, Stepniak's preface to the second edition of *Career of a Nihilist* suggests he did not intend for his work to have this type of appeal. Responding to reviewers, Stepniak wrote: 'If I chose the characters of my novel and laid its action among the extreme or terrorist section of Russian revolutionists, it was simply because it seemed to me better suited to my artistic purpose.'[115]

Stepniak's representations of terrorism in *Career of a Nihilist* were influenced by real revolutionary experiences, complicating the division of his work into fiction and non-fiction. For example, Claudia Verhoeven has argued that *Career of a Nihilist*, and other works such as Savinkov's novels, illustrate how late nineteenth and early twentieth century Russian revolutionary terrorists experienced the passing of time in a distorted way.[116] Verhoeven has argued that terrorism itself was 'an expression of

---

[111] Stepniak, 'Preface', in Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, ix

[112] 'List of Walter Scott's Publications', September 1890, in Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, p. 60. The quotations came from a review in the *Athenaeum*.

[113] 'List of Walter Scott's Publications', September 1890, in Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, p. 60

[114] 'Underground Russia', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 3 April 1883. Quotations came from the *Daily Graphic* and *Daily News*.

[115] Stepniak, 'Preface', in Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, x

[116] Claudia Verhoeven, 'Oh Times, There Is No Time (But the Time that Remains): The Terrorist in Russian Literature (1863-1913)', in Thomas Austenfeld, Dimiter Daphinoff, and Jens Herlth (eds), *Terrorism and Narrative Practice* (Berlin, 2011), pp. 123-5. Verhoeven argued that 'temporal concerns' permeated the novel, particularly contrasting phases of inertia and 'feverish activity'.

political impatience'.[117] Stepniak's own experiences informed Kozhukov's forced inaction, including when, at the beginning of the novel, Kozhukov returned from an 'airing aboard', where he had written for émigré newspapers, and overcome 'in a few months the obstacle of language'.[118] Stepniak also highlighted his own frustrations with émigré life:

> Nothing was left to Andrey but to make a virtue of necessity. Time had blunted the edge of his first disappointment [his first request to return to Russia had been denied]. He had gradually made up his mind to the life of an exile, with its petty troubles and vexations, and its profound pleasures found in an unrestricted access to all the treasures of thought. Thus he passed three years of quiet uneventful existence, enlivened only by the feverish expectation of something new coming from Russia.
>
> He did not wait in vain. After a brief pause the smouldering revolution burst out with redoubled energy, and Andrey was eager to seize the opportunity. He sent a new request, which he urged upon his friends with an energy and eloquence that unfortunately were never found in his more elaborate compositions. There were no longer any grounds for delay, and after a few more weeks of expectation, George's letter was his answer.[119]

Stepniak's hopes for unity among émigrés characterised his hopes for *Free Russia* and *Letuchie listki*.[120] *Underground Russia* had also depicted the sense of lacking purpose among exiles: '[the exile] can only stand with folded arms, regarding with envious eyes the country where the combatants are fighting, dying, conquering, while they, sad and idle, stifle in their forced inaction, strangers in a strange land.'[121]

In the novel, summer also represented forced inaction:

> In St Petersburg the season was as dull as usual. The burning heat of the short summer, which is felt the more owing to its striking contrast with the rest of the year, drives away from the suffocating and miasmic town all who have the means to get a breath of fresh air. The summer season is that in which all Russia, both labouring and intellectual, hasten to the green fields, either for work or for repose. This produces a universal lessening of tension in all branches of the intellectual and social life of the city. Rebellion, like everything else, slumbers during the hot season, its combustible elements being scattered far and wide through the land.[122]

Venturi thought that Stepniak had been inspired by Chernyshevskii's *What is to be Done?*. However, this conclusion is problematic because Kozhukov does not appear to have been an ascetic hero and he also suffered from distractions, unlike Chernyshevskii's revolutionaries and radicals.[123] Kozhukov failed to kill the tsar, because he jeopardised a carefully-timed plan as on the way '[u]nconsiously he had

---

[117] Verhoeven, 'Time of Terror, p. 254
[118] Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, pp. 13-4
[119] Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist,* p. 14
[120] Martin A. Miller, 'The Transformation of the Russian Revolutionary Emigre Press at the End of the 19th-Century', *Russian History*, vol. 16, nos. 2-4 (1989), pp. 202-3
[121] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 93
[122] Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, p. 80
[123] Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, p. 333

greatly slackened his pace' because he was thinking about the life he and Tania might have lived together.'[124] Arriving chaotic and unfocused, he missed the tsar with all six shots from his revolver, was arrested and

> thrown in prison half dead. He recovered, and was in due time tried, condemned, and executed.
>
> He had perished. But the work for which he died did not perish. It goes forward from defeat to defeat towards the final victory, which in this sad world of ours cannot be obtained save by the sufferings and the sacrifice of the chosen few.[125]

Throughout the novel, love repeatedly disrupted the terrorists' activities. Another member of Kozhukov's cell, Zina, hoped to rescue her lover Boris but became irrational, endangering the plan:

> Zina's reluctant confession [that she alone wanted to rescue Boris] only confirmed what he had said to himself long ago. She was consumed by a slow fire. The constant suspense, the brooding over an affair on which depended Boris' life, was more than flesh could bear. A sudden bereavement was easier to support than this. And now her pain had reached a point when reason ceased to control her feelings. If she remained in Dubravnik, she would do something desperate, and only ruin herself to no purpose. She must be dragged away at any price.[126]

Shortly after this incident, Zina was arrested when the group was betrayed, so the reader never discovered what they would have done.[127]

As in *Underground Russia*, repeated failed terrorist acts in *Career of a Nihilist* contributed to Stepniak's cult of the attempt. He represented all attempted terrorist acts as important contributions to the revolutionary cause:

> He knew very well that he must, and would do his best, to make the attempt successful. The blow would be greater by far if the Tzar were killed, or at least wounded. But this was for the party. For the party the attempt was the essential matter, his own inevitable capture and execution were merely incidental. But in his individual brain the tables were turned. For him the essential was that he had to die. The attempt was a secondary affair, upon which he would have time to think when on the spot. In the meanwhile, he could not bring himself to take any interest in the matter. He had his own business to attend to – which was to die. The rest seemed not to concern him in the least.[128]

Though he blamed Kozhukov for his own failure, Stepniak also highlighted the constant danger of betrayal. Kozhukov was a flawed terrorist, but his flaws did not necessarily invalidate the legitimacy of the act. Instead they merely prevented him from being successful.

In the novel, Stepniak also explored contemporary moral debates about terrorism and the ethics of centralised, elite revolutionary movements. At first it seemed that Kozhukov had surrendered entirely to the will of the party, and thereby

---

[124] Stepniak, *Career of a Nihilist*, pp. 315-6
[125] Ibid., pp. 319-20
[126] Ibid., p. 176. This was the second planned attempt to rescue Boris.
[127] Ibid., pp. 214-5
[128] Ibid., p. 304

the people. But Kozhukov was no simplistic, one-dimensional, ideological tool. Stepniak explored how Kozhukov felt and made him experience real emotions such as falling in love with Tania Repina. Older generations of intellectuals had criticised terrorists for being selfish and self-destructive, but Stepniak illustrated that the psychological reality of carrying out an act of terrorism was much more complicated. Equally, neither the act nor the organisation defined the terrorist, as shown in Stepniak's approach to breaking up the content of *Underground Russia* and the lack of focus on organisations beyond reprinting the letter from *Narodnaia volia*. He showed that in order to understand terrorism, it was also necessary to consider the individual and their motivations and character and his approach also made it possible to celebrate the terrorist without necessarily celebrating the act. Divorced from the actuality of their terrorism and simply associated with its motivations, terrorists could be idealised.

Stepniak's writing must also be seen in the context of his extensive translation work, much of which he completed with Westall, contributing to the growing availability of Russian literature in English in this period. These works reinforced themes in his work and gave it further context, attracting sympathy for the Russian revolutionary cause. Westall and Stepniak usually translated works with revolutionary themes. The most successful appears to have been Vladimir Korolenko's *The Blind Musician* (*Slepoi muzykant*), published by Ward and Downey in two editions in 1890 and 1893, who also published a volume containing the pair's translation of two of Korolenko's short stories, 'In Two Moods' and 'Bad Society' in 1892. Korolenko's work was particularly popular in England and *Free Russia* printed his story 'A Queer Girl' in 1892 among their regular fiction items. Stepniak clarified the revolutionary themes in his introductions, for example when introducing *The Blind Musician*, he highlighted that the Stavruchenko brothers were 'Nihilists' as '[t]his is not put quite clearly in the story'. Here, he used the term to refer to a propagandist in the Russian tradition, although to a reader in English it may have suggested violence.[129] These introductions reveal what Stepniak hoped to achieve by this work, in addition to the money. He used his introduction to Korolenko's stories to correct misconceptions about the Russian revolutionary movement:

> The characters being taken almost exclusively from the student class, English readers may imagine that political struggle in Russia is carried on by children. This is not so. Russian youths are almost abnormally versatile and precocious, and the active life of thought and feeling begins with them at a much earlier age than with the youth of England and other European countries, and it is in Russian high schools that

[129] Sergius Stepniak, 'Introduction', in Korolenko, *The Blind Musician*, trans. Sergius Stepniak and William Westall. 2nd ed. (London, 1893), vii

> this activity finds its most earnest expression. This is a historic fact, and we mention it here only lest the reader should deem Gavrik's' psychological meditations too deep and complicated, and his views of life too broad for a young man of twenty.[130]

Stepniak wrote that Gavrik was 'typical' of the generation that founded 'militant Nihilism', or terrorism, noting that the group Gavrik belonged to in the story was 'engaged in an "actual conspiracy against existing institutions," to cite the usual official description'[131] As Pease did for his own work, Stepniak cut sections of *The Blind Musician* irrelevant to the 'action' or which would be unintelligible to English readers, including 'several allusions to the early history of the Ukrainian Cossaks [sic]'.[132]

Stepniak's introductions reinforced themes from his own writing, including the repeated exclusion or dismissal of women's contributions to the revolutionary cause. He described the character Velia in the *Blind Musician* as

> a girl of homely virtues, unable by nature to be fixed with any broad, social, or political idea…
>
> For one moment Velia seems aroused, but that moment passes; she is not born for political heroism, but for the modest work of devotions and sacrifice in home life. It is a striking testimony to Korolenko's artistic gift, that in a time when all are captivated with the opposite type of women [sic], he was able to feel the beauty of this one and reproduce it with such delicacy of touch and depth of conception.[133]

Pease had similarly described the character of Tanya in *Career of a* Nihilist as just 'a loveable noble girl, devoted to the cause', praising the depiction of her conversion to the 'faith' but seeing her as 'only part of the scenery which Andrey moves.'[134] Stepniak's work frequently alluded to the idea that women's contributions might be limited to less prestigious spheres of revolutionary activity. For example, his allegorical revolutionary movement in *Underground Russia* was exclusively male:

> Stefanovic was the Organiser; Clemens the Thinker; Ossinsky the Warrior; Krapotkine the Agitator.
>
> Demetrius Lisogub was the Saint.[135]

Like Velia, Gelfman appeared only in a supporting role as an 'obscure toiler' and though he acknowledged that Perovskaia had led a terrorist group, he praised her best qualities as a 'schoolmistress' and 'nurse'.[136] She was 'an organiser', but only

---

[130] 'Introduction', in Korolenko, *In Two Moods*, trans. Sergius Stepniak and William Westall (London, 1892), iv. Strange phrasing in the anonymously-authored introduction echoes Stepniak's own.
[131] Ibid., iv and v
[132] Stepniak, 'Introduction', in Korolenko, *The Blind Musician*, vi
[133] Ibid., vii-viii
[134] Untitled document following letter of 10 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, ll. 51-51ob and l. 53ob
[135] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 110
[136] Ibid., p. 111 and p. 127

Stefanovich was 'the Organiser'.[137] Whereas he dismissed Perovskaia's work by representing her as too feminine, he showed Zasulich as the opposite: odd, badly dressed, and introverted.[138] Women did not fit comfortably into Stepniak's idea of the revolutionary movement. He included profiles of revolutionary women, perhaps in response to their popularity, but did not celebrate them in the same way that he did men.

Stepniak's readers, however, were deeply interested in the idea of women terrorists, as, for example, Pease had been obsessed with Zasulich. Sofia Perovskaia was particularly prominent in Western newspaper reports of the arrest and trial of *Narodnaia volia* members for the assassination of the tsar in 1881. Her prominence in the West was similar to her prominence in Russian and Russian revolutionary narratives of the act.[139] Journalists focused on the contrast between her aristocratic upbringing and terrorist activities.[140] Buckler has argued that in British melodrama, women terrorists were not represented as being threatening or dangerous, seeing the origins of this in the Zasulich trial.[141] Stepniak's representations of women terrorists in *Underground Russia* therefore appear to align with pre-existing narratives about female terrorists which were familiar to foreign audiences.

Examining the production and publication of Stepniak's translation work also reveals some important elements of his work process and networks. Stepniak and Westall also completed a translation of the novel *Nigilistka* by the Russian mathematician Sofia Kovalevskaia, naming it after its protagonist *Vera Barantzova*. Fanni Stepniak's contributions to the translation of this novel were uncredited, but Westall suggested her translations were sometimes better than her husband's, including where she had written 'shawl for which you substitute "head". Now I am not very conversant with the manners and customs of Russian society and it may be presumptuous on my part to offer an opinion but I was disposed to think that Russian ladies are <u>not</u> in the habit of taking off their heads when they make a call.'[142] Fanni Stepniak's contributions were made invisible because of her husband's personal fame, which was used to sell these books, suggesting these translations were also

[137] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 139
[138] Ibid., p. 117 and p. 119
[139] Anke Hilbrenner, 'The Perovskaia Paradox or the Scandal of Female Terrorism in Nineteenth Century Russia', The Journal of Power Institutions in Post-Soviet Society, no. 17 (2016). http://journals.openedition.org/pipss/4169 [accessed 4 December 2018]
[140] 'Russia and the Nihilists: Sophie Pieoffsky a Chief Mover in the Czar's Murder', *New York Times*, 31 March 1881
[141] Buckler, 'Melodramatizing Russia', p. 74
[142] William Westall to Stepniak, 9 March 1893. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 462, ll. 67-67ob

part of Stepniak's self-fashioning. Fanni Stepniak did a significant amount of work towards her husband's novel too, particularly copying out the manuscript. After revising the manuscript, Pease asked if she would be willing to copy out the whole of the first part again.[143] Her role here was characteristic of the kinds of work women did which was publicly invisible but essential to the writing and publishing process.

Stepniak's translation work had brought him into contact with new publishing firms, including Walter Scott, which published his novel and his other books with Westall led to their translation work for Ward and Downey. Though Pease physically took Stepniak's novel to Walter Scott in March 1889, Stepniak was already in touch with the firm about producing translations of novels by Goncharov, plays by Ostrovskii, and works by Turgenev.[144] Pease closely followed its progress, reporting that Dircks 'speaks highly of it, so far!'[145] Having heard the arrangements, he wrote to say he was pleased they were 'concluded satisfactorily.'[146] Pease helped revise the novel, but Stepniak handled the financial negotiations himself. Stepniak's translation work must therefore also be considered in any study of his literary work.

James Hulse also believed Stepniak probably wrote the majority of Hesba Stretton's novel *The Highway of Sorrow*, published in 1894, based on Stretton's acknowledgment of an anonymous co-author.[147] Stretton was an English novelist and a member of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom. This is confirmed by Kropotkin's foreword to Stepniak's Russian-language novel *Shtundist Pavel Rudenko*, published in 1900, which states that when Stretton approached Stepniak about the book, he had liked the idea, compiled materials, and permitted Stretton to use them however she wished. Kropotkin noted that the plot, characters, and many chapters appeared exactly as they had in Stepniak's version.[148] She emphasised the truthfulness of the depiction of the persecution of the Stundists:

> I have written "The Highway of Sorrow" in collaboration with a well-known Russian author, now an exile in England, who has supplied me with the outlines of the story; especially with the prison and Siberian incidents, which he assures me are founded on facts. It would have been impossible for me to have done this work without help as complete as that which he has rendered…

[143] Pease to Stepniak, 1 June [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 63 ob
[144] Pease to Stepniak, 10 March [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 49ob; Gordon to Stepniak, 10 November 1888. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 1, Gordon to Stepniak, 13 November 1888. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, ll. 2-2ob, and Gordon to Stepniak, 16 March 1889. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 251, l. 5
[145] Pease to Stepniak, 15 April [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 57ob
[146] Pease to Stepniak, 21 May [1889]. RGALI, f. 1158, op. 1, d. 385, l. 59ob
[147] Hulse, *Revolutionists in London*, p. 48
[148] Peter Kropotkin, 'Ot izdatelei', in S. Stepniak, *Shtundist Pavel Rudenko. Roman.* (Geneva, 1900), iii-iv

> It is for the purpose of making their sorrows and martyrdom more widely known that the facts of their history have been woven into this story. There has been no exaggeration. The worst has not been told.[149]

The novel, therefore, complemented Stepniak's publication of evidence of the persecution of religious minorities in Russia as a justification for revolutionary activities, which featured particularly prominently in *Free Russia*. In his introduction to *Pavel Rudenko*, Kropotkin noted that Stepniak had written it at the time when the English public had opposed the treatment of the Stundists in Russia.[150] However, this was, perhaps, an overstatement of interest in the Stundists. Though readers in English were interested in the treatment of religious minorities, groups such as the Doukhobors had a wider and more diverse network of humanitarian supporters.[151] *The Highway of Sorrow* helped Stepniak by adding weight to his representations of the oppression of religious minorities in Russia, supporting his reasoning behind the use of terrorism.

5.3 Boris Savinkov

Like Stepniak, Savinkov was a former terrorist living in emigration when he wrote his novels about life in the Socialist Revolutionaries' *Boevaia organizatsiia* (Fighting Organisation) in the early years of the twentieth century. However, though Stepniak was known to some abroad as a terrorist, Savinkov's own involvement in terrorist activities was much more notorious. Savinkov wrote three novels about terrorism and revolutionary activities, published in English translation between 1917 and 1924. His memoirs also appeared in translation in 1931. Savinkov's novels provided a unique insight into the workings of the BO and, in addition to this, interest in Savinkov re-emerged in 1917 when he became Deputy Minister for War in the Provisional Government under Alexander Kerenskii and, later, a commander of the armies of the White forces in the Russian Civil War. Reviewers linked his novels as they were published to these ongoing events.[152] Savinkov's death in 1925 created another sensation when it was rumoured that he had been pushed out of the window from which he had fallen in the Lubianka prison in Moscow, having been captured by the

---

[149] Hesba Stretton, 'Preface', in Hesba Stretton, *The Highway of Sorrow at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1894), v-vii. The Stundists were Russian Protestants, influenced by German Protestant communities in Russia. Sergei Stepniak, *The Russian Peasantry*, vol. 2 (London, 1888), pp. 556-7

[150] Kropotkin, 'Foreword', iii. The Doukhobors had the widest and most diverse network of humanitarian supporters. Charlotte Alston, '"A Great Host of Sympathisers"', pp. 200-15

[151] Charlotte Alston, '"A Great Host of Sympathisers"', pp. 200-15

[152] 'War Books', *Boston Daily Globe*, 5 January 1918 and 'The Russian Spirit', *Manchester Guardian*, 10 January 1919; 'Minister Savinkov's Novel', *New York Times*, 16 December 1917

Bolsheviks.[153] The disappearance of his associate, the famous British spy Sidney Reilly, in Russia the same year only added to his notoriety.[154] Attending the Paris Peace Conference at Versailles in 1919, Savinkov encountered political figures such as Winston Churchill, who wrote about him in a 1937 book.[155]

Studying Savinkov's novels in English translation adds a new perspective to the extensive body of research considering his novels, particularly in light of the continuities in response with Stepniak and Andreev's works. Historians and literary scholars have used Savinkov's novels to study the discourses surrounding terrorism, primary focusing on moral debates about its use. In 1987, Aileen Kelly argued that Russian revolutionary terrorists stopped practising 'self-censorship' in the early twentieth century, resulting in the flawed individuals represented in Savinkov's novels.[156] Daniel Beer attributed the furore in response to the novels to controversies surrounding terrorism, arguing that Savinkov's representations of terrorism undermined late nineteenth century 'hagiographies' of terrorists.[157] However, while Stepniak frequently idealised his subjects, as in *Underground Russia*, Kozhukov in *Career of a Nihilist* was much more problematic, unfocused and lacking complete dedication to the cause. Savinkov's complex terrorists were, therefore, not an entirely new theme. Morrissey has argued that although SR propaganda used the rhetoric of innocence, violence remained problematic for the SRs. Ivan Kaliaev, who assassinated the tsar's uncle in 1905, appeared as both a 'lone avenger', operating within strict ethical limits, and as an inspiration for mass violence, as the SRs believed in a mass revolution.[158] SR leaders were never quite able to reconcile terrorism with other aspects of their programme, with wider condemnations of terrorism adding to their unease, such as the famous 'Vekhi' ('Landmarks') essays from 1909 that questioned the intelligentsia's role in society after the failed revolution

[153] Newspapers reports followed Savinkov's trial, the commutation of his death sentence to life imprisonment, and his suspicious death. *The Times* doubted he had committed suicide as the Soviet government claimed, but Savinkov's biographer believed it was unlikely they would have chosen this rather indiscrete method of killing him. 'Death of Savinkoff', *The Times*, 14 May 1925; Spence, *Boris Savinkov*, pp. 370-2

[154] Richard B. Spence, 'Sidney Reilly in America, 1914-1917', *Intelligence and National Security*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1995), p. 92

[155] Savinkov attended as Minister of War in Kerenskii's government in exile. Recalling the American Mission to the Paris Peace Conference, Stephen Bonsal, who had met Savinkov some years earlier in Moscow, emphasised Savinkov's unease, writing: '[i]n restaurants and cafés he invariably sits with his back to the wall and facing the entrance.' Stephen Bonsal, *Suitors and Suppliants: The Little Nations at Versailles* (New York, 1946), p. 20; Winston S. Churchill, *Great Contemporaries* (London, 1937)

[156] Aileen Kelly, 'Self-Censorship and the Russian Intelligentsia, 1905-1914', *Slavic Review*, vol. 46, no. 2 (1987), p. 194

[157] Beer, 'Morality of Terror', p. 46

[158] Morrissey, 'The "Apparel of Innocence"', p. 620

of 1905. In particular, Sergei Bulgakov described a movement led by 'children' who were impatient because of their egoistic desire to play the hero.[159] Scholars have also linked the critical representations of terrorism in Savinkov's first two novels to the contemporaneous Azef affair, particularly as Azef had orchestrated a number of high-profile, failed terrorist acts.[160] Scholars have also illustrated how Savinkov's novels provide insight into models of romantic heroism, adventure narratives, and the difficulties and intricacies of plotting terrorist attacks.[161]

Savinkov wrote three novels: *Kon blednyi* (*The Pale Horse*), serialised in the journal *Russkaia mysl* (*Russian Thought*) in 1909, *To, chego ne bylo* (*What Never Happened*), serialised in *Zavety* (*Legacies*) in 1912, and *Kon voronoi* (*The Dark Horse*), published in Paris in 1924. *The Pale Horse* appeared in English in 1917, translated by Zinaida Vengerova and published by Maunsel &Co. Ltd. in London and Dublin. The American edition, published by A.A. Knopf in New York in 1919, appears identical, though it did not credit Vengerova. *What Never Happened* was published in English by A.A. Knopf and in London in 1919 by G. Allen and Unwin.[162] These early English-language editions were published under Savinkov's pseudonym, V. Ropshin. William & Norgate published a translation of *Kon voronoi* by Paul Dukes as *The Black Horse* in 1924. Savinkov's third novel has largely been overlooked. Savinkov's last novel was a fictionalised account of the 1920 defeat of an army loyal to Savinkov's People's Union for the Defence of Russia and Freedom in the Mozyr region.[163] Though Savinkov wrote it later, after the revolutions of 1917, it too addressed terrorism. Investigations into how these works came to be published in English will offer some insight into what publishers thought their commercial appeal would be.

The Pale Horse and *What Never Happened* both incorporate a fictionalised account of events leading up to the assassination of Grand Duke Sergei, the tsar's

---

[159] Sergei Bulgakov, 'Heroism and Asceticism: Reflections of the Religious Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia', in *Vekhi: Landmarks, A Collection of Articles about the Russian Intelligentsia*, trans. and ed. Marshall S. Shatz and Judith E. Zimmerman (Armonk and London, 1994), pp. 26-31

[160] Alexander Trapeznik, 'V M Chernov, Terrorism and the Azef Affair', *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, vol. 35 (2001), p. 105. Trapeznik argued Azef's exposure intensified the process of 'demoralisation' occurring in response to repression in Russia.; Morrissey, 'The "Apparel of Innocence"', p. 639

[161] Patyk, 'The Byronic Terrorist', pp. 163-90; Alexis Peri and Christine Evans, 'How Terrorists Learned to Map: Plotting in Petersburg and Boris Savinkov's The Pale Horse', in Olga Matich (ed), *Petersburg/Petersburg: Novel and City, 1900-1921* (Madison, WI, 2010), pp. 149-73

[162] Though the Allen and Unwin edition was dated 1919, the British Museum acquired the book on 11 December 1918.

[163] Jonathan Smele, *The "Russian" Civil Wars, 1916-1926: Ten Years That Shook the World* (Oxford, 2015), p. 325

uncle, in 1905. They are often studied together, but as is often the case, the tendency is to focus on *The Pale Horse*. As the novels depict real events, historians have seen in the novels evidence for the malaise among Russian intellectuals following the failed revolution of 1905 and the Azef affair. Kelly, for example, argued they illustrated that the 'monolithic hero' in terrorist ideology had been destroyed.[164] In addition to the novel's roots in real events, Patyk has suggested Vania's literary roots were also significant, finding them in Dostoevskii's *The Brothers Karamazov* (*Bratia Karamazovy*).[165] The relation to real events would have been significant for readers of English translations as they received extensive and detailed news reports of the assassination of Grand Duke Sergei at the time. One significant difference between the novels was their structure. Savinkov organised *The Pale Horse* as a series of diary entries written by the main character, George.[166] In contrast, *What Never Happened* was much longer, and the text was not as fragmented and did not feature as much direct speech as *The Pale Horse*.

The Pale Horse's complex and controversial character Vania has no real equivalent in *What Never Happened*. Instead, Savinkov made the model of an ethical and moral terrorist a myth imagined by the youngest characters in the novel, who had no experience of revolutionary activity. For example, Bolotov's younger sister Natasha knew nothing about the terrorists, only 'hearsay', but believed them to be 'self-sacrificing' people.[167] Bolotov's younger brother Misha ran away to join the terrorists because he imagined them to be idealists, and, believing that he had no right to do nothing, wanted to willingly give his life for the cause.[168] Savinkov used Misha's death on the barricades in Moscow to comment on the futility of dying for the cause, but, at the same time, Misha's death represented the ideal, morally pure death for the cause.[169]

In *The Pale Horse*, events took place in the unspecified town 'N_ ', leaving the reader to imagine the location.[170] Peri and Evans have identified editions of the

---

[164] Kelly, 'Self-Censorship', p. 201; Anna Geifman, *Death Orders: The Vanguard of Modern Terrorism in Revolutionary Russia* (Santa Barbara CA, 2010), p. 60

[165] Patyk, 'The Byronic Terrorist', p. 175. Patyk's evidence was a letter written by Savinkov phrasing a question similarly to one from *Brothers Karamazov*.

[166] In the Russian '*Zhordzh*', as opposed to the Russian Iuri. Boris Savinkov, 'Kon blednyi', in Boris Savinkov, *Izbrannoe* (Moscow, 1990), p. 309

[167] V. Ropshin, *What Never Happened,* trans. Thomas Seltzer (New York, 1917), p. 55

[168] Ibid., p. 144

[169] Ibid., p. 160

[170] Russian novelists commonly used this technique. Dostoevskii similarly referred to real streets and places in St. Petersburg in *Crime and Punishment*, which Constance Garnett preserved in her English translation, including 'K. Bridge'. Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, trans. Constance Garnett. Introduction and Notes by Keith Carabine (Ware, 2000), p. 3. Dostoevskii used real initials, enabling researchers to map locations in his

novel referring to 'Moscow' instead of 'N', but Vengerova's translation preserved the original.[171] Savinkov described other real places without naming them, such as the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow, which became the 'white temple' beside the river.[172] In contrast, *What Never Happened* used real place names and Savinkov specified that the main events took place in Moscow and St Petersburg. *What Never Happened* also described in more detail peripheral revolutionary activities, including a failed uprising and Savinkov gave his main terrorist, Andrei Bolotov, a history, whereas George in *The Pale Horse* was much more mysterious.[173]

The revolutionary party's influence on terrorist activity is clearer in *What Never Happened*. In *The Pale Horse*, the party was an unspecified, distant body, and George only had contact with the Central Committee through Andrei Petrovich, a mysterious character who visited him several times. Illustrating the party's distance from the terrorists, George told Andrei Petrovich at their first meeting in the novel that the terrorists would continue their activities even if the Central Committee were to pass a resolution ending their work.[174] Instead, in *What Never Happened*, Savinkov developed the characters of each of the members of the Central Committee, including, for example, Arseny Ivanovich, who was proud of his peasant origins.[175] The party was at the foreground of *What Never Happened* and Bolotov and his brother Misha regularly consulted with the committee about their plans.[176] Despite this, Savinkov represented the Central Committee in *What Never Happened* as ineffective: 'neither were they the masters of the revolution, and their attempts to direct it were always and invariably futile'.[177] Only the character David imagined the party to be anything other than a small group of theoreticians and activists. He then later became further detached from reality, allowed himself to be captured easily carrying a revolver, and was executed.[178]

While scholars have focused on Vania's links to Kaliaev, English readers might have been more interested in Savinkov's own links with England, which he

---

novel. Savinkov, however, made them up. Carabine, 'The St. Petersburg of *Crime and Punishment*', xxxiv

[171] Peri and Evans, 'How Terrorists Learned to Map', p. 151

[172] V. Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, trans. Z. Vengerova. (Dublin, 1917), p. 74. The assassination took place at the 'Surikov house'. Vasilii Surikov was a Russian painter and his house may have been a clue to the real location. (p. 128)

[173] Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, p. 161

[174] Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, pp. 20-2

[175] Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, pp. 15-6

[176] Ibid., p. 15 and pp. 146-52. Misha wanted to join the Party like his brother.

[177] Ibid., p. 17

[178] Ibid., p. 34. 'He was not disturbed by the fact that there were almost no revolutionists in his town. He thought that this committee was an exception, that in other more fortunate towns there were thousands of devoted Party members.'

used in *The Pale Horse*. He named the main character George O'Brien and never revealed his real name, but it was clear this was a pseudonym, as he noted that George was not English and could not speak English.[179] After the assassination George lived in hiding with 'no name', but Andrei Petrovich continued to call him George, as other characters had done so throughout the novel.[180] It was as if he was anonymous to them too. Savinkov suggested that the police also knew him by this name, as George was tempted to reveal himself by whispering it in the ear of the secret police chief he met by chance at a hotel.[181] In his memoirs, Savinkov revealed that he had used an English passport to travel back to Russia for the assassination of Viacheslav von Plehve in the summer of 1904 and Kaliaev, accompanying him, had used a 'Russian (Jewish)' one.[182] A British passport was a powerful tool for revolutionaries, as shown by the case involving Henry Brailsford, an SFRF member, who had procured English passports for three Russians he believed to be returning to Russian to engage in peaceful activism. One of the passports, in the name of his friend Arthur McCulloch, however, was found on the body of a terrorist who had died when his bomb exploded at the Hotel Bristol in St Petersburg in 1905. Brailsford admitted what he had done when assured no criminal action would be taken as he claimed he had not given the passport to that particular individual. Russian pressure on the British government to try the pair escalated the affair. The court fined them £100 each and denied them the right to give their own statements.[183] As the trial approached, Brailsford wrote to Lazar Goldenberg, manager of the Russian Free Press Fund (RFPF):

> I remember the story you told about Lord Derby assisting the Italians by allowing them to steal passports. Could you tell me where you read this? It would make a most effective story for my advocate to tell. If you know any others as good, I should be grateful for them…I am quite glad to be "a political" at last – it is like taking one's degree in politics.[184]

Writing to David Soskis, then editor of *Free Russia*, Brailsford asked him to send details of his case to the Russian underground press so they would know English men were taking risks on their behalf, but maintained he had never intended the passports to be used for as they were.[185] Brailsford was apparently unwittingly drawn

[179] Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, p. 1 and p. 14
[180] Ibid., p. 140 and p. 131
[181] Ibid., pp. 155-6
[182] Savinkov, *Memoirs of a Terrorist*, p. 20
[183] F.M. Leventhal, *The Last Dissenter: H.N. Brailsford and His World* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 52-5
[184] H.N. Brailsford to Goldenberg, 15 May [1905]. GARF, f. 5799, op. 1, d. 126, ll. 1-2ob
[185] Leventhal, *Last Dissenter*, p. 55

into a terrorist plot similar to those featured in popular contemporary fiction.[186] Savinkov illustrated the power of the British passport in *The Pale Horse*, when George read from the passport: '"We, Henry Charles Keith Petty Fitz-Maurice, Marquess of Lansdowne, Earl Wycombe, etc. As I don't know English, I pronounced the syllables slowly one after another" followed with a threat to telegraph the embassy when he thought he had been discovered as the man returning his passport after registering it at a hotel asked him what religion he was, information the passport contained.'[187] Brailsford's case may have been familiar to readers of Savinkov's novel in Britain.

British and American readers would also have recognised the terrorist acts in *The Pale Horse* and *What Never Happened* from newspaper coverage of Grand Duke Sergei's assassination in 1905, accounts of which were reprinted over a number of years. Reviews of these novels usually noted Savinkov's involvement in the grand duke's assassination.[188] Savinkov's writing also reflected the gory detail with which English and American newspapers reported the assassination.[189] Savinkov fictionalised the events by changing the terrorists' targets. In *The Pale Horse* the target was the city governor of 'N.' and in *What Never Happened* a prosecutor. Like Grand Duke Sergei, these officials were important symbols of the regime and its oppressive powers. However, Savinkov also retained specific details, including the bombing of the carriage, which Anna Geifman has argued was a 'trademark of the SR assassinations' by 1905.[190] Both novels included a moment when the terrorist looked his target in the eyes and saw fear, but in reality, Kaliaev had thrown the bomb under the carriage's wheels and not through the window.[191] An addition to *What Never Happened* not in *The Pale Horse*, Savinkov described seeing the carriage's driver die, suggesting this was an important memory of the scene for him.[192] In addition to the assassination, *What Never Happened* also referenced real events from the time, including the Russo-Japanese War of 1905 and the

---

[186] Examples included Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent*, Olivia and Helen Rossetti's *A Girl Among the Anarchists* (1903), and novels by William Le Queux, which David Stafford has argued fed into popular xenophobic narratives. David Stafford, 'Conspiracy and Xenophobia: The Popular Spy Novels of William Le Queux, 1893-1914', *Europa*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1981), pp. 163-87

[187] Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, pp. 62-3. Lansdowne was Foreign Secretary at the time of the assassination of the grand duke.

[188] For example: 'The Pale Horse', *New York Times*, 24 August 1919

[189] For example: 'Grand Duke Serge Killed by a Bomb, *The Times*, 18 February 1905; Charles E. Hands, 'The Murdered Grand Duke', *Daily Mail*, 20 February 1905; 'Terrorist Bomb Slays Sergius: Czar's Uncle Blown to Pieces in Moscow', *New York Times*, 18 February 1905

[190] Geifman, *Death Orders*, p. 30

[191] Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, p. 128; Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, p. 270

[192] Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, pp. 270-1

assassination of von Plehve.[193] The characters responded to these events, as for example when Misha spoke about the massacre of protestors in St Petersburg on Bloody Sunday in 1905 or the party's surprise at uprisings that year.[194] Integrating the events of the novel into real revolutionary events made the fictional elements seem more realistic and authentic. However, this also added to the justifications for terrorism in the novel, applying the problem to the real fight against the tsar.

The novel also reflected the theme of 'fatherlessness' present in examples of fiction about Russian radicals and revolutionaries in the late nineteenth century. In the novel, Bolotov's father, a retired general, represented the regimes values of militarism and Orthodox religion.[195] Misha argues with their father about his political beliefs, but stops short of declaring his support for the party because he does not want to upset his mother further.[196] Both Bolotov and Misha are shown to reject their father's values and way of life in favour of what Savinkov depicted as a more purposeful life, despite the allusion that Misha's death for the cause was unnecessary.

Both *The Pale Horse* and *What Never Happened* appeared in English translation in 1917 and received significant attention from reviewers in newspapers and literary journals. Vengerova's translation of *The Pale Horse* was published by Maunsel and Co., a Dublin based publishing house, in 1917 for Britain and Ireland, and then in New York by Alfred A. Knopf in 1919.[197] Knopf had previously published *What Never Happened* in 1917, and it was published in London by George Allen and Unwin in 1919.[198] Both Knopf's *Pale Horse* and *What Never Happened* printed Savinkov's name alongside Ropshin's, making explicit his real identity. Maunsel and Co. printed the novel as part of their Modern Russian Library series, part of efforts after 1910 to increase the firm's reputation outside of Ireland.[199] Originally, the firm had been founded in 1905 to publish 'books *about* Ireland *in* Ireland' and played an important role in the Irish literary revival.[200] Choosing to publish works by Chekhov and Dostoevskii, among others, suggests the firm selected them based on the

---

[193] Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, p. 9
[194] Ibid., p. 56 and p. 66
[195] Ibid., p. 58
[196] Ibid., p. 64
[197] The editions were identical, and both were marked 'Printed by T. and A. Constable, Edinburgh, Scotland', except for different title page appearing in the Knopf edition, which identified the author: 'By "Ropshin"/ [Boris Savinkov]/ Author of "What Never Happened"
[198] Allen and Unwin's *What Never Happened* was identical to Knopf's, including the binding, except without Knopf's introductory note.
[199] Jane French, 'A History of the House of Maunsel and a Bibliography of Certain of its Publications' (MLitt dissertation, Trinity College Dublin, 1969), p. 37
[200] Colin Reid, *The Lost Ireland of Stephen Gwynn: Irish Constitutional Nationalism and Cultural Politics, 1864-1950* (Manchester, 2011), pp. 67-8 [italics in original]

authors' proven popularity in English translation. In 1916, the firm's edition of Korolenko's *Blind Musician*, intended for the Modern Russian Library series was being set up by the printers, probably also in response to Stepniak's successful translation.[201]

Vengerova (1867-1941) was a translator and Symbolist writer, who primarily translated European modernist literature into Russian. *The Pale Horse* was one of few translations she made from Russian into English. Vengerova travelled around Europe, studying and later speaking and writing, from the late-1880s onwards, including speaking on Russian literature at Liverpool in 1914.[202] Vengerova also reviewed Russian literature for the *Saturday Review*, but only anonymously.[203] It is likely that she met Savinkov through Zinaida Gippius, her close friend and leading figure in several Russian literary circles.[204] Vengerova's biographer, Rosina Neginsky, argued that her work introducing Russian literature to Europe helped 'change the existing clichéd image of Russians', but it seems unlikely that English-speakers would have known her name.[205] Neither edition of *The Pale Horse* acknowledged the introduction' author, however, it is possible it was Vengerova, commenting on the novel's place in Russian literature, Ropshin's real identity, and the Russian writer Dmitrii Merezhkovskii's opinion on the book.[206]

What seems likely to have been Vengerova's introduction suggested that Savinkov intended the novel's 'picturesque' aspects to contrast with the new type of revolutionary, different to the 'former romantic fanatics of terrorism', and that his 'confessional and autobiographical' approach offered a unique insight into the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary mentality.[207] This aligns with scholars' interpretations of the novel as representing terrorism in a less idealised way.[208]

---

[201] The text may have been Stepniak and Westall's translation as the copyright would have expired in 1910, seven years after Westall's death. This was the only manuscript the firm submitted a claim for to the Property Losses (Ireland) Committee, responsible for assessing claims resulting from the 1916 Easter Rising. French, 'A History of the House of Maunsel', p. 44. French believed the firm may not have claimed for the other manuscripts as they were of a 'semi-treasonable' nature, which would have made the committee less sympathetic towards them. (pp. 44-5)

[202] 'A New Life for Russia', *Manchester Guardian*, 21 November 1914

[203] Rosina Neginsky, *Zinaida Vengerova: In Search of Beauty. A Literary Ambassador between East and West* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004), p. 137

[204] Ibid., p. 71. She had first met Gippius in 1894. Unfortunately, Neginsky's literary biography did not mention Savinkov or *The Pale Horse*.

[205] Ibid., p. 176

[206] 'Introduction', in Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, v-ix. Merezhkovskii was a Russian writer, poet, literary critic, and Gippius' husband.

[207] Ibid., vi-vii and viii

[208] Kelly, 'Self-Censorship', p. 201

Despite this, however, the publishers' comments on the novel and reviews suggest it was valued for several other reasons than its explorations of the terrorist mind.

Alfred Knopf's introduction to *What Never Happened* provides some insight into how publishers wanted to frame Savinkov's novels for English-speaking audiences. He claimed he had wanted to publish the novel since founding his publishing business in 1915.[209] However, the timing of the novel's publication and Maunsel's publication of *The Pale Horse* the same year suggests that the events of the February Revolution in Russia provided an initial surge of interest in stories about revolutionary Russia. *The Pale Horse* went on sale in the summer of 1917, *What Never Happened* in December, and Andreev's *The Seven who were Hanged* the following year, showing interest in the terrorist theme beyond Savinkov's novels.[210] However, Knopf's comments must also be seen in the context of recent research into the publishing house. Amy Root Clements has argued that the firm was an early expert in professionalism, branding, and marketing in the book market.[211] Therefore, Knopf's comments might be seen to reflect the potential commercial value of the work rather than its literary value.

Literary reviews also reveal readers' responses to Savinkov's novels, in addition to how reviewers thought wider audiences might respond. The urgency to publish was matched by the need to write reviews quickly. Researching British literary culture in this period, Philip Waller concluded that as many reviewers received large numbers of books to review, they often rushed their reviews and seemed to have given positive or negative conclusions sometimes at random.[212] The *Irish Independent* was first to print a review of Savinkov's *Pale Horse* and the review reflected this urgency as it only referred to the introduction, sometimes acknowledging quotations, but otherwise simply plagiarising the text.[213] Other reviewers explicitly mentioned the novel's relevance to ongoing events.[214] Oddly, several reviews revealed the majority of the plot, suggesting the novel's main appeal lay in its relation to real events and contemporary revolutionary

[209] Alfred A. Knopf, 'Note', in Ropshin, *What Never Happened: A Novel of the Revolution* (New York, 1917), p. 5
[210] Alfred Knopf's introduction to *What Never Happened* was dated 28 October, which, considering calendar differences, was before the October Revolution.
[211] Amy Root Clements, *The Art of Prestige: The Formative Years at Knopf, 1915-1929* (Amherst MA, 2014), pp. 5-10
[212] Philip Waller, *Writers, Readers, and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain, 1870-1918* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 150-1
[213] 'Russian Revolutionaries', *Irish Independent*, 21 May 1917
[214] 'A Modern Revolutionary', *Manchester Guardian*, 1 June 1917

activities.[215] Most reviewers agreed that this was one of the most significant aspects of Savinkov's novels. One reviewer simply described *What Never Happened* as a 'prophesy' and another similarly wrote: 'In this light of what has now happened [,] this book, "What Never Happened," is a revelation. It is a specification of that seed of which the present great Russian upheaval is flower.'[216] However, William Francis Casey, reviewing Savinkov's *Pale Horse*, concluded that the Russian mentality was completely incomprehensible: 'If you could understand this book it would help you to understand the recent revolution better… [George] is not incredible; on the contrary, he is very real; it is simply that one cannot understand his taking the trouble to kill anyone; and the whole book, therefore, leaves one baffled.'[217] Similarly, other reviewers thought *The Pale Horse* and *What Never Happened* reflected the contemporary chaos in Russia, assisting readers 'to visualize, if not to comprehend, the Russian mentality'.[218] In contrast, the reviewer in the *Freeman's Journal* believed the novel depicted the wider problems of revolution: '[a]ll the futility, the cruelty, the inconsequence and the profound purpose of social revolution are evoked in these pages, and emerge in a vague manifestation of historic purpose.'[219] Reviewers seemed to agree that contemporary events in Russia were chaotic but disagreed on whether it was possible understand them. They did however show an appreciation for the complexities of revolutionary politics. Shortly before *The Black Horse* appeared in English, Savinkov was arrested, tried, and sentenced to death.[220] One advertisement from November referred to his death sentence, reflecting this ongoing interest, but without mentioning that by that time it had been commuted.[221] Similarly to reviewers of Savinkov's earlier books, the critic Carl Bechhofer for the *Times Literary Supplement* noted that the novel represented the present mentality in Russia. He details of Savinkov's revolutionary career in his review and noted that its translator Paul Dukes had known Savinkov personally.[222] Dukes had been a British secret agent in Russia

---

[215] 'Minister Savinkov's Novel', *New York Times*, 16 December 1917, Carl Eric Bechhofer, 'A Classic of Terrorism', *TLS*, 28 November 1918 [referring to a recently-republished Russian edition], and 'The Russian Spirit', *Manchester Guardian*, 10 January 1919

[216] 'The Russian Spirit', *Manchester Guardian*, 10 January 1919

[217] William Francis Casey, 'The Pale Horse', *TLS*, 7 June 1917

[218] 'A Terrorist Novel', *Freeman's Journal*, 25 January 1919; 'The Pale Horse', *New York Times*, 24 August 1919

[219] 'A Terrorist Novel', *Freeman's Journal*, 25 January 1919

[220] 'An Anti-Bolshevist Revolutionary: Savinkoff Condemned in Moscow', *The Times*, 30 August 1924 and 'The Savinkoff Trial: Moscow Allegations', *The Times*, 3 September 1924

[221] 'New Books', *TLS*, 13 November 1924

[222] Carl Erich Bechhofer, 'The Black Horse', *TLS*, 1 January 1925

during the Civil War assisting the anti-Bolshevik forces and had already published his own book *Red Dusk and the Morrow: Adventures and Investigations in Soviet Russia* in 1922.[223] Bechhofer too had been in Russia during the war and Civil War and had published several books on the subject.

In May 1917, one reviewer praised Savinkov's *Pale Horse* for depicting 'the spirit of the new, more spiritualized and religious Russian revolutionary.'[224]Though Kelly and Beer have argued that the image of the ethical terrorist was destroyed in Russian ideology and literature in the early twentieth century, for English-speaking audiences it continued to represent the Russian revolutionary movement in 1917. This model remained relevant until the realities of the path the revolution was taking emerged in the early 1920s as it became clear the Bolsheviks would not institute a democratic regime. By the time Savinkov's *Black Horse* was published in English, the Bolshevik rise to power had entirely destroyed the image of the moral and ethical Russian revolutionary. Though Savinkov's last novel has been described as his best, it has received little attention from scholars.[225]

Savinkov linked *The Black Horse* to his *Pale Horse* through the title and the main character, George Nikolaevitch.[226] In the later novel, he also made a reference to the four horsemen of the apocalypse in the Bible which had given *The Pale Horse* its name.[227] When compared to the first, this second novel illustrates Savinkov's anxiety as the Bolshevik's subverted revolutionary idealism. In *The Black Horse*, George became distressed on learning his former love had become a Bolshevik: 'In a nun's cell? In a hermitage? And why this image, this portrait in the gilded frame?... the abyss has opened and darkness has blinded my eyes. Olga – and the self-complacent, pompous portrait of Marx! Olga – and the gospel of temptation! Olga – and unbridled fury!'[228] Olga represented the revolution: 'To me, Russia and Olga are one. Without Olga, my love for Russia is as nothing, Without Russia, my love for Olga loses its inmost meaning.'[229]

Bechhofer also argued that the novel had 'all Savinkov's power of description and exciting interest', writing: 'It is more than a piece of fiction; it is the revelation of a tortured mind.'[230] These comments reflected ongoing interest in the themes Savinkov

---

[223] Michael Hughes, 'Dukes, Sir Paul (1889-1967)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/40869 [accessed 23 November 2018]
[224] 'New Books and Reprints', *TLS*, 24 May 1917
[225] Jonathan Smele, *The Russian Revolution and Civil War 1917-1921: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 2003), p. 594
[226] In Russian, Savinkov used '*Iurii*', whereas he had used '*Zhordzh*' in *The Pale Horse*.
[227] Boris Savinkov, *The Black Horse*, trans. Sir Paul Dukes, K.B.E. (London, 1924), p. 89
[228] Ibid., pp. 110-1
[229] Ibid., p. 8
[230] Bechhofer, 'Black Horse'

had previously written about, but also show that Bechhofer saw the current situation in Russia as a painful experience for all Russians and one that Britain had, mercifully, been spared. Reviews of Savinkov's first two novels had similarly emphasised their literary value, including one claiming *The Pale Horse* was 'not unworthy of a place beside the works of the greater Russian writers'.[231] Other newspapers also praised Savinkov's approach to moral and philosophical questions.[232] Russophilia among intellectuals was tied to enthusiasm for Russian literature's depictions of the workings of the mind, as illustrated here, though these works were also positively received for their entertainment value.

According to many reviewers, Savinkov's novels were also adventure stories, being 'exciting' and 'picturesque, stirring and dramatic'.[233] Publishers then used these comments in advertisements.[234] The *Irish Independent* noted that readers could find in *The Pale Horse* '[b]ombs and bloodshed, the scaffold and the cell, and all the other stock-in-trade of the old-fashioned writer of the Nihilist story' as well as explorations of psychological turmoil.[235] Adverts for Savinkov's third novel followed similar patterns, such as one in the *Times Literary Supplement*, telling readers: 'Strange, terrible, mysterious Russia! Read this throbbing book, written by the most romantic figure of the Communist chaos – his death sentence has been pronounced by the Bolsheviks, yet he himself was a revolutionary under the tsarist *regime*.'[236] Another advert described *The Black Horse* as an 'intensely dramatic story'.[237]

Reviewers particularly celebrated the authenticity of these works. Articles about Savinkov and his activities within the SR Combat Organisation had appeared in the British and American Press, with the *Washington Post*, for example, reporting enthusiastically that though the Russian authorities believed they had arrested him; in fact, he was safe abroad.[238] Similarly, *New York Times* reported in 1907 that he was planning to assassinate both the Russian prime minister and the tsar.[239]

---

[231] 'A Russian Terrorist', *Freeman's Journal*, 7 July 1917

[232] 'Minister Savinkov's Novel', *New York Times*, 16 December 1917 and 'The Russian Spirit', *Manchester Guardian*, 10 January 1919.; One 1941 article placed Savinkov alongside Dostoevskii, Chekhov, Tolstoy, and Gorkii, advising that their work was 'not recommended to those who want something light for a mental lift'. 'Mark Twain and Russia', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 11 June 1941

[233] 'Two Hundred Leading Books of the Year: Annotated List of Representative Publications in Various Departments of Literature Compiled with a View to Helping Holiday Book Buyers', *New York Times*, 2 December 1917; War Books', *Boston Daily Globe*, 5 January 1918

[234] 'Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.', *TLS*, 2 January 1919

[235] 'Russian Revolutionaries', *Irish Independent*, 21 May 1921

[236] 'New Books', *TLS*, 13 November 1924

[237] Ibid. and 'New Books', *TLS*, 11 December 1924

[238] 'Sentenced to Death: Slayer of Sergius refused to plead at trial', *Washington Post*, 19 April 1905

[239] 'Terrorists Talk of Killing Czar', *New York Times*, 28 June 1907

Readers would have recognised his name and involvement in the assassination of Grand Duke Sergei in 1905, therefore, when the introduction to *The Pale Horse* hinted that the author was in fact a famous revolutionary, readers probably would have known who they meant.[240] Some newspapers openly acknowledged Savinkov's authorship.[241] The 1917 American edition of *What Never Happened* printed Savinkov's name alongside Ropshin's and the *New York Times* followed, titling its review 'Minister Savinkov's Novel'.[242] After the revolution, in responses to the 1919 editions of his first two novels and in responses to his third novel in 1924, he derived authenticity from news of his Bolshevik activity, with his publishers, Williams & Norgate, stating that it was '"true" from beginning to end' and concluded: 'here is the real thing at last.'[243] Publishers also emphasised Savinkov's authenticity by comparing his book to other fiction with similar themes and settings available to readers in English. The introduction to Maunsel's edition of *The Pale Horse* presented the novel as the opposite of 'the old conventional and romantic type of the 'Nihilist story,' as it used to be written – especially in England.'[244] However, excitement about authenticity did not necessarily derive from enthusiasm for the truth. Though the *New York Times* had published two articles by Savinkov in July 1910 about his terrorist activities, they do not appear to have been reprinted in other newspapers or commented upon elsewhere.[245] Press interest in Savinkov's memoirs, published posthumously in English translation in 1931 was also short lived.

Certain motifs in Savinkov's novels were similar to those used by Stepniak. Savinkov also used summer to represent the dull and oppressive atmosphere of waiting for revolutionary action to begin in *What Never Happened*, comparing forced inaction to waiting to bring in the harvest with the oppressive heat only making the sensation more overwhelming.[246] Savinkov lengthened the timescale of events in the novel to accommodate the summer season, as in reality, Bloody Sunday and Grand Duke Sergei's assassination had occurred in January and February respectively. In *The Black Horse*, the forest where George and the revolutionaries lived represented

---

[240] 'Introduction', in Ropshin, *Pale Horse*, viii-ix
[241] 'Miscellany', *Manchester Guardian*, 21 September 1917
[242] 'Minister Savinkov's Novel', *New York Times*, 16 December 1917. At that time Savinkov was a minister in the Provisional Government.
[243] 'New Books', *TLS*, 11 December 1924
[244] 'Introduction', in Ropshin, *The Pale Horse*, (Dublin, 1917), v
[245] B. Savinkov, 'Assassins own Story of the Death of Von Plehve: Remarkable Document Giving Every Detail of the Attempts of the Life of the Russian's Police System, the Second of Which was Successful', *New York Times*, 10 July 1910 and B. Savinkov, 'An Assassin's Story of Killing Russia's Police Chief: Successful Outcome of Plot to Murder Von Plehve told by One of the Anarchists who took part', *New York Times*, 17 July 1910
[246] Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, p. 139

the oppressive nature of forced inaction: 'The melancholy of the forest gnaws me. I am in prison. The branches are prison bars, the rustle of the leaves the rattle of fetter-chains, the camp four bare walls. Shall I never escape … Shall I never break the tightening bonds – floggings, gallows, courts martial?'[247] Savinkov contrasted this to the disorienting effect of the new regimes frenzied activity, with George struggling to recognise Moscow with all of its new monuments.[248]

5.4 Leonid Andreev

Though Leonid Andreev wrote several stories about terrorists and terrorism, unlike Stepniak and Savinkov, he was never directly involved in revolutionary activity, though he was arrested on 9 Feb 1905 for allowing the Central Committee of the RSDRP to meet in his St Petersburg apartment during the revolution. However, Andreev's biographer James Woodward has argued that he probably either lent the apartment as a favour to his friend, the writer Maksim Gorkii who was involved in the RSDRP, or, in the spirit of the times, to make tentative contact with the revolutionary movement, without necessarily agreeing with their politics.[249] Woodward has, however, noted that Andreev's own biographical sketches, from 1903 and 1910, are not especially useful for researchers interested in Andreev's motives for writing.[250]

Andreev's work was popular and Frederick H. White has argued that this was because, although Andreev denied it, many people believed he suffered with mental illness and this supposed link made his work popular as an exploration of his psychology and because of the links to widespread contemporary debates about degeneration theory in Russia.[251] White's arguments have proved controversial among Russian scholars, but his assertion that in order to understand Andreev's work, we must understand the cultures in which it was read and readers' expectations of the author is important. [252] Studying the readers' responses to Andreev's work about terrorism in English translation is a new avenue of exploration.

English translations of these stories did not appear until several years after they were written, and many not until after Andreev's death in 1919. Unlike Stepniak and Savinkov, Andreev's vast corpus of writings addressed a wide range of themes

[247] Savinkov, *Black Horse*, p. 80
[248] Ibid., p. 101
[249] James B. Woodward, *Leonid Andreyev: A Study* (Oxford, 1969), p. 108 and p. 110
[250] Woodward, *Leonid Andreyev*, pp. 1-2. Instead scholars have used Andreev's diaries, extensive correspondence, and memoirs of Andreev written by individuals including Gippius and Gorkii.
[251] Frederick H. White, *Degeneration, Decadence and Disease in the Russian Fin de Siècle: Neurasthenia in the Life and Work of Leonid Andreev* (Manchester, 2014), p. 1
[252] In response to White's original article, several scholars jointly published an article challenging White's conclusions in 2005.

and issues and was also available to readers in English. The framing of Andreev's work on terrorism in comparison to these other works suggests what publishers thought would be commercially successful. References to real revolutionary events in Russia repeatedly featured in forewords and introductions, establishing the authenticity of his plots. Andreev's authenticity as a commentator on revolutionary issues was recognised in the foreign press, which reported that he had been employed as a court clerk in his youth.[253] The introduction to one translation detailed Andreev's personal life, included an extract from one of his biographical sketches, and noted his suicide attempts and attempts on his life by 'assassins'.[254] His life appeared exciting as well as authentic.

Andreev's works featuring terrorism were *Gubernator* (*The Governor*) published in 1906, *Tma* (*The Dark*) from 1907, and *Rasskaz o semi povoshennyk* (*The Seven who were Hanged*) from 1908. Andreev's only novel, *Sashka Zhegulev,* first published in 1911, was also about terrorism. Only *The Seven who were Hanged* was published in English before 1917, translated by Herman Bernstein in 1909. A different translation of the same story, likely completed by Thomas Seltzer, was published in 1918.[255] In 1921, the radical London publisher Charles W. Daniel published a translation of *Gubernator* alongside some of Andreev's other works. In 1922, Leonard and Virginia Woolf's Hogarth Press published a translation of *The Dark*. In 1925, the New York publisher Robert McBride & Co. published a translation of *Sashka Zhegulev* which Jarrolds and Son published in London the following year. Jarrolds bought the rights for the English edition together with another work by the Russian writer Nikolai Leskov.[256] It appears that Jarrolds had no prior experience publishing Russian fiction and the circumstances of their acquisition of the rights suggests this was a result of expected popular success. The variety of specialist literary and political firms as well as commercial publishing houses producing editions of Andreev's work in English translation suggests that his work was framed and received in many different ways. Scholars researching Andreev's work in English translation have paid little attention to his novel or the terrorist theme in his work more generally. Comparing responses to Andreev's treatment of terrorism makes it possible to situate Stepniak and Savinkov's work in broader perspective.

---

[253] 'The Russian Poe', *Washington Post*, 7 August 1909

[254] Thomas Selzter, 'Introduction', in Leonid Andreyev, *The Seven that were Hanged* (New York, 1918). This edition's translator was anonymous and differences in the translation suggest that it was not the same as Herman Bernstein's.

[255] Seltzer wrote the introduction for this version, although he was not credited as the translator. He had also translated Savinkov's *What Never Happened.*

[256] Memorandum of Agreement. Records of Robert M. McBride and Company, Random House Archives [copy supplied by archivist]

Andreev finished writing the first of these works, the story *The Governor*, at the end of 1905, a year in which Russia had experienced widespread revolution and repression. Andreev had also experienced upheaval: after his arrest in February, he spent the summer in Crimea, but on his return to Moscow, right-wing militants' threats convinced him to leave Russia for Europe.[257] The journal *Pravda*, the Russian Marxist literary journal then edited by the Bolshevik Alexander Bogdanov, published the story in 1906, but it divided Russian revolutionary thinkers.[258] Gippius, for example, approved of it, but criticised its representation of failed revolutionary actions. Woodward, however, believed that she failed to understand Andreev only used revolutionary activity as a background to explore other issues and themes, just as he had earlier used autobiographical details.[259] Like Stepniak, Andreev used the botched assassination to interrogate wider discourses of just terrorism. Savinkov had similarly recounted failed terrorist acts and explored the moral and philosophical significance that might be ascribed to terrorists' failings. However, despite everything, Andreev's terrorist managed to kill the governor, who offered no resistance or attempt to escape, which Woodward has argued represented 'the supernatural origin of this act of justice'.[260] One reviewer disagreed with this idea, noting that the events in the story illustrated that there was something other than 'mechanism kept in mad motion by pitiless destiny.'[261] This particular review suggested that Andreev's story illustrated the renewing power of terrorism to some Western readers. Charles William Daniel, who had established his firm in 1902 for the principal purpose of publishing Tolstoy's work, published Maurice Magnus' translation of the story in 1921.[262] The firm's choice to publish three of Andreev's stories with revolutionary themes in 1921 suggests that these works were selected for their revolutionary themes which foreign readers may have been interested in.[263]

As suggested by Andrew Barratt, understanding Andreev's friendship with Maksim Gorkii is crucial to interpretations of *The Dark* and responses to its

---

[257] Woodward, *Leonid Andreyev*, p. 109

[258] At the time, *Pravda*'s editor was Alexander Bogdanov, an important figure in the Bolshevik faction. Andreev later fell out with Bogdanov, as the latter deemed his stories anti-revolutionary. V.I. Kachalov, 'Gubernator', *Iskusstvo* (M. 1954), p. 68, in Leonid Andreev, *Gubernator* (Letchworth, 1977), p. 56. A Russian-language edition had also appeared in Germany in 1906; James D. White, 'The first *Pravda* and the Russian Marxist tradition', *Soviet Studies*, vol. 26, no. 2 (1974) pp. 181-204

[259] Woodward, *Leonid Andreyev*, p. 116

[260] Ibid., p. 115

[261] L.B., 'Two Russian Stories', *Manchester Guardian*, 12 August 1921

[262] Alston, *Tolstoy and his Disciples*, p. 140. The firm gave the book the English title *His Excellency the Governor*.

[263] The other works were *Tsar golod* (*Tsar Hunger*) and *K zvezdam* (*To the Stars*).

publication in Russian.[264] He identified hostility in Andreev's letter to Gorkii defending the story against criticism printed in *Lituraturnyi raspad* (*Literary Decay*), which had included an essay by Gorkii entitled 'On Cynicism'.[265] Barratt proposed one reason for their disagreement: Andreev's imagery of darkness contrasted to Gorkii's of light, which Russian revolutionary ideology associated with individual heroism.[266] Woodward also argued that their friendship deteriorated because Gorkii believed Andreev had abused a story he had heard while staying at Gorkii's home on the island of Capri about a real BO terrorist named Rutenberg who had hidden from police in a brothel.[267] Later Andreev accused Gorkii of having changed his views when he called *The Dark* 'reactionary'.[268] Gorkii's links with the Bolshevik Party, and later with Stalin's regime, meant that works by authors who criticised him for many years were suppressed in the Soviet Union.[269] In fact, because Andreev did not commit to supporting either the Bolsheviks or their political opponents throughout his life, both Bolsheviks and émigrés rejected his work, as neither could reconcile his attitudes to politics with their own.[270] Gorkii's criticisms of Andreev's work also contributed to the framing of his work in English translation, as he later wrote an introduction for the English translation of Andreev's novel *Sashka Zhegulev*, published in 1925 by the American firm Robert M. McBride. Gorkii's own reputation as a writer and his friendship with Andreev may have been the reasons for this choice.[271] However, Gorkii had hated the novel, describing it as 'badly written, dull and uneven' and criticising Andreev's 'clever intellectualizing'.[272] Unsurprisingly, though Gorkii acknowledged Andreev's contributions to literature, his introduction for the English translation was also fiercely critical, calling Sashka 'one of those Russian

---

[264] Andrew Barratt, 'Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreev: At the Heart of "Darkness"', in Nicholas Luker (ed), *The Short Story in Russia, 1900-1917* (Nottingham, 1991), p. 94

[265] Barratt, 'Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreev', pp. 84-5. The collection also contained an essay by Anatolii Lunacharskii titled 'The Dark' criticising the work.

[266] Ibid., p. 93

[267] Woodward, *Leonid Andreyev*, p. 178. The key difference between the real and fictional story was that Rutenberg did not undergo a conversion and abandon his ideals.

[268] Letter 91, Andreev to Gorkii, 28 March 1912, in Peter Yershov (ed), *Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912*, trans. Lydia Weston (London, 1958), p. 129

[269] White thought Leonid Afonin, the first Soviet biographer of Andreev in this period, highlighted aspects of Andreev's biography agreeing with Soviet rhetoric and minimized problematic areas. Yuri Leving and Frederick H. White, *Marketing Literature and Posthumous Legacies: The Symbolic Capital of Leonid Andreev and Vladimir Nabokov* (Lanham MD, 2013), p. 43.; A literary biography of Andreev appeared soon after his death, but scholarly interest in both the Soviet Union and the West quickly vanished. Alexander Kaun, *Leonid Andreyev: A Critical Study* (New York, 1924 [PhD 1923])

[270] Ibid., p. 39

[271] The previous year, McBride had published a translation of Gorkii's *Fragments from my Diary*.

[272] Letter 90, Gorkii to Andreev, [late 1911/early 1912], in Yershov (ed), *Letters of Gorky and Andreev*, p. 121

dreamers who believe that the evil of life can be conquered by the same power of evil' and claiming that Andreev would have come close to the achievements of Dostoevskii and Tolstoy, 'had the insufficient development of his personal spiritual culture not prevented him from broadening and strengthening his own peculiar talent.'[273]

Andreev wrote the story from the perspective of the governor in a provincial town, beginning fifteen days after he had ordered soldiers to shoot at a crowd of protesting workers and their families by accidentally waving his handkerchief.[274] The governor's impending death permeated the whole story as the governor ruminated on his certain assassination and Andreev revealed that the governor would die at the beginning of the final chapter: 'Two weeks before the Governor's death, a linen-covered package was handed in to the government house'.[275] The governor reflected on the principles of justice; at first, he only thought about legality, with Andreev discussing morality as an external voice, and believed that he would die because of the way others reacted to his actions.[276] Only later did the governor begin to consider the idea of justice in moral terms as 'a death for a death'.[277]

Whereas Andreev's treatment of the governor's psychology and mental turmoil has been appreciated, the significance of terrorism in the story beyond its effect on the governor has been overlooked. The terrorist appeared twice in the story before the assassination, once when the governor saw him in the street and once represented by a letter received by the governor. On the first occasion, the governor noticed the man's strange behaviour as he walked past his carriage, but his secret police minders showed little interest.[278] The governor then received the letter after a woman whose daughter was killed at the protest went mad in the street.[279] Andreev did not reveal who had written the letter, but it accused the governor of murdering the protestors and violating their rights. Suggesting its author was a revolutionary, the

[273] Maxim Gorki, 'Preface', in Leonid Andreyev, *Sashka Jigouleff* (London, 1926), vii-viii and xii
[274] Leonid Andreieff, *His Excellency the Governor* (London, 1921), p. 5
[275] Andreieff, *His Excellency the Governor*, p. 84. Andreev also suggested everyone else knew the governor would die too. (p. 49)
[276] The governor asked himself: 'Why try to rouse the Judge's pity? It's not honourable to work on his feelings…Interests of State demand that the starving be *fed* – and not shot at.' Andreieff, *His Excellency the Governor*, pp. 38-9 [italics in original]. He also considered what would have happened if his son, whom he expected would also become a governor, had ordered the shooting.
[277] Andreieff, *His Excellency the Governor*, p. 51
[278] Ibid., pp. 94-5
[279] Ibid., pp. 60-2

letter referred to those rights in terms of the revolutionary traditions of 'Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality'.[280]

There were many assassinations which this story could have depicted and scholars have proposed several examples, including the assassination of Grand Duke Sergei in 1905 and the assassination of a governor in the provincial town of Ufa.[281] Andreev's story referred to events similar to the real Bloody Sunday, when a crowd comprising workers and their families led by the priest Father Gapon attempted to present a petition to the tsar but were fired on by the army. The story differed though, because Grand Duke Sergei had not been the one to order the shooting of protestors, though for a long time it was believed that Grand Duke Vladimir, another of the tsar's uncles, had ordered the shooting.[282] Sergei, however, was instead associated with a disaster at Khodynka on the outskirts of Moscow shortly after the coronation in 1896, where members of the public died in a crush. Helen Baker has argued that people were angry the tsar had protected his uncle from punishment.[283] By the time of his assassination on 4 February, Grand Duke Sergei had resigned from his post governor-general but remained military commander of Moscow. Andreev's use of real events and the links between the image of his governor as uncaring and incompetent led to comparisons with the imperial family. While no reviews of *The Governor* in English seem to have referenced the real events of 1905, readers must surely have been aware of the many high-profile assassinations that had taken place in the early twentieth century in Russia.

The story criticised nineteenth-century-models of revolutionary behaviour, such as a focus on asceticism and self-improvement, found in novels such as Chernyshevskii's *What is to be Done?* Recounting the story of one night in the life of an unnamed terrorist who spent the night in a brothel with a prostitute named Liuba in order to evade police, *The Dark* was published in 1907, appearing simultaneously in the *Shipovnik* literary almanac and published by Ladyzhnikov in Berlin.[284] Like George in *The Pale Horse*, the terrorist was anonymous: he told Liuba his name was

---

[280] Andreieff, *His Excellency the Governor*, p. 69

[281] Woodward, *Leonid Andreyev*, p. 111; Frederick H. White, 'Interpreting History: Meaning Production for the Russian Revolution', *Adaption*, vol. 9, no. 2 (2016), pp. 205-20

[282] Walter Sablinsky, *The road to bloody Sunday: Father Gapon and the St. Petersburg Massacre of 1905* (Princeton NJ, 1976), p. 222. Sablinsky thought it more likely another general was in charge of the troops that day.

[283] Helen Baker, 'Monarchy discredited? Reactions to the Khodynka coronation catastrophe of 1896', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2003), p. 39

[284] Richard Davies and Andrei Rogatchevskii, 'Groping in the Dark: Leonid Andreev and the Hogarth Press', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, no. 36 (2011), p. 71. Davies and Rogatchevskii highlighted small differences between versions. The Ladyzhnikov text did not include final revisions because it had to be published first to secure copyright in countries that had signed the Berne Convention. (p. 80)

Peter and stopped himself from revealing his real name.[285] Barratt has argued that Andreev may have used the story to attack Gorkii, calling his terrorist Aleksei after the writer, but it is unclear what version of the story Barratt referred in making this claim.[286] Criticising idealistic and self-centred revolutionaries, Liuba challenged the terrorist: 'What right have you to be fine when I am so common?'[287] This criticism echoed contemporary debates about the ethics of terrorism and condemnation of nineteenth-century revolutionaries who had looked to literature for models of behaviour and self-improvement. Andreev's terrorist soon realised he had been foolish: 'He recalled the books which had taught him how to live, and he smiled bitterly. Books!'[288] The police, while arresting him, then mockingly called him 'Mr. Anarchist' and ridiculed him for the contrast between his political beliefs and where they found him.[289] In *The Dark*, Andreev applied his exploration of the contradictions between aspects of individuals' beliefs to revolutionary terrorism.

The terrorist hid in a brothel because he believed the police would not think to look for him there, although he found the idea repulsive.[290] At first, his self-denial and celibacy governed his behaviour; he turned away when Liuba undressed and agreed she could it in the chair while he slept. Permitting himself to sleep in the comfortable bed caused his self-denial to begin to unravel and his peaceful sleep contrasted to that of Rakhmetov on his bed of nails in *What is to be done?*.[291] Liuba enables him to free himself from revolutionary worries, allowing him to lock to door and keep the key in order to sleep peacefully and then representing the 'freedom' and 'Truth' that would cause him to abandon his ideals.[292] In *The Dark*, Andreev reversed traditional roles in the revolutionary movement where men tended to dominate discussions at revolutionary circles.[293] The terrorist's evident discomfort at being in the brothel made Liuba realise his true identity as he forgot 'his British passport and the affected accent he had been using lately, and he blushed again at the thought of having

---

[285] Leonid Andreev, *The Dark* (London, 1922), p. 12. For most of the story Andreev simply used 'he' or 'man', indicating the terrorist as he was the only man present.
[286] Barratt, 'Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreev', p. 88
[287] Andreev, *The Dark*, p. 28. Davies and Rogatchevskii pointed out that 'fine' was a strange translation of the word *khoroshii*, when 'good' would have been 'more obvious and appropriate'. Davies and Rogatchevskii, 'Groping in the Dark', p. 83
[288] Andreyev, *The Dark*, p. 31
[289] Ibid., p. 49; In the Russian, this was '*gospodin anarkhist'.* Leonid Andreev, *Tma* (Berlin, 1907), p. 62
[290] Andreev, *The Dark*, p. 5
[291] Ibid., pp. 9-13
[292] Ibid., p. 33
[293] 'Vera Figner', in Barbara Alpern Engel and Clifford N. Rosenthal (eds), *Five Sisters, Women Against the Tsar: The Memoirs of Five Young Anarchist Women of the 1870s* (New York, 1992), p. 8. Someone from Figner's circle suggested they form a women's only circle to build their experience in discussing revolutionary ideas.

forgotten to keep up the pretence as he ought to have done'.[294] He was so overwhelmed he could not bring himself to play the part, continuing to use the formal 'you' ('*vy*') instead of the informal ('*ty*').[295] Barratt argued that the story showed Liuba undergoing a transformation, claiming she had decided to support the terrorist's cause when she threw herself at his feet when he was being arrested and said: ''Oh, darling, why did you give up your revolver?" the girl moaned, struggling with the policeman. "Why didn't you bring a bomb? We might have . . . might have . . . them all to . . ."'[296] However, Andreev's subversion of revolutionary models of integrity is a much more powerful theme in the story.

The Dark was published in English in 1922 by the Hogarth Press, a venture run by Leonard and Virginia Woolf from their home in Richmond, London. It is unlikely their reasons for publishing this work will ever become clear as no file relating to it survives in the archives of the Hogarth Press.[297] Richard Davies and Andrei Rogatchevskii suggested that the translator Leonard Arthur Magnus may have approached them and that the press, having previously published translations by Samil Kotelianskii, were seeking a new source to replace the difficult translator.[298] Diane Gillespie has argued that during Leonard Woolf's association with various periodicals in the 1920s and 1930s, but primarily the *Nation*, the press 'evolved into a more commercial and professional enterprise' working with 'broader intellectual networks'.[299] The publishers welcomed John Middleton Murray's review in the *Nation* newspaper and quoted from it in an advertisement: ''The Dark,' now admirably translated by Messrs. Magnus and Walter, is more of an achievement than any other story of his we have yet read…. It is a notable book.'[300] This suggests the Woolfs may have selected the book expecting positive responses to Andreev's style. Equally importantly, as numerous translations of Andreev's work had already appeared, their advertisement reflects attempts to exploit the success of his other works.[301] Thomas Seltzer's introduction to a new translation of Andreev's *Seven who were Hanged* in 1918 also reflected this intention, arguing that the work was one of Andreev's best

[294] Andreev, *The Dark*, p. 7
[295] Ibid., p. 9. Andreev, *Tma*, p. 10
[296] Andreev, *The Dark*, p. 51
[297] Virginia Woolf's extensive diaries also do not mention it.
[298] Davies and Rogatchevskii, 'Groping in the Dark', pp. 78-9. They suggest Routledge may have rejected it as Russian titles were not popular, though they had published nine of Magnus' fifteen previous translations and his brother was a director at the firm (p. 74).
[299] Diane F. Gillespie, ''Woolfs' in Sheep's Clothing: The Hogarth Press and 'Religion', in Helen Southworth (ed), *Leonard and Virginia Woolf, the Hogarth Press and Networks of Modernism* (Edinburgh, 2010), p. 75
[300] 'The Hogarth Press, Richmond', *TLS*, 1 February 1923
[301] Russian series including Andreev and Savinkov tended to feature lesser-known works by other Russian writers such as Gogol and Gorkii.

because it contemplated death.[302] However, other factors may have influenced positive reviews of *The Dark*. Significantly, when *The Dark* was published, Leonard Woolf was literary editor of the *Nation* and the small size of the literary world means that using literary reviews as sources for investigating the reception of particular works can be problematic.[303] The reviewer for the *Manchester Guardian*, however, was similarly complimentary: 'The result is a hard, glittering cleverness of description which is too impersonal to stir one with the unmistakeable compulsion of great art.'[304] Also important is May's suggestion that English translations of Russian literature tended to emphasise literariness when relations with Russia were good and demonstrate Russia's evils when they soured.[305] This may provide one explanation for interpretations of Savinkov's *Black Horse* and Andreev's *Sashka Jigouleff* in the mid-1920s seeing evidence for chaos in Russia.

Reviews of Andreev's *Seven who were Hanged* similarly highlighted the writer's place in the Russian literary canon and praised his insights into psychology, his style, and the elements of realism woven into his work. Such comments were widely expressed.[306] In particular, reviewers compared Andreev to the widely-praised American writer Edgar Allen Poe.[307] Though reception of the book was principally confined to the US, on the publication of another of Andreev's works in translation in 1910, Allan Monkhouse, reviewing for the *Manchester Guardian*, also compared the him to Poe and, referring to his *Seven who were Hanged* and *The Red Laugh*, called him 'a very unconventional and imaginative writer'. Monkhouse also noted that the *Seven who were Hanged* displayed that 'his sympathies with the desolate and oppressed are profound and unflinching'.[308] Herman Bernstein, the Russian-born American special correspondent to the *New York Times*, was the main face of Andreev's fiction in the USA. Bernstein produced the first English translation of Andreev's story *The Seven who were Hanged*, which the New York firm JS Ogilvie published in 1909. Ogilvie was known for publishing large print runs of popular editions at cheap prices.[309] Around this time, Bernstein was writing regular articles for

---

[302] Thomas Seltzer, 'Introduction', in Leonid Andreyev, *The Seven that were Hanged* (New York, 1918), xiv.
[303] Elizabeth Dickens, 'Circulating Ideas and Selling Periodicals: Leonard Woolf, the *Nation and Athenaeum*, and Topical Debate', in Jeanne Dubino (ed), *Virginia Woolf and the Literary Marketplace* (New York, 2010), p. 44
[304] 'The Dark', *Manchester Guardian*, 31 January 1923
[305] May, *Translator in the Text*, p. 12
[306] 'Read What the Reviewers Say About the Seven Who Were Hanged', *New York Times*, 5 June 1909. Ogilvie's advertisement quoted reviews from several regional US newspapers.
[307] 'The Russian Poe', *Washington Post*, 7 August 1909
[308] A. N. M., *Manchester Guardian*, 20 April 1910
[309] 'J.S. Ogilvie Publishing Co.: Mr. Ogilvie's Strong Purpose and How He Fully Realized It', *Cambridge Tribune* [US], 10 December 1904

the *New York Times* about his travels in Europe and Russia. Andreev's *Seven who were Hanged* was twice translated into English and adapted as a play which was revived several times in the 1920s and 1930s.

The 1918 re-translation of Andreev's *Seven who were Hanged* (titled *The Seven that were Hanged*) passed with little attention but Bernstein referenced the story in his reports of contemporary events in Russia about 'The Six who were Shot' and summary executions in Petrograd under Bolshevik rule in the *Washington Post*.[310] Bernstein commented that at least under tsarist rule, there had been some semblance of a trial for criminals.[311] He then focused on Andreev as an opponent of the Bolsheviks in his reports to the *Washington Post* during the Russian Civil War.[312] Despite contemporary interest in Andreev as a political commentator during the Civil War, the new translation of the *Seven who were Hanged* was not widely popular in the West. When in 1924 the Yiddish Arts Theatre of America performed a play on tour based on Andreev's *Seven who were Hanged*, the play was praised for its psychological treatment of those facing certain death.[313] The article in the *Daily Mail* about the performance noted that the play was 'as thrilling and as gruesome as the title suggests.'[314] The play was performed in Yiddish. 'Pathos, tragedy, the frailty of humanity, and the splendour of humanity, all play their parts in a drama that must move even those who do not understand a word of the language in which it is acted.'[315] Responses to the play suggest such stories were popular both for their excitement as well as their artistic merit.

In 1905, American women had attempted to revive the networks of the American Society of Friends of Russian Freedom, active in the 1890s, in order to provide moral and material support to the Russian people suffering under the political and economic oppression of the tsarist regime.[316] In a letter to Bernstein about the book, reproduced in the 1909 edition, Andreev suggested that transnational humanitarian activism was important:

---

[310] 'The Six who were Shot', *Washington Post*, 29 June 1918; Herman Bernstein, 'Petrograd in Terror', *Washington Post*, 14 March 1918

[311] Bernstein, 'Petrograd in Terror'

[312] For example: Herman Bernstein, 'L. Andreieff Makes Stirring Appeal to Russia's Soldiers to Save Land they Betrayed', *Washington Post*, 19 November 1917 and 'Miliukov's Dramatic Foreword to Andreyev's Plea: Written 'Somewhere in Finland' and Sent to Paris and London', *Atlanta Constitution*, 15 June 1919

[313] 'Yiddish Art Theatre: "The Seven Who Were Hanged"', *The Times*, 29 April 1924. The critic called it Andreev's play. As the story contained considerable direct speech, it may have closely resembled the original text.

[314] The Dramatic Critic, 'A Gruesome Play: Yiddish Drama', *Daily Mail*, 30 April 1924

[315] 'A Gruesome Play'

[316] Smith, 'From Relief to Revolution', pp. 607-10

> Knowing the sensitivities of the American people, who at one time sent across the ocean, steamers full of bread for famine-stricken Russia, I am convinced that in this case our people in their misery and bitterness will also find understanding and sympathy. And if my truthful story about seven of the thousands who were hanged will help toward destroying at least one of the barriers which separate one nation from another, one human being from another, one soul from another soul, I shall consider myself happy.[317]

Bernstein presented Andreev's story as an argument against the death penalty in Russia, inspired by the tradition of fusing literary and political activism and in the style of Tolstoy's recently-published protest against tsarist rule, 'I cannot remain silent', to which Bernstein claimed the story was a 'powerful forerunner'.[318] This reflected Andreev's own purpose in writing the story.[319] Bernstein emphasised his own authenticity as a translator and interpreter of Andreev's views similar to the importance of associations with Stepniak of his translation work. He had met and interviewed Andreev as a *New York Times* special correspondent.[320] Bernstein's translation of the *Seven who were Hanged* also included a translation of a letter from Andreev to him alongside a poor facsimile of the original. Dedicating his translation to Tolstoy, Bernstein's arguments against the death penalty echoed those of Andreev and Tolstoy.[321] It appears that the translator and publisher selected this book in order to appeal to current intellectual debates concerning Russia and humanitarianism. Equally, Andreev did not celebrate martyrdom in this story, though he did address it without cynicism, exploring it in logical and dispassionate terms. The character Musya felt unworthy of a martyr's death and Andreev focused on her searching for a reason to make her sacrifices worthwhile.[322] Andreev's exploration of this issue touched on contemporary debates among Russians when he was writing it, but its publication in English a few years later appears to have had different significance.

The particular interest in women terrorists dying for the cause is reflected in the reproduction of an element of the Ogilvie cover image focusing on the female figure in Bernstein's article about the book for the *New York Times*.[323] Bernstein's articles for the *New York Times,* and later the *Washington Post*, were usually

---

[317] Leonid Andreev, 'Introduction [Translation of the Foregoing Letter]', trans. Herman Bernstein, in Leonid Andreev, *The Seven who were Hanged*, trans. Herman Bernstein (New York, 1909), pp. 15-6

[318] Herman Bernstein, 'The Story of the Seven Who Were Hanged', *New York Times*, 8 November 1908

[319] Letter 83, Andreev to Gorkii, 23 March 1908, in Yershov (ed), *Letters of Gorky and Andreev*, p. 100

[320] Herman Bernstein, 'A Day with Andreyev in His Russian Home', *New York Times*, 5 September 1909

[321] Bernstein also interviewed Korolenko about his opposition to the death penalty. Herman Bernstein, 'Russia's Gallows Kept Busy Despite Duma's Prohibition', *New York Times*, 24 July 1910

[322] Andreev, *Seven who were Hanged*, pp. 104-11

[323] Bernstein, 'Story of the Seven Who Were Hanged'

accompanied by large illustrations. This echoed earlier interest in women terrorists in both Russia and abroad. Andreev's story appealed because it featured many recognisable tropes and narratives of fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism and publishers advertised it in these terms.

The 'Seven' in the story comprised two ordinary criminals and five revolutionary terrorists. The first few chapters recount the terrorists' arrest, trial, and imprisonment, followed by chapters profiling each of the seven and their emotional response to the death sentence, before returning to the main narrative and the hangings. While not all of the terrorists are depicted favourably, some of them approach their impending execution in a dignified and calm manner. Though the characters and their terrorism were compared to what people knew about Russia and the 1905 Revolution, the popularity of this book might also have been a result of its similarity in many ways to Stepniak's famous and commercially successful book *Underground Russia*, combining profiles of revolutionaries, alongside short sketches concerning their activities, On the reprint of another of Andreev's work in translation in 1915, the reviewer in *The Times* commented that the book was 'propaganda rather than art', a 'defect of the artist'. However, the reviewer believed, while noting that the book was not about the present war, that it revealed the 'ugliness' of war in general, Andreev's works were therefore seen to have relevance to universal questions.[324]

Andreev's novel *Sashka Zhegulev* (rendered into English as *Sashka Jigouleff*) addressed the ethics of terrorism through a story of conversion to and dying for the revolutionary faith. The story followed Sasha (Alexander) Pogodin from his early life, through his school years, to his friendship with the revolutionary Kolesnikov and then recounted how he abandoned his life, shot a clerk during a robbery, was excluded by his band of revolutionaries because they carried out more violent expropriations than he wanted, and was finally executed. Andreev's depiction of Sasha's childhood centred on the contrast between Sasha's 'gentle' character and his father's cruelty and violence towards his mother.[325]After his execution at the end of the novel, Sasha's body was displayed on a pole alongside three other members of his gang.[326] The epilogue to the novel depicts Sasha's mother, sister, and supposed fiancée living in perpetuity, awaiting Sasha's return, telling each other that he has escaped, perhaps to America.[327] Sasha's mother's mourning for her son to the revolutionary

[324] 'Novels of War', *The Times*, 6 April 1915
[325] Andreyev, *Sashka Jigouleff*, p. 19 and p. 31
[326] Ibid., p. 275
[327] Ibid., p. 285

cause mirrored Bolotov's mother's mourning and wearing black in Savinkov's *What Never Happened* after her son became a revolutionary.[328]

The novel's central themes were Sasha's willingness to die for the cause and that it was his destiny to do so. The novel addressed the ethical questions of terrorism through Sasha's conversion to the revolutionary faith and his conceptualisation of his own martyrdom for the cause. This echoed themes in Savinkov's work , as Jay Bergman has identified, in wider revolutionary culture of the time.[329] The choice to imitate Christ was also present in *The Pale Horse*, where Savinkov presented the character Vania struggling with the problematic morals of his actions.[330] Andreev concluded the novel by writing: 'Sasha Pogodin, a noble and unhappy youth, died an awful and shameful death, to which he had been predestined by those who had lived before and had burdened Russia with their sins.'[331]

The publication of *Sashka Jigouleff* passed with little advertisement or interest.[332] There were two broadly negative reviews, though they praised some aspects of Andreev's characterisation. In the *Saturday Review*, LP Hartley dismissed the novel's premise, commenting that with '[a] little more restraint in the first place, we think, a little less time and trouble given to the acquiring of arms, the mustering of *désœvrés* desperados, and the marking of likely country-houses on maps – and Sasha Pogodin might have lived on with his mother and sister, ignorant that he had a soul at all. After all, no one is compelled to commit murder.'[333] He praised Andreev's portrayal of Sasha's 'intransigence, the force of his fanaticism' but did not think Andreev was comparable to Dostoevskii in addressing moral questions and that Sasha was 'not the stuff of which heroes are made', nor was he equal to *Crime and Punishment*'s Raskolnikov: 'the organ-notes with which Andreyev celebrates his death are, one feels, much too grand for the occasion. [Sasha] was an assassin, and died like a dog. Russian literature provides many impressive voluntaries for picturesque criminals such as he.'[334] Similarly, the *Manchester Guardian* review noted that Sasha was an 'excellent' character, though lacking Raskolnikov's moral complexity, and that the portrayal of the revolutionary movement was otherwise

---

[328] Ropshin, *What Never Happened*, p. 54
[329] Jay Bergman, 'The Image of Jesus in the Russian Revolutionary Movement: The Case of Russian Marxism', *International Review of Social History*, vol. 35 (1990), pp. 220-48
[330] Beer, 'Morality of Terror', p. 41
[331] Andreyev, *Sashka Jigouleff*, p. 275
[332] Adverts only seem to have appeared in the *New York Times* on 27 September 1925 and in the *Daily Mail* on 22 October 1926. A lack of adverts may have contributed to the lack of interest, which contrasted to enthusiasm for regular new editions of Andreev's short stories and plays.
[333] L.P. [Leslie Poles] Hartley, 'New Fiction', *Saturday Review*, 1 January 1927, p. 21.
[334] Ibid., p. 21

deeply flawed.[335] Both reviews therefore reflected Gorkii's unfavourable comparison of Andreev with Dostoevskii in the preface to the novel and ongoing enthusiasm for the earlier writer's work.[336] Though the *Manchester Guardian* reviewer acknowledged that the story depicted the mentalities of its time and that Andreev had based Sasha on 'the figure of a real semi-bandit, semi-revolutionary', they simply called Sasha a 'criminal', not acknowledging the revolutionary context of his actions.[337] Hartley similarly concluded that '[t]he scheme of revolutionary, bandit morals would be more convincing to a Latin than to an Anglo-Saxon audience.'[338] Comments in both reviews illustrate that foreign observers no longer recognised assassinations as a form of justice against the tsarist regime or felt enthusiasm for the Russian revolutionary movement.

Like Stepniak and Savinkov, Andreev played with his characters' experience of time in the novel. Stephen Hutchings has identified non-linear representations of time in several of Andreev's short stories.[339] As in Stepniak and Savinkov's novels, *Sashka Zhegulev* contrasted periods of forced inactivity with those of frenzied activity and Andreev also used summer to intensify the sense of lethargy accompanying the inactivity, describing the oppressive heat, and comparing the feeling of anticipation for the terrorist act with waiting for harvest time.[340]

5.5 Conclusion

Fiction about terrorism by Stepniak, Savinkov, and Andreev gained new significance when published for readers in English. Reviewers of all three writers responded to their works as romantic adventure stories as well as for their literary accomplishments. Studied together, it is apparent that these authors used similar representations of terrorism, therefore, readers in English continued to receive representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism which reinforced pre-existing narratives. The authors were also inspired by similar events, such as Savinkov and Andreev making extensive use of the assassination of Grand Duke Sergei in 1905. This reinforced the image of Russian revolutionaries as terrorists targeting those at the very highest levels of the Russian royal family and administration.

The similarities in their representations of terrorism, the co-existence of heroic and problematic representations of terrorists, is significant because it illustrates that

---

[335] 'Russian Books', *Manchester Guardian*, 4 January 1927
[336] Gorki, 'Preface', vii-viii
[337] 'Russian Books', *Manchester Guardian*, 4 January 1927
[338] Hartley, 'New Fiction'
[339] Stephen Hutchings, 'Mythic Consciousness, Cultural Shifts, and the Prose of Leonid Andreev', *Modern Language Review*, vol. 85, no. 1 (1990), p. 108
[340] Andreyev, *Sashka Jigouleff*, pp. 221-2

these figures were cast as literary types, beyond literature written by terrorists themselves. All three authors represented the morality of terrorism as complex and readers' responses to the terrorist hero changed over time, and in particular as events in Russia developed after the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. Comparing these three authors together has allowed for a greater understanding of how English-speaking audiences responded to fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism across a much longer period. These works of fiction, and their authors, appear to have been an important way in which information about Russia was transmitted to English readers and their authenticity as commentaries on Russian mentalities and the revolutionary movement was regularly reinforced.

One important common element in responses to these works by English and American reviewers is that these writers were not easily able to control the ways in which their works were received. All three were cast as authors of adventure stories, despite their literary ambitions, an image that was only encouraged by their publishers. This indicates that the foreign support for Russian revolutionary terrorism explored elsewhere in this thesis emerged in a complex environment, motivated not only by sympathy for the Russian revolutionary cause, but by romantic notions of what it entailed.

Conclusion

In April 1924, the Yiddish Art Theatre of the United States presented a play adapted from Leonid Andreev's story *The Seven who were Hanged* at the New Scala Theatre, London. The *Daily Mail*'s theatre critic reported: 'Pathos, tragedy, the frailty of humanity, and the splendour of humanity, all play their parts in a drama that must move even those who do not understand a word of the language in which it is acted.'[1] These sentiments echoed the responses to Stepniak's book *Underground Russia* when it was first published in English translation in 1883: 'The stories of these as of others are vigorously and pathetically told; and we cannot withhold a tribute of admiration from those who could face their sad fate with such dignity and calmness, however erring and mistaken they may have been.'[2] Both reviewers recognised the shortcomings of the characters being presented to them but, regardless of the controversial nature of terrorism, admired them anyway.

It was precisely this narrative of heroism which was perpetuated by members of the RFPF over the last decades of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century. Stepniak had written in 1883 of the impact Zasulich's attempt to assassinate General Trepov: 'this occurrence gave to the Terrorism a most powerful impulse. It illuminated it with its divine aureola, and gave to it the sanction of sacrifice and of public opinion.'[3] Members of the RFPF carried abroad these representations of terrorist acts in Russia. While Volkhovskii may have later adopted a conciliatory position in debates about terrorism among members of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, he defended his right to publish journals, using their money, despite the anti-terrorism line taken by the party's leadership. The RFPF proved to be an important constant force in the promotion of heroic images of self-sacrificing Russian revolutionary terrorists throughout this period. This thesis has approached Russian revolutionary terrorism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries from different perspectives and illustrated how RFPF members presented these representations of terrorism to different audiences as part of their transnational activism.

The in-depth examination of the activities of the Russian Free Press Fund and Societies of Friends of Russian Freedom in this thesis has reconsidered their members' political activism and publishing work as transnational phenomena. Whereas previous scholarship has usually focused on aspects of this history in

---

[1] 'A Gruesome Play, *Daily Mail*, 20 April 1924
[2] 'Contemporary Literature', *British Quarterly Review*, vol. 78, no. 155 (July 1883), p. 189
[3] Stepniak, *Underground Russia*, p. 36

national contexts, uniting these narratives has brought new nuances to our understanding of these activities and highlighted the difficulties faced by Russian revolutionaries and their foreign sympathisers in their work. Incorporating the story of *Frei Russland* into this study has further illustrated the difficulties Russian revolutionary émigrés faced in trying to have transnational appeal. Examining the revival of the SAFRF and the SFRF's continued activities after 1900 illustrated continuities in representations of terrorism which underpinned foreign sympathisers' desire to campaign on behalf of Russian causes into the twentieth century. Lesser-known individuals, particularly Lazar Goldenberg, have emerged through this thesis as leaders and facilitators of the various activities of the RFPF, SFRF, and SAFRF. This thesis has also explored the work of Leonid Andreev, whose stories are not usually considered in studies of fiction about revolutionary terrorism.

This thesis has also concluded that Russian revolutionary émigrés positioned themselves and their political activism in relation to ongoing global revolutionary movements, the political and social mores of those they hoped to gain sympathy and material support from, and ongoing moral debates about the ethics of the aims and methods of their political activism. It has argued that the Russian revolutionary terrorists and terrorist propagandists studied in this thesis recognised themselves as transnational actors and the universality of their aims of liberation from despotic rule, but fundamentally were forced to confront the difficult realities of operating as such. While the 'real Sophie Peroffsky' dynamite used to assassinate the tsar in 1881 might have captured the attention of foreign observers, the claims to its legacy of liberation by foreign terrorists caused problems for Russian revolutionary émigrés. The overt separation between Russian and foreign terrorisms presented by Stepniak and other members of the RFPF was a key foundation of their appeal to foreign sympathisers. Representations of terrorism considered in this thesis illustrate the variety of reasons for which foreigners chose to sympathise with and support Russian revolutionaries using terrorism as a tool of revolution. Central to these representations were often descriptions of political, social, and economic life in Russia and the individuals occupying the local and central hierarchies of the imperial bureaucracy. Representations of terrorism relied upon wider discourses of anti-imperialism and reform as well as discussions of the moral issues surrounding justice and punishment, including prisons. Living transnationally, Russian revolutionaries were forced to negotiate these debates in transnational and other national contexts in order to pursue their political campaigning and publishing work.

The members of the RFPF carefully controlled their representations of terrorism so as to generate popular support among foreign sympathisers. However,

as this thesis has illustrated in the case of Peter Kropotkin, the mainstream press played an important role in establishing their public images. Using this different source base for the study of Russian revolutionary terrorism, this thesis has illustrated that Kropotkin's comments on terrorism in English-language forums helped generate the established patterns of sympathy which RFPF members could later capitalise on. While it appears that at least by his death, foreign observers were acquainted with his support for the use of terrorism in limited circumstances, Kropotkin had been a victim of circulating fears and rumours throughout his life.[4] The case of Kropotkin serves to further reinforce the importance of Russian revolutionaries' narratives of terrorism restricting its legitimate use to the liberation of the Russian people from the despotic tsar. Russian terrorists could expect foreign sympathy as long as they were not perceived to be exporting terrorism to other imperial contexts, such as Ireland, or countries with some official democratic system. They could expect financial and organisational support so long as their appeals aligned with the values of the middle classes, professions, and political classes from which they drew their support in emigration. Despite sharing in some aims, transnational co-operation was precluded by pragmatic interests.

Despite the transnational concerns circulating about terrorist conspiracies which shaped public discourse about terrorism, foreigners' responses were also informed by local or national concerns. Aligning with recent scholarship in the history of humanitarianism, this thesis has discovered that foreigners' support for Russian revolutionary terrorism was informed by their own moral, political, and religious beliefs. Analysis of the mainstream press in transnational perspective in Chapter Four also indicated the importance of local interests and experiences of terrorism in shaping responses to Russian revolutionaries. Political figures in Chicago may have feared violence on the anniversary of the deaths of those hanged for the Haymarket bombings and seen Kropotkin's speech at a meeting in London as incendiary.[5] The rest of the world, including London, seemed largely disinterested.

Taking a new chronological approach to the history of Russian revolutionary terrorist publishing, this thesis has illuminated concrete links between Russian revolutionary terrorism in the late nineteenth century and that of the early twentieth century through personnel involved in publishing operations. Individuals such as Volkhovskii linked different phases and organisations publishing on the topic of Russian revolutionary terrorism, creating continuities where incidences of terrorism in

[4] 'Peter Kropotkin'. *Manchester Guardian*, 31 January 1921
[5] 'Foreign Anarchists Meet: They Remember the Haymarket Riots at a Noisy and Excited Gathering', *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 12 November 1891

Russia were absent, less frequent, or less visible. Based on the idea that terrorism exists beyond the act itself and its meanings are formed in media and cultural products, this is a significant discovery. When the Socialist Revolutionary Party funded the publishing activities of Burtsev and Volkhovskii in the early years of the twentieth century, they gave them the resources they needed to promote and preserve their representations of Russian revolutionary terrorists as brave and ethical actors. The investigation into the representations of terrorism in underutilised publications such as *Za narod* and *Narodnoe delo. Sbornik* in comparison with the more widely known *Byloe* has revealed important similarities and continuities, illustrating how émigré publications perpetuated certain representations of terrorism, even as it became a more controversial issue and the party began 'hairsplitting'. Following the networks and funding which supported these publications has also illustrated how Volkhovskii and Burtsev benefitted from the legacies of their earlier political activism. Remnants of networks in emigration linked various phases of émigré revolutionary literary, journalistic, and political activity that continued through the Revolution, and Civil War.

The new chronological approach taken by this thesis across periods of decreased terrorist activity in Russia, influenced by tracing individuals and organisations in emigration, also informed the approach taken in Chapter Five, which looked beyond the Russian Revolution of 1917. A cross-revolutionary perspective made it possible draw broader conclusions about how cultural, social, and political experiences were shaped by new technological developments and increased cross-border and global connections in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Reading, writing, and publishing about Russian revolutionary terrorism occurred in connected and transnational environments. Literature was a key component of discourses of Russian revolutionary terrorism among foreign audiences, alongside the journalism and propaganda considered in other chapters. Alongside reinterpretations of several well-known works about Russian revolutionary terrorism using the context of translation and a longer-term and cross-revolutionary perspective, this chapter also incorporated less-frequently considered works in studies of terrorism in literature, those of Leonid Andreev. Alongside journalistic and propagandistic representations of Russian revolutionary terrorism, literary examples reveal wider responses to Russian revolutionary terrorism in the West and their place in East-West relations across the period between the 1880s and 1920s. This thesis has illustrated that the cross-cultural transfer of writing about terrorism in particular caused the texts to take on new significance and meaning, which is further reinforced by responses to continued re-imaginations and new adaptions of the stories and

novels discussed in Chapter Five. Andreev's play *The Seven who were Hanged* was adapted again for the stage in 1961 and in 2004, Mosfilm released the film *Vsadnik po imeni smert* (*The Rider Named Death*). Directed by the acclaimed Russian director Karen Shakhnazarov and based on Savinkov's novel *The Pale Horse*, it was nominated for a prize at the Montreal Film Festival.[6] The circulation of these stories in the contemporary world is, as one critic said of Shakhnazarov's film, 'intellectually audacious'.[7] Responses to the film were mixed, but critics praised its approach to philosophical questions.[8] It took on new meanings with reference to contemporary terrorisms, just as fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism in translation had done in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including the novel which was the source material for the film.

Taking a new approach to fiction about Russian revolutionary terrorism in transnational perspective has revealed important new aspects of perceptions of Russia in the West but also broadening our understanding of responses to these works by an important component of their audience: English-speaking readers. This thesis has highlighted new aspects of growing and receding enthusiasm for Russian culture and politics between the 1880s and 1920s. The chapters of this thesis examining Kropotkin and fiction both add to wider understanding of the cross-cultural transfer of images of terrorism across this period. They have illustrated that Russian revolutionaries and writers approaching the topic of Russian terrorism did not always have control over how they and their work was received. In contrast to Stepniak and other RFPF members, who consciously linked their representations of terrorism to British and American values, individuals or literary works not addressing this were more vulnerable to negative associations with terrorism. Together, these chapters also illustrate the importance of looking beyond 1917 in the history of Russian revolutionary terrorism.

Despite the wide-ranging re-evaluations of the history of Russian revolutionary terrorism which can be drawn from this study, the voices that remain conspicuously from this study are the émigré women, married to members of the RFPF but political activists and writers in their own right. Building on earlier research, this thesis has expanded knowledge of the roles of foreign women in supporting the publishing activities of Russian émigré terrorist propagandists. Foreign women

---

[6] 'Play based on Novel by Andreyev', *The Times*, 29 April 1961; In the last months of the Soviet Union, the director Vasilii Panin had also created another version of *The Pale Horse*, the *Ischade ada* (*Demons of Hell*), though this film does not appear to have been released in the West.

[7] Dana Stevens, 'The Rider Named Death', *New York Times*, 18 March 2005

[8] Ronnie Scheib, 'Rider Named Death (Vsadnik po imeni smert)', Variety, 11 October 2004

played important roles in building networks for distributing materials among foreign sympathisers and smuggling revolutionary materials into Russia. Their pre-existing networks of political activism on behalf of issues such as women's suffrage and humanitarian work formed the basis of fruitful activism on behalf of Russian revolutionary issues. However, these Russian women's voices are rarely heard in the archives consulted for this research which built on previous studies of organisations such as the RFPF, SFRF, and SAFRF. This thesis has highlighted the occasions in which these women can be seen to have carried out important political or professional work, for example Fanni Stepniak carrying out translation work published under her husband's name. Careful examination of popularly-used documents has partially restored Stepniak to the historical narrative and revealed the lecturing work carried out by Sofia Kropotkina. The process of researching this thesis has uncovered new archival collections belonging to these women which will be useful in fully recognising the fundamental roles played by Fanni Stepniak, Nadezhda Konchevskaia, Iuliia Lazareva, and Sofia Kropotkina. Without their stories, this history remains incomplete.

Russian revolutionary terrorists and terrorist propagandists carried representations of terrorism into emigration where they continued to write and publish on the topic in the same terms. However, their writing also reflects their consideration of the political and moral values held by the audiences from among whom they hoped to attract foreign sympathisers. This was crucial as the impact and perception of foreign terrorisms threatened to deter potential supporters and the mainstream press was, at times, inclined to perpetuate myths about Russian revolutionary aims and the existence of a vast, international terrorist conspiracy. Despite these difficulties, the RFPF in particular was able to establish a strong support base in emigration and a community of revolutionary émigrés coalesced around its political activism. The networks they established later formed the basis for Russian-language publishing efforts, which permitted them to continue promoting the image of the ethical terrorist, in alliance with the Socialist Revolutionary Party. These activities took place against a background of widespread enthusiasm for revolutionary and terrorist themes in fiction among English-speaking audiences and contributed to similar narratives of liberation from despotism. Similar responses to such fiction echoed in later decades and, indeed, across the revolutionary divide, before souring as news of the realities of Bolshevik rule emerged. The revolutionary ideal promoted by groups such as the RFPF and writers was lost. Taking an unconventional periodisation, an approach to terrorism focusing on the representations as opposed to the acts themselves, and a study of networks and interactions incorporating figures

who do not usually feature centrally in studies of Russian revolutionary terrorism, this thesis has sought to redefine the boundaries of the study of Russian revolutionary terrorism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Bibliography

Archival Collections

British Library Manuscripts
ADD MS 45345 William Morris Papers
RP 7435 Letters of P. Kropotkin Mr Cazenove, his agent

Durham University Special Collections
UND/F10/H3 Academic Papers of Barry Hollingsworth

Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii
[State Archive of the Russian Federation]
Fond 5799 Niu-Iorkskoe otdelenie “Fonda volnoi Russkoi pressy” predstavitel LB Goldenberg (Papers of the New York Office of the Russian Free Press Fund’s representative LB Goldenberg)

Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University
63013 Boris I Nicolaevsky Collection
66000 Vladimir Lvovich Burtsev Papers
67046 Felix Vladimirovich Volkhovskii Papers

Houghton Library, Harvard University
MS Russ 51 F. Volkhovskii Correspondence

International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam
Partija Socialistov-Revoljucionerov (Rossija) Archives

Leeds Russian Archive, Brotherton Library, University of Leeds
MS1381 Tuckton House Papers
L.B. Goldenberg Papers

National Archives, UK
FO5 Foreign Office: Political and Other Departments: General Correspondence before 1906, United States of America, Series II

National Library of Scotland
John Murray Archive
MS43148 Copyright agreements with Smith Elder and Company
MS43217 Publication Ledger, Smith Elder and Company

Newcastle University Special Collections
GB186/SW Spence Watson Weiss Papers

Parliamentary Archives, UK
STH Stow Hill Papers
DS David Soskis Papers

Random House Archives
Records of Robert M. McBride and Company

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatura i iskusstva
[Russian State Archive of Literature and Art]
Fond 1158 Papers of Sergei Mikhailovich Kravchinskii (pseudonym Stepniak)

***Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsialnoi i politicheskoi istorii* [Russian State Archive of Social and Political History]**

Fond 328 Burtsev, Vladimir Lvovich

Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University

A/B632a1d Papers of Alice Stone Blackwell
AD9115 Papers of Florence I Duncan

Digital and Microfilm Collections

www.ancestry.co.uk
1898 Electoral Register. Hammersmith, London
1901 Census. England. Hammersmith, London
1911 Census. Hammersmith, London
Middlesex City and County Directory, 1894
U.S Naturalization Record Indexes, 1791-199

Catholic University of America Digital Collections
Fenian Brotherhood Records and O'Donovan Rossa Personal Papers

Firms out of Business. Harry Ransom Centre, University of Texas at Austin.
http://norman.hrc.utexas.edu/watch/fob.cfm

Hansard House of Commons Debates

The Archives of Swan Sonnenschein & Company, 1878-1911
Brian Maidment (ed), (Bishops Stortford, 1973)

Newspapers and Periodicals

Aberdeen Weekly Journal
Atlanta Constitution
Atchison Daily Globe
Bristol Mercury and Daily Post
Boston Daily Globe
Boston Evening Transcript
Byloe
Chernii peredel
Chicago Daily Tribune
Courier and Argus [Dundee]
Daily Evening Bulletin [San Francisco]
Daily Mail
Daily News
Daily Telegraph
Edinburgh Evening News
Evening News [Portsmouth]
Evening Telegraph and Post [Dundee]
Evening Telegraph [Dundee]
Free Russia [English edition]
Free Russia [American edition]
Freeman's Journal
Frei Russland

Fort Collins Courier
Galveston Daily News
Huddersfield Daily Chronicle
Irish Independent
Irish People
Irish World
Leeds Mercury
Manchester Guardian
Narodnoe delo. Sbornik
Observer
Pall Mall Gazette
Portland Daily Press
Salida Mail
New York Herald
New York Times
Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art
Sheffield and Rotherham Independent
Star [Saint Peter Port, Guernsey]
Tamworth Herald
Time [London]
The Times
Times Literary Supplement
United Irishman
Variety
Washington Post
Western Gazette [Yeovil]
York Herald
Za narod!

Articles, Books, Dissertations, and Reference Works

Acton, Edward, *Alexander Herzen and the Role of the Intellectual Revolutionary* (Cambridge, 1979)

Adams, Matthew S., *Kropotkin, Read, and the Intellectual History of British Anarchism: Between Reason and Romanticism* (Basingstoke, 2015)

Alexei, 'Nihilism: Its Moral Justification and Political Necessity', *Monthly Review*, vol. 18, no. 53 (February 1905), pp. 59-73

Alonso, Harriet Hyman, *Growing up Abolitionist: The Story of the Garrison Children* (Amherst MA, 2002)

Alston, Charlotte, *Tolstoy and his Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement* (London, 2014)

'Transnational solidarities and the politics of the left, 1890-1990 – introduction', *European Review of History*, vol. 21, no. 4 (2014), pp. 447-50

'"A Great Host of Sympathisers": The Doukhobor Emigration and its International Supporters, 1895–1905', *JMEH*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2014), pp. 200-215

‘News of the Struggle: The Russian Political Press in London, 1853-1921’, in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), p. 155-74

Andreev, Leonid *Tma* (Berlin, 1907)

The Seven who were Hanged, trans. Herman Bernstein (New York, 1909)

The Dark (London, 1922)

Gubernator (Letchworth, 1977)

Andreieff, Leonid, *His Excellency the Governor* (London, 1921)

Andreyev, Leonid, *The Seven that were Hanged* (New York, 1918)

Sashka Jigouleff (London, 1926)

Anemone, Anthony (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010)

Avrich, Paul, *The Russian Anarchists* (Princeton NJ, 1967)

‘Kropotkin in America’, *International Review of Social History*, vol. 25, no. 1 (1980), pp. 1-34

The Haymarket Tragedy (Princeton NJ, 1984)

Bachman, John Elliot, ‘Sergei Mikhailovich Stepniak-Kravchinskii: A Biography from the Russian Revolutionary Movement on Native and Foreign Soil’ (PhD dissertation, The American University, 1971)

Baker, Helen, ‘Monarchy discredited? Reactions to the Khodynka coronation catastrophe of 1896’, *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2003), pp. 1-46

Bantman, Constance, *The French Anarchists in London, 1880-1914: Exile and Transnationalism in the First Globalisation* (Liverpool, 2013)

‘Introduction: The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Local and Transnational Contexts’, in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), pp. 1-14

Bantman, Constance and Bert Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (Abingdon, 2015)

Bantman, Constance and Bert Altena, ‘Introduction: Problematising Scales of Analysis in Network-Based Social Movements’, in Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 3-22

Bantman, Constance and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018)

‘Baron George Armitstead of Castlehill, 1824-1915: Merchant, Politician and Philanthropist’, Armitstead Lecture Trust, http://www.armitstead.org.uk/about.html

Barratt, Andrew, ‘Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreev: At the Heart of “Darkness”', in Nicholas Luker (ed), *The Short Story in Russia, 1900-1917* (Nottingham, 1991), pp. 73-97

Beasley, Rebecca, and Phillip Ross Bullock (eds), Phillip Ross Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (Oxford, 2013)

Beasley, Rebecca, and Phillip Ross Bullock, ‘Introduction: Against Influence: On Writing about Russian Culture in Britain’, in Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 1-18

Bell, Alan, ‘Saintsbury, George Edward Bateman (1845–1933)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35908?docPos=1 [accessed 10 August 2016]

Beer, Daniel, ‘The Morality of Terror: Contemporary Responses to Political Violence in Boris Savinkov's The Pale Horse (1909) and What Never Happened (1912)’, *SEER*, vol. 85, no. 1 (2007), pp. 25-46

Bergman, Jay, *Vera Zasulich: A Biography* (Stanford CA, 1983)

Belchem, John, ‘“Freedom and Friendship to Ireland”: Ribbonism in Early-Nineteenth-Century Liverpool’, *International Review of Social History*, vol. 39 (1994), pp. 33-56

Bevan, Tom, *Runners of Contraband* (London, 1908)

Bevir, Mark, ‘Pease, Edward Reynolds (1857-1955)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/35445 [accessed 13 February 2017]

The Making of British Socialism (Princeton NJ, 2011), EBL e-book

Black, Gerry, ‘Health and Medical Care of the Jewish Poor in the East End of London, 1880-1914’, *Jewish Historical Studies*, vol. 36 (1999/2000), pp. 93-111

Blackwell, Alice Stone (ed.), *Armenian Poems* (Boston MA, 1896)

Songs of Russia (Chicago IL, 1906)

Boniece, Sally, ‘The Spiridonova Case: 1906: Terror, Myth, and Martyrdom’, in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), pp. 127-62

‘The Shesterka of 1905-06: Terrorist Heroines of Revolutionary’, *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 172-91

Bonsal, Stephen, *Suitors and Suppliants: The Little Nations at Versailles* (New York, 1946)

Borisova, Tatiana, ‘Public Meaning of the Zasulich Trial 1878: Law, Politics and Gender’, *Russian History*, vol. 43, nos. 3-4 (2016), pp. 221-44

Boyce, D. George, and Alan O’Day, ‘Introduction: 'Revisionism' and the 'revisionist controversy’’, in D. George Boyce and Alan O’Day (eds), *The Making of Modern Irish History: Revisionism and the revisionist controversy* (London, 1996), pp. 1-14

Brower, Daniel, *Training the Nihilists: Education and Radicalism in Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca NY, 1978)

Budd, Louis J., 'Twain, Howells, and the Boston Nihilists', *New England Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3 (1959), pp. 351-71

Buckler, Julie, 'Melodramatizing Russia: Nineteenth Century Views from the West', in Louise McReynolds and Joan Neuberger (eds), *Imitations of Life: Two Centuries of Melodrama in Russia* (2002), pp. 55-78

Budnitskii, Oleg, *Terrorizm v rossiiskom osvoboditelnom dvizhenii: ideologiia, etika, psikhologiia (vtoraia polovina XIX-nachalo XX v.)* (Moscow, 2000)

Bulgakov, Sergei, 'Heroism and Asceticism: Reflections of the Religious Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia', in *Vekhi: Landmarks, A Collection of Articles about the Russian Intelligentsia*, trans. and ed. Marshall S. Shatz and Judith E. Zimmerman (Armonk and London, 1994), pp. 17-50

Burke, David, 'Theodore Rothstein, Russian Emigré and British Socialist', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), pp. 80-99

Burtsev, Vl., *Za sto let (1800-1896)*. *Sbornik po istorii politicheskikh i obshchestvennykh dvizhenii v Rossii* (London, 1897)

Butterworth, Alex, *The World that Never Was: A True Story of Dreamers, Schemers, Anarchists and Secret Agents* (London, 2010)

Cahm, Caroline, *Kropotkin and the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism, 1872-1886* (Cambridge, 1989)

Camfield, Graham, 'From Tolstoyan to Terrorist: The Revolutionary Career of Prince D.A. Khilkov, 1900–1905', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1999), pp. 1-43

Carr, E.H., *Michael Bakunin* (London, 1937)

Challinor, Raymond, 'Gun-Running from the North-East Coast, 1905-7', *Bulletin of the North-East Group for the Study of Labour History*, vol. 6 (1972), pp. 1-5

Chatterjee, Choi, 'Transnational Romance, Terror, and Heroism: Russia in American Popular Fiction, 1860–1917', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 50, no. 3 (2008), pp. 753-77

Chatterjee, Choi, and Beth Holmgren, 'Introduction', in Choi Chatterjee and Beth Holmgren (eds), *Americans Experience Russia: Encountering the Enigma, 1917 to the Present* (Abingdon, 2013), pp. 1-11

Cherepakov, M.S., and E.M. Fingerit, *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat (1895-oktiabr 1917). Spravochnik* (Moscow, 1957)

Chernov, V.M., *Pered Burei: Vospominaniia* (New York, 1953)

Chernyshevsky, Nikolai G., *What is to be Done?,* trans. Michael R. Katz. Annotated by William G. Wagner. (Ithaca NY, 1989)

Churchill, Winston S., *Great Contemporaries* (London, 1937)

Clavin, Patricia, 'Defining Transnationalism', *CEH*, vol. 14, no. 4 (2005), pp. 421-39

Securing the World Economy: The Reinvention of the League of Nations, 1920-1946 (Oxford, 2013)

Clements, Amy Root, *The Art of Prestige: The Formative Years at Knopf, 1915-1929* (Amherst MA, 2014)

Clutterbuck, Lindsay, 'The Progenitors of Terrorism: Russian Revolutionaries or Extreme Irish Republicans', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2004), pp. 154-81

Corder, Percy, *The Life of Robert Spence Watson* (London, 1914)

Curthoys, Ann, and Marilyn Lake, 'Introduction', in Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective* (Canberra, 2005), pp. 5-20

Curtis, L. Perry, 'Moral and Physical Force: The Language of Violence in Irish Nationalism', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 27, no. 2 (1988), pp. 150-89

Davies, Richard, and Andrei Rogatchevskii, 'Groping in the Dark: Leonid Andreev and the Hogarth Press', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, no. 36 (2011), pp. 66-90

Davitt, Michael, *Within the Pale: The True Story of Anti-Semitic Persecutions in Russia* (London, 1903)

Delaney, Enda 'Directions in historiography: Our island story? Towards a transnational history of late modern Ireland', *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 37, no. 148 (2011), p. 599-621

'Ireland's Great Famine: A Transnational History', in Niall Whelehan (ed), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (New York and Abingdon, 2015), pp. 106-26

Di Paola, Pietro, 'The Spies Who Came in from the Heat: The International Surveillance of the Anarchists in London', *EHQ*, vol. 37, no. 2 (2007), pp. 189-215

The Knights Errant of Anarchy: London and the Italian Anarchist Diaspora (1880-1917) (Liverpool, 2013)

Dickens, Elizabeth, 'Circulating Ideas and Selling Periodicals: Leonard Woolf, the *Nation and Athenaeum*, and Topical Debate', in Jeanne Dubino (ed), *Virginia Woolf and the Literary Marketplace* (New York, 2010), pp. 43-56

Diner, Hasia, *The Jews of the United States: 1654 to 2000* (Berkeley CA, 2004)

Dobroliubov, Nikolai, 'What is Oblomovism?', in Thomas Riha (ed), *Reading Russian Civilization: Vol. 2 Imperial Russia, 1700-1917* (Chicago IL, 1964)

'Dora Vladimirovna Brilliant', *Visions of Terror: The Death of Plehve through the Eyes of Savinkov*. http://petersburg.berkeley.edu/alexis/alexis_brilliant.html [accessed 22 November 2018]

Dostoevsky, Fyodor, *Crime and Punishment*, trans. Constance Garnett. Introduction and Notes by Keith Carabine (Ware, 2000)

Downey, Edmund, *Twenty Years Ago: A Book of Anecdote Illustrating Literary Life in London.....* (London, 1905)

Engel, Barbara Alpern, *Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, 1983)

Engel, Barbara Alpern and Clifford N. Rosenthal (eds), *Five Sisters, Women Against the Tsar: The Memoirs of Five Young Anarchist Women of the 1870s* (New York, 1992),

Evtuhov, Catherine, David Goldfrank, Lindsey Hughes, and Richard Stites, *A History of Russia: Peoples, Legends, Events, Forces* (Boston MA, 2004)

Eyck, Frank, *G.P. Gooch: A study in History and Politics* (London, 1982)

Field, Daniel, 'Peasants and Propagandists in the Russian Movement to the People of 1874', *JMH*, vol. 59, no. 3 (1987), pp. 415-438

Fisher, Jess Lumsden, '"Night marauders" and "deluded wretches": Public Discourses on Ribbonism in Pre-Famine Ireland', in Kyle Hughes and Donald MacRaild (eds), *Crime, Violence and the Irish in the Nineteenth Century* (Liverpool, 2017), pp. 53-66

Foglesong, David S., *The American Mission and the "Evil Empire": The Crusade for a "Free Russia" since 1881* (Cambridge, 2007)

Footman, David, *Red Prelude: A Life of A.I. Zhelyabov* (London, 1944)

The Alexander Conspiracy: A Life of A.I. Zhelyabov (LaSalle IL, 1974)

Foster, R.F., *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland, 1890-1923* (London, 2015)

French, Jane, 'A History of the House of Maunsel and a Bibliography of Certain of its Publications' (MLitt dissertation, Trinity College Dublin, 1969)

Frolova, Evgeniia, '"Esli liubish Rossiiu": Egor Egorovich Lazarev (1855-1937)', in Evgeniia Frolova (ed), *Osmyslenie sudby: Istoriko-biograficheskie ocherki, publitsistika* (St Petersburg, 2011), pp. 54-84

Futrell, Michael, *Northern Underground: Episodes of Russian Revolutionary Transport and Communications through Scandinavia and Finland, 1863-1917* (London, 1963)

Gabriel, Elun T., Assassins *and Conspirators: Anarchism, Socialism, and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (DeKalb IL, 2014)

Gantt, Jonathan, 'Irish-American Terrorism and Anglo-American Relations, 1881-1885', *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, vol. 5, no. 4 (2006), pp. 325-57

Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community, 1865-1922 (Basingstoke, 2010)

Garnett, Edward, 'Kropotkin-Revolutionist', *The Outlook*, no. 99, 23 December 1899, pp. 674-5

Geifman, Anna, 'The Kadets and Terrorism, 1905-1907', *JGO*, vol. 36, no. 2 (1988), pp. 248-267

Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1894-1917 (Princeton NJ, 1993)

‘The Social Democrats and Terror’, in Anna Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1894-1917* (Princeton NJ, 1993), pp.84-122

‘The “Seamy Side” of the Revolution: The Criminal Element, the Psychologically Unbalanced, and Juveniles’, in Anna Geifman, *Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1894-1917* (Princeton NJ, 1993), pp. 154-180

Russia Under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion, 1894-1917 (Oxford, 1999)

‘The Anarchists and the "Obscure Extremists’, in Anna Geifman, *Russia Under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion, 1894-1917* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 93-110

Entangled in Terror: The Azef affair and the Russian Revolution (Wilmington DE, 2000)

Death Orders: The Vanguard of Modern Terrorism in Revolutionary Russia (Santa Barbara CA, 2010)

‘The Liberal Left Opts for Terror’, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 25, no. 4 (2013), pp. 550-60

Gerwarth, Robert and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, ‘Internationalising Historical Research on Terrorist Movements in Twentieth-century Europe’, *European Review of History*, vol. 14, no. 3 (2007), pp. 275-81

Gillespie, Diane F., ‘‘Woolfs’ in Sheep’s Clothing: The Hogarth Press and ‘Religion’, in Helen Southworth (ed), *Leonard and Virginia Woolf, the Hogarth Press and Networks of Modernism* (Edinburgh, 2010), pp. 74-100

Gleason, Abbott, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (Chicago IL, 1983)

Glencree, *Scientific Warfare, or the Resources of Civilization. A Lecture* (1888)

Goldin, V.I., ‘Nikolai Chaikovskii in Revolution and Counter-Revolution’, *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 14, no. 1 (2001), pp. 22-41

Good, Jane E., ‘America and the Russian Revolutionary Movement, 1888-1905’, *Russian Review*, vol. 41, no. 3 (1982), pp. 273-287

Graydon, William Murray, *With Cossack and Convict* (London, 1903)

Green, James, *Death in the Haymarket: A Story of Chicago, the First Labor Movement, and the Bombing that Divided Gilded Age America* (New York, 2006)

Haberer, Erich E., *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge, 1995)

Hamburg, Gary Michael, ‘The London Emigration and the Russian Liberation Movement: The Problem of Unity, 1889-1897’, *JGO*, vol. 25, no. 3 (1977), pp. 321-339

Hardy, Deborah, *Land and Freedom: The Origins of Russian Terrorism, 1876-1879* (New York, 1987)

Harison, Casey, ‘The Paris Commune of 1871, the Russian Revolution of 1905, and the Shifting of the Revolutionary Tradition’, *History and Memory*, vol. 19, no. 2 (2007), pp. 5-42

Hartnett, Lynn Ann, *The Defiant Life of Vera Figner: Surviving the Russian Revolution* (Bloomington IN, 2014)

Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge MA, 1990)

Hecht, David, *Russian Radicals Look to America, 1825-1894* (Cambridge MA, 1947)

Henderson, Robert, ‘International Collaboration in the Persecution of Russian Political Émigrés: The European Pursuit of Vladimir Burtsev’, *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 22, no. 1 (2009), p. 21-36

‘’For the Cause of Education’: A History of the Free Russian Library in Whitechapel, 1898-1917’, in Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 71-86

‘The Hyde Park Rally of 9 March 1890: A British Response to Russian Atrocities’, *European Review of History*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2014), pp. 451-66

Vladimir Burtsev and the Struggle for a Free Russia: A Revolutionary in the Time of Tsarism and Bolshevism (London, 2017)

Henty, G.A., *Condemned as a Nihilist* (Glasgow, 1907)

Hilbrenner, Anke, ‘The Perovskaia Paradox or the Scandal of Female Terrorism in Nineteenth Century Russia’, *The Journal of Power Institutions in Post-Soviet Society*, no. 17 (2016). http://journals.openedition.org/pipss/4169 [accessed 4 December 2018]

Hildermeier, Manfred, *The Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party before the First World War* (Münster/New York, 2000)

Hilliard, Andrew, *Under the Black Eagle* (London, 1897)

Hirschkop, Ken, ‘Afterword: A Time and Place for Everything: On Russia, Britain, and Being Modern’, in Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock (eds), *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 258-68

Hollingsworth, Barry, ‘The Society of Friends of Russian Freedom: English Liberals and Russian Socialists, 1890-1917’, *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. 3 (1970), pp. 45-64

‘David Soskice in Russia in 1917’, *European Studies Review*, vol. 6 (1976), pp. 73-97

Hughes, Michael, ‘Dukes, Sir Paul (1889-1967)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/40869 [accessed 23 November 2018]

Hughes, Michael J., ‘British opinion and Russian terrorism in the 1880s’, *EHQ*, vol. 41, no. 2 (2011), pp. 255-77

Hulse, James W., *Revolutionists in London: A Study of Five Unorthodox Socialists* (Oxford, 1970)

Hutchings, Stephen, ‘Mythic Consciousness, Cultural Shifts, and the Prose of Leonid Andreev’, *Modern Language Review*, vol. 85, no. 1 (1990), pp. 107-23

Iriye, Akira, *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World* (Berkeley CA, 2002)

Iriye, Akira and Pierre-Yves Saunier (eds), *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (Basingstoke, 2009)

Ivanoff, ‘Anarchists: Their Methods and Organisation: Part II’, *New Review* (January 1894), pp. 9-16

Jackson, Alvin, ‘Widening the Fight for Ireland's Freedom: Revolutionary Nationalism in Its Global Contexts’, *Victorian Studies*, vol., no. 1 (2011), pp. 95-112

Johnson, Barry C. (ed), *Olive & Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-95* (Birmingham, 1993)

Jones, Dorothy Richardson *"King of critics": George Saintsbury, 1845-1933, critic, journalist, historian, professor* (Ann Arbour MI, 1992)

Jones, Polly, ‘The Fire Burns On? The “Fiery Revolutionaries” Biographical Series and the Rethinking of Propaganda in the Brezhnev Era’, *Slavic Review*, vol. 74, no. 1 (2015), pp. 32-56

Jones, Thomas C. and Constance Bantman, ‘From Republicanism to Anarchism: 50 Years of French Exilic Newspaper Publishing’, in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), pp. 91-111

Joyce, Toby, ‘The American Civil War & Irish Nationalism’, *History Ireland*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1996), pp. 36-41

Kachalov, V.I., ‘Gubernator’, *Iskusstvo* (M. 1954), p. 68, in Leonid Andreev, *Gubernator* (Letchworth, 1977), p. 56

Katz, Michael R., and William G. Wagner, ‘Introduction’, in Nikolai G. Chernyshevsky, *What is to be Done?*, trans. Michael R. Katz. Annotated by William G. Wagner. (Ithaca NY, 1989), pp. 1-36

Kaun, Alexander, *Leonid Andreyev: A Critical Study* (New York, 1924)

Kelly, Aileen, ‘Self-Censorship and the Russian Intelligentsia, 1905-1914’, *Slavic Review*, vol. 46, no. 2 (1987), pp. 193-213

Kelly, Luke ‘British humanitarianism and the Russian famine, 1891-2’, *Historical Research*, vol. 89, no. 246 (2016), pp. 824-45

‘Christianity and Humanitarianism in the Doukhobor Campaign, 1895–1902, *Cultural and Social History*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2016), pp. 339-55

British Humanitarian Activity in Russia, 1890-1923 (London, 2018)

Kelly, Matthew, 'Languages of Radicalism, Race, and Religion in Irish Nationalism: The French Affinity, 1848-1871', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 49, no. 4 (2010), pp. 801-25

Kennan, George, *Siberia and the Exile System*, 2 vols (New York, 1891)

Keough, Willeen, '"Long looked for, come at last": discourses of Whiteboyism and Ribbonism in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland', *Irish Studies Review*, vol. 26, no. 1 (2018), pp. 5-23

Khilkov, D., '*Terror i massovaia borba*' (1904)

Kimball, Alan, 'The First International and the Russian *Obshchina*', *Slavic Review*, vol. vol. 32, no. 3 (1973), pp. 491-514

Kinna, Ruth, 'Kropotkin's Theory of the State: A Transnational Approach', in Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 43-61

Kinealy, Christine, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester, 2009)

Knudsen, Ann-Christina L., and Karen Gram-Skjoldager, 'Historiography and Narration in Transnational History', *Journal of Global History*, vol. 9, no. 1 (2014), pp. 143-161

Korolenko, *The Blind Musician*, trans. Sergius Stepniak and William Westall. 2nd ed. (London, 1893)

In Two Moods, trans. Sergius Stepniak and William Westall (London, 1892)

Kovalevsky, Sophia, *Vera Barantzova*, trans. Sergius Stepniak and William Westall (London, 1895)

Krapotkine, P., 'Russian Prisons', *The Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, vo. 13, no. 71 (January 1883),

Kropotkin, *The Terror in Russia*. First ed. (London, 1909)

Kropotkin, P., 'The Russian Revolutionary Party', *Fortnightly Review*, vol. 31, no. 185 (1882), pp. 654-71

Memoirs of a Revolutionist, vol. 2 (London, 1899)

Zapiski revoliutsionera (London, 1902)

The Conquest of Bread (London, 1913),

Kropotkin, Peter*, The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793*, trans. N.F. Dryhurst. The Anarchist Library. http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-the-great-french-revolution-1789-1793#toc70 [viewed 3 December 2018]

Kravchinskii, S.M., 'Irlandskie dela', *Delo*, no. 8, 1881, pp. 149-177 and no. 9, 1881, pp. 195-217

Laity, Paul, *The British Peace Movement, 1870-1914* (Oxford, 2001)

Laqua, Daniel, ‘Inside the Humanitarian Cloud: Causes and Motivations to Help Friends and Strangers’, *JMEH*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2014)

‘Political Contestation and Internal Strife: Socialist and Anarchist German Newspapers in London, 1878-1910’, in Constance Bantman and Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva (eds), *The Foreign Political Press in Nineteenth-Century London: Politics from a Distance* (London, 2018), pp. 135-54

Laqueur, Walter, *Terrorism* (London, 1977)

Lenin, V.I., ‘Revolutionary Adventurism’, *Iskra*, no. 23, 1 August 1902. Marxists Internet Archive. https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1902/sep/01.htm [accessed 21 November 2018]

Le Queux, William, *The Great Plot* (London, 1907)

Leventhal, F.M., *The Last Dissenter: H.N. Brailsford and His World* (Oxford, 1985)

Leving, Yuri and Frederick H. White, *Marketing Literature and Posthumous Legacies: The Symbolic Capital of Leonid Andreev and Vladimir Nabokov* (Lanham MD, 2013)

Levy, Carl, ‘Anarchism and Cosmopolitanism’, *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 16, no. 3 (2011), pp. 265-78

Liebersohn, Harry, ‘1848’, in Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier (eds), *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 1-2

Lure, F.M., *Khraniteli proshlogo. zhurnal “Byloe”: Istoriia, redaktory, izdateli* (Leningrad, 1990)

Lyall, Edna [Ada Ellen Bayly], *Autobiography of a Slander* (London, 1887)

Mathur, Chandana, and Dermot Dix, ‘The Irish Question in Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engels's Writings on Capitalism and Empire’, in Séamas Ó Síocháin (ed), *Social Thought on Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2009), pp. 97-107

May, Rachel, *The Translator in the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English* (Evanston IL, 1994),

Mayer, Henry, *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York, 1998)

McClellan, Woodford, *Revolutionary Exiles: The Russians in the First International and the Paris Commune* (London, 1979)

McGee, Owen, ‘“God Save Ireland”: Manchester-Martyr Demonstrations in Dublin, 1867–1916’, *Éire-Ireland*, vol. 36, nos. 3-4 (2001), pp. 39-66

The IRB: The Irish Republican Brotherhood, from the Land League to Sinn Féin (Dublin, 2007)

McGill, P.M., *The Irish Avenger, or Dynamite Evangelist* (Washington DC, 1881)

McKay, Iain, ‘Sages and Movements: An Incomplete Peter Kropotkin Bibliography’, *Anarchist Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, (2014), pp. 66-101

McKinsey, Pamela Sears, ‘From City Workers to Peasantry: The Beginning of the Russian Movement "To the People"’, *Slavic Review*, vol. 38, no. 4 (1979), pp. 629-649

McLuhan, Marshall, *Understanding Media: The Extension of Man* (London, 1964)

Meijer, J.M., *Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zuerich (1870-1873). A Contribution to the Study of Russian Populism* (Assen, 1955)

Melchiori, Barbara Arnett, *Terrorism in the Late Victorian Novel* (London, 1985)

Meredith, Isabel [Helen and Olivia Rossetti], *Girl Among the Anarchists* (London, 1903)

Merriman, John, *The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror* (London, 2009)

Messer-Kruse, Timothy, *The Haymarket Conspiracy: Transatlantic Anarchist Networks* (Urbana IL, 2012)

Miller, Martin A., *Kropotkin*, (Chicago, 1976)

‘The Transformation of the Russian Revolutionary Emigre Press at the End of the 19th-Century’, *Russian History*, vol. 16, nos. 2-4 (1989), pp. 197-207

The Foundations of Modern Terrorism: State, Society and the Dynamics of Political Violence (Cambridge, 2012)

Moeller, Susan D., *Packaging Terrorism: Co-opting the News for Politics and Profit* (Chichester, 2009)

Morozov, K.N., *Partiia sotsialistov-revoliutsionerov v 1907-1914 gg.* (Moscow, 1998)

Morrissey, Susan K., *Heralds of Revolution: Russian Students and the Mythologies of Radicalism* (Oxford, 1998)

‘Terrorism, Modernity, and the Question of Origins’, *Kritika,* vol. 12, no. 1 (2011), pp. 213-26

‘The "Apparel of Innocence": Toward a Moral Economy of Terrorism in Late Imperial Russia’, *The Journal of Modern History* (*JMH*), vol. 84, no. 3 (2012), pp. 607-42

Muddock, J.E., *For God and Czar* (London, 1892)

Murphy, Maureen, ‘Ford, Patrick’, *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a3328 [accessed 20 November 2018]

Naarden, Bruno, *Socialist Europe and Revolutionary Russia: Perception and Prejudice, 1848-1923* (Cambridge, 1992)

Nacos, Brigitte L., *Mass-Mediated Terrorism: The Central Role of the Media in Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism* (Lanham MD/Oxford, 2002)

Naimark, Norman M., *Terrorists and Social Democrats: The Russian Revolutionary Movement under Alexander III* (Cambridge MA, 1983)

‘Terrorism and the Fall of Imperial Russia’, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1990), pp. 171-92

Nechiporuk, D.M., ‘“Chto amerikantsy mogut sdelat’ dlya Rossii?”: agitatsiia amerikanskogo Obshchestva druzei russkoi svobody I zhurnal “*Free Russia*” (1891–1894 gody)’, *Istoricheskii ezhegodnik* (2008), pp. 137-50

Neginsky, Rosina, *Zinaida Vengerova: In Search of Beauty. A Literary Ambassador between East and West* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004)

Neilson, Keith, ‘Tsars and Commissars: W. Somerset Maugham, Ashenden and Images of Russia in British Adventure Fiction, 1890-1930’, *Canadian Journal of History*, vol. 27(1992), pp. 475-500

Newsinger, John, ‘“A Great Blow must be struck in Ireland”’ Karl Marx and the Fenians’, *Race and Class*, vol. 24, no. 2 (1982), pp. 151-67

Nic Dháibhéid, Caoimhe, *Terrorist Histories: Individuals and Political Violence since the 19th Century* (Abingdon, 2017)

Nic Dháibhéid, Caoimhe, and Colin Reid, ‘Introduction: The Constitutional and Revolutionary Histories of Modern Ireland’, in Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid and Colin Reid (eds), *From Parnell to Paisley: Constitutional and Revolutionary Politics in Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2010), pp. 1-14

Nora, Pierre, ‘Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire’, *Representations*, no. 26 (1989), pp. 7-24

Ó Broin, Leon, *Revolutionary underground: The Story of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, 1858-1924* (Dublin, 1976)

O’Ferrall, Fergus, *Catholic Emancipation: Daniel O'Connell and the Birth of Irish Democracy, 1820-30* (Dublin, 1985)

‘Official List of Patents’, *Scientific American*, vol. 22, no. 4 (22 January 1870), pp. 67-8

Offord, Derek, ‘Dostoevsky and Chernyshevsky’, *SEER*, vol. 57, no. 4 (1979), pp. 509-30

The Russian Revolutionary Movement in the 1880s (Cambridge, 1986)

Nineteenth-Century Russia: Opposition to Autocracy (Harlow, 1999)

Orsini, Alessandro, *Anatomy of the Red Brigades*, trans. Sarah J. Nodes (Ithaca NY, 2011)

Ossorguine, Tatiana, Eugénie Lange and Paul Chaix, ‘Périodiques en langue russe publiés en Europe de 1855 a 1917’, *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, vol. 11, no. 4 (1970), pp. 629-709

Ossorguine-Bakounine, Tatiana, *L'Émigration russe en Europe: catalogue collectif des périodiques en langue russe, 1855-1940* (Paris, 1976)

Owens, Gary, ‘Hedge Schools of Politics: O'Connell's Monster Meetings’, *History Ireland*, vol. 2, no. 1 (1994), pp. 35-40

‘Nationalism without Words: Symbolism and Ritual Behaviour in the Repeal ‘Monster Meetings’ of 1843-5’, in James S. Donnelly and Kerby A. Miller (eds), *Irish Popular Culture, 1650-1850* (Dublin, 1999), pp. 242-70

Partridge, Monica, ‘Herzen and the English Press’, *SEER*, vol. 36, no. 87 (1958), pp. 453-70

Pašeta, Senia, *Before the Revolution: Nationalism, Social Change and Ireland's Catholic Elite, 1879-1922* (Cork, 1999)

Pasieka, K.S., ‘The British Press and the Polish Insurrection of 1863’, *SEER*, vol. 42, no. 98 (1963), pp. 15-37

Patyk, Lynn Ellen, ‘"The Double-Edged Sword of Word and Deed": Revolutionary Terrorism and Russian Literary Culture’, (PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 2005)

‘Remembering “The Terrorism”: Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinskii’s “Underground Russia”’, *Slavic Review*, vol. 68, no. 4 (2009), pp. 758-81

‘The Byronic Terrorist: Boris Savinkov's Literary Self-Mythologization’, in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), pp. 163-90

‘Dressed to Kill and Die: Russian Revolutionary Terrorism, Gender, and Dress’, *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 192-209

Peaker, Carol L., ‘Reading Revolution: Russian Émigrés and the Reception of Russian Literature in England, c. 1890-1905’ (PhD dissertation, University of Oxford, 2006)

Pease, Edward R., in Thomas Kirkup, *A History of Socialism. Fifth Edition largely revised and rewritten by Edward R. Pease* (London, 1913)

Pease, Edward R., *Some Recollections for my Sons*, unpublished, [1930/1953]. [Privately printed, held at British Library, shelf mark X.705/281]

Peri, Alexis, and Christine Evans, ‘How Terrorists Learned to Map: Plotting in Petersburg and Boris Savinkov’s The Pale Horse’, in Olga Matich (ed), *Petersburg/Petersburg: Novel and City, 1900-1921* (Madison, WI, 2010), pp. 149-73

Pipes, Richard, *The Degaev Affair: Terror and Treason in Tsarist Russia* (New Haven CT, 2003)

Russian Conservatism and its Critics: A Study in Political Culture (New Haven NH, 2005)

‘The Trial of Vera Z.’, *Russian History,* Special Issue, vol. 37, no.1 (2010)

‘Trepov Shot’, *Russian History*, Special Issue: The Trial of Vera Z., vol. 37, no. 1 (2010), pp. 33-49

Pirumova, N., *Mikhail Bakunin: Zhizn i deiatelnost* (Moscow, 1966)

Pirumova, N.M., *Petr Alekseevich Kropotkin* (Moscow, 1972)

Pomper, Philip, *Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement* (Chicago, 1972)

Lenin's Brother: The Origins of the October Revolution (New York, 2010)

Porter, Bernard, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge, 1979)

'The Freiheit Prosecutions, 1881-1882', *Historical Journal*, vol. 23, no. 4 (1980), pp. 833-56

Putnam, Lara, 'The Transnational and the Text-Searchable: Digitized Sources and the Shadows They Cast', *American Historical Review*, vol. 121, no. 2 (2016), pp. 376-402

Raeff, Marc, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia: The Eighteenth-century Nobility* (New York, 1966)

Rak, V.D., '*O chetverostishii, pripisannom Pushkinu*', in V.D. Rak, *Dostoevskii i drugie (voprosy tekstologii, materiali k kommentariam)* (St Petersburg, 2003), pp. 42-63

Reid, Colin, *The Lost Ireland of Stephen Gwynn: Irish Constitutional Nationalism and Cultural Politics, 1864-1950* (Manchester, 2011)

Ritina, In. [I.I. Rakitnikova], 'Feliks Vadimovich Volkhovskii', *Mysl*, no. 40, 1 January 1915. https://socialist-revolutionist.ru/component/content/article/82-public/1243-rakitnikova-ii-statya-feliks-vadimovich-volxovskij

Ropshin, *What Never Happened: A Novel of the Revolution* (New York, 1917)

Ropshin, V., *The Pale Horse*, trans. Z. Vengerova. (Dublin, 1917)

What Never Happened, trans. Thomas Seltzer (New York, 1917)

Rosada, Bruno, 'Journalism', in Gaetana Marrone (ed), *Encyclopedia of Italian Literary Studies* (New York, 2007), pp. 977-82

Ryan, James, *Lenin's Terror: The Ideological Origins of Early Soviet State Violence* (Abingdon, 2012)

Sablinsky, Walter, *The road to bloody Sunday: Father Gapon and the St. Petersburg Massacre of 1905* (Princeton NJ, 1976)

Saburova, Tatiana and Ben Eklof, *Druzhba, semia, revoliutsiia: Nikolai Charushin i pokolenie narodnikov 1870-x godov* (Moscow, 2016)

Saunders, David, 'Vladimir Burtsev and the Russian Revolutionary Emigration (1888-1905)', *EHQ*, vol. 13, no. 1 (1983), pp. 39-62

'Tyneside and the Making of the Russian Revolution', *Northern History*, vol. 21, no. 1 (1985), pp. 259-84

Saunier, Pierre-Yves, *Transnational History* (New York, 2013)

Savinkov, Boris, *The Black Horse*, trans. Sir Paul Dukes, K.B.E. (London, 1924),

Memoirs of a Terrorist, trans Joseph Shaplen (New York, 1931)

Izbrannoe (Moscow, 1990)

Schenk, Frithjof Benjamin, 'Attacking the Empire's Achilles Heels: Railroads and Terrorism in Tsarist Russia', *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 232-53

Scotto, Peter, 'The Terrorist as Novelist: Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinsky', in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), pp. 97-126

Sedlmaier, Alexander, 'The Consuming Visions of Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-century Anarchists: Actualising Political Violence Transnationally', *European Review of History*, vol. 14, no. 3 (2007), pp. 283-300

Senese, Donald, 'S. M. Kravchinskii and the National Front Against Autocracy', *Slavic Review*, vol. 34, no. 3 (1975), pp. 506-22

'Felix Volkhovsky in London, 1890–1914', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), pp. 67-78

S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii: The London Years (Newtonville MA, 1987)

Senn, Alfred Erich, 'M. K. Elpidin: Revolutionary Publisher', *Russian Review*, vol. 41, no. 1 (1982), pp. 11-23

'The Russian Revolutionary Movement of the Nineteenth Century as Contemporary History', Kennan Institute Occasional Paper Series, no. 250 (Washington DC, 1993)

Shishko, L. 'K voprosu ob organizatsii', in *Pamiati Leonida Emmanuilovicha Shishko* (1910), pp. 64-72

Shishko, L.E., '*Otkrytoe pismo Zh. Zhoresu*', in O. V. Budnitskii, *Istoriia Terrorizma v Rossii v Dokumentakh, Biografiiakh, issledovaniiakh* (Rostov-on-Don, 1996), pp. 243-8

[Shishko, Leonid], '*Razskazy iz russkoi istorii. Chast vtoraia*.' (1902)

Siljak, Ana, *Angel of Vengeance: The Girl who Shot the Governor of St Petersburg and Sparked the Age of Assassinations* (New York, 2008)

Slatter, John, 'Stepniak and the Friends of Russia', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1983), pp. 33-47

'Jaakoff Prelooker and The Anglo-Russian', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), pp. 48-66

'The Correspondence of P. A. Kropotkin as Historical Source Material', *SEER*, vol. 72, no. 2 (1994), pp. 277-88

'"Chto eto ty, rodnoi, vse khrovaesh?". Pisma P.A. Kropotkina F. V. Volkhovskomu. 1894-1905 gg.', *Istoricheskii Arkhiv*, no. 5-6 (1997), pp. 156-66

'Bears in the Lion's Den: The Figure of the Russian Revolutionary Emigrant in English Fiction, 1880-1914', *SEER*, vol. 77, no. 1 (1999), pp. 30-55

'"Reaktsiia solidarna vo vsem mire": Pisma P.A. Kropotkina D.V. Soskisu, 1901-1916 gg.', *Istoricheskii Arkhiv*, no. 1 (2001), pp. 54-63

Smele, Jonathan, *The Russian Revolution and Civil War 1917-1921: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 2003),

The "Russian" Civil Wars, 1916-1926: Ten Years That Shook the World (Oxford, 2015)

Smith, Helen, *The Uncommon Reader: A Life of Edward Garnett* (London, 2017)

Smith, Shannon, 'From Relief to Revolution: American Women and the Russian-American Relationship, 1890-1917', *Diplomatic History*, vol. 19, no. 4 (1995), pp. 601-16

Smyth, James and Murdoch Rogers, 'Peter Petroff and the socialist movement in Britain, 1907–18', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2, no. 3 (1983), pp. 100-116

Spence, Richard B., *Boris Savinkov: Renegade on the Left* (New York, 1991)

'Sidney Reilly in America, 1914-1917', *Intelligence and National Security*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1995), pp. 92-121

Spence Watson, Robert, *England's Dealings with Ireland* (1887)

Home Rule for Ireland: Fear or Hope? (1893)

Spiridovich, A. I., *Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Rossii v period imperii: Partiia sotsialistov-revoliutsionerov i eia predshestvenniki, 1886-1916* (Petrograd, 1918)

Stafford, David, 'Conspiracy and Xenophobia: The Popular Spy Novels of William Le Queux, 1893-1914', *Europa*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1981), pp. 163-87

Stepniak, *Underground Russia: Revolutionary Profiles and Sketches from Life* (London, 1882)

'Terrorism in Russia and Terrorism in Europe', *Contemporary Review*, no. 45 (1884), pp. 325-41

'A Female Nihilist', *The Cornhill Magazine*, vol. 3, no. 17 (November 1884), pp. 485-512

The Russian Storm Cloud (London, 1886)

The Russian Peasantry (London, 1888)

The Career of a Nihilist, Second ed. (London, 1890)

King Stork and King Log: A Study of Modern Russia (London, 1895)

Stepniak, S., *Russia Under the Tzars* (London, 1885)

Domik na Volge. Povest (Geneva, 1896)

Andrei Kozhukov. Roman (Geneva, 1898)

Stundist Pavel Rudenko. Roman (Geneva, 1900)

Stites, Richard, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism 1860-1930* (Princeton NJ, 1978)

Stretton, Hesba, *The Highway of Sorrow at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1894)

Surkis, Judith, ‘Of Scandals and Supplements: Relating Intellectual and Cultural History’, in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (eds), *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 94-111

Taratuta, Evgeniya Alexandrovna, *Etel Lilian Voinich* (Moscow, 1960)

S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii: revoliutsioner i pisatel (Moscow, 1973)

Trapeznik, Alexander, ‘V M Chernov, Terrorism and the Azef Affair’, *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, vol. 35 (2001), pp. 101-11

Travis, Frederick F., *George Kennan and the American-Russian Relationship, 1865-1924* (Athens OH, 1990)

Treadgold, Donald W., ‘The Populists Refurbished’, *Russian Review*, vol. 10, no. 3 (1951), pp. 185-96

Trigos, Ludmilla A., ‘Historical Models of Terror in Decembrist Literature’, in Anthony Anemone (ed), *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia* (Evanston IL, 2010), pp. 25-52

Turcato, Davide, ‘Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement, 1885-1915’, *International Review of Social History*, vol. 52, no. 3 (2007), pp. 407-44

‘Nations without Borders: Anarchists and National Identity’, in Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (eds), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 25-42

Turner, John R., ‘Title-Pages Produced by the Walter Scott Publishing Co Ltd’, *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 44 (1991), pp. 323-31

Turton, Katy, *Family Networks and the Russian Revolutionary Movement, 1870–1940* (Basingstoke, 2018)

Ulam, Adam B., *Prophets and Conspirators in Prerevolutionary Russia* (New Brunswick NJ, 1998)

Venturi, Franco, *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in 19th century Russia*, trans. Francis Haskell. With a revised introduction by the author. (London, 2001)

Verhoeven, Claudia, *The Odd Man Karakozov* (Ithaca NY, 2009)

‘Time of Terror, Terror of Time: On the Impatience of Russian Revolutionary Terrorism (Early 1860s-Early 1880s)’, *JGO*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2010), pp. 254-73

‘Oh Times, There Is No Time (But the Time that Remains): The Terrorist in Russian Literature (1863-1913)’, in Thomas Austenfeld, Dimiter Daphinoff, and Jens Herlth (eds), *Terrorism and Narrative Practice* (Berlin, 2011), pp. 117-36

Waller, Philip, *Writers, Readers, and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain, 1870-1918* (Oxford, 2006)

Ward, Ken, *Mass Communication and the Modern World* (Basingstoke, 1989)

Warwick-Haller, Sally, *William O'Brien and the Irish Land War* (Dublin, 1990)

Whelehan, Niall, ‘'Scientific Warfare or the Quickest Way to Liberate Ireland': The Brooklyn Dynamite School’, *History Ireland*, vol. 19, no. 6 (2008), pp. 42-5

The Dynamiters: Irish Nationalism and Political Violence in the Wider World, 1867-1900 (Cambridge, 2012)

'Playing with Scales: Transnational History and Modern Ireland', in Niall Whelehan (ed), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (Abingdon, 2015), pp. 7-29

Whelehan, Niall, (ed), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (Abingdon, 2015)

Whishaw, Frederick, *Sons of Freedom, or The Fugitives from Siberia* (London, 1897)

White, Frederick H., *Degeneration, Decadence and Disease in the Russian Fin de Siècle: Neurasthenia in the Life and Work of Leonid Andreev* (Manchester, 2014)

'Interpreting History: Meaning Production for the Russian Revolution', *Adaption*, vol. 9, no. 2 (2016), pp. 205-20

White, James D., 'The first *Pravda* and the Russian Marxist tradition', *Soviet Studies*, vol. 26, no. 2 (1974) pp. 181-204

Williams, Helen, '"Vesti i slukhi": The Russian Émigré press to 1905', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 13, no. 2 (2000), pp. 45-61

Wood, Gordon S., *Revolutionary Characters: What Made the Founders Different* (New York, 2006)

Woodward, James B., *Leonid Andreyev: A Study* (Oxford, 1969)

Wortmann, Richard, *The Crisis of Russian Populism* (Cambridge, 1967)

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm, *Road to Revolution: A Century of Russian Radicalism* (Princeton NJ, 2014)

Yershov, Peter (ed), *Letters of Gorky and Andreev: 1899-1912*, trans. Lydia Weston (London, 1958)

Zuckerman, Fredric S., 'Vladimir Burtsev and the Tsarist Political Police in Conflict, 1907-14', *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1977), pp. 193-219

The Tsarist Secret Police Abroad: Policing Europe in a Modernising World (Basingstoke, 2002)