Chapter 4: Henry Adams and Andrei Bely: The Explosive Mind

Bombs educate vigorously.

Henry Adams

Like the telegraph, airplane, cinema, and bicycle, all of which were invented in this period, the dynamite bomb is modern. Its historical specificity and metaphorical implications make it a particularly appropriate master trope for modernist literature. To political opponents of anarchism, the revolutionary bomb signifies the destruction of order, but to some modernists the bomb had a positive charge. Just as the dialectic of order and chaos obsesses the narrator of The Education of Henry Adams and Petersburg`s patriarch Apollon Apollonovich, who is afraid of space, fascinated by spheres, comforted by rectangles and squares, attraction to and fear of anarchy inform both texts.

Although they belonged to different generations, the Russian novelist Andrei Bely and the American historian Henry Adams were conservative anti-statists who responded in illuminatingly similar ways to the new century. Both framed their anti-statism in generational terms.

Adams`s claim to be a "conservative Christian anarchist" is important to an understanding of his autobiography. In addition to nationality and age, there were, of course, other differences between them. Both were interested in modern science and mathematics, but Bely sought to present his version of mysticism as a science, while Adams grappled with scientific orthodoxies. Like Adams, Bely, whose father was a mathematician, was fascinated by new theories about mathematics and physics—natural forces, energy, infinity, unity, disorder. [1] I call Bely and Adams fellow travelers of anarchism, despite their ambivalent and contradictory political attitudes, because they recognize and invoke the anarchist sublime.

Historical Connections

Henry Adams and Andrei Bely deployed the imagery of chaos and explosion to meditate upon what is often called "the crisis of European civilization," of which anarchism, the Russian Revolution, and World War I were manifestations. While neither The Education of Henry Adams (1907) nor Bely`s high modernist novel Petersburg (1913) attempts to represent anarchism as a political movement, they have related concerns: anarchy and chaos, force and power, the divided or fragmented self, Russia as a "natural" site for anarchy, an ambivalent fascination with oppositional politics. The contemporaneity of the two texts is even more

specific: Petersburg is set during the 1905 Russian Revolution, and The Education concludes with the year 1905. For both writers, furthermore, order is culture and anarchy is nature.

A particular bomb appears in both Petersburg and The Education in references to the assassination of the notorious Russian Minister of the Interior Vyacheslav von Plehve, killed by a bomb thrown by a Socialist Revolutionary on July 28, 1904. [2] (Plehve`s assassination is also the opening event in Conrad`s Under Western Eyes.). In his own account of 1905, Leon Trotsky evocatively describes Plehve as Conrad might have: "he loathed the revolution with the fierce loathing of a police detective grown old in his profession, threatened by a bomb from around every corner; he pursued sedition with bloodshot eyes—but in vain." [3] The assassination was carried out by the Battle Organization, the terrorist wing of the Social Revolutionists, and was approved by Evno Azef, who was both head of the Battle Organization and a secret agent of the police. [4] Almost everyone except the tsar was happy about Plehve`s death. [5] Edward Judge, Plehve`s biographer, writes that "by arousing or increasing the enmity of almost every segment of the population, he had set in motion the forces which had led to the Russian revolution of 1905" and accordingly he is "the principal author of this revolution." [6]

One of Petersburg`s main characters, Apollon Apollonovich, is a friend and protégé of Plehve who occasionally thinks of the assassination.[7] At the end of Chapter 32 of The Education, Adams also thinks about

Plehve's assassination. In the summer of 1904 he is wandering through the streets of Troyes when he sees a notice posted in a shop window announcing the minister's assassination in St. Petersburg. What he describes as "the mad mixture of Russia and the Crusades" causes him to enter a nearby church and admire its windows as he ponders history and politics. "Was assassination forever to be the last word of Progress?" he wonders. The church seems all the more serene for its contrast with "explosive murder" and Adams wonders with whom the conservative Christian anarchist should identify, the victim or the assassin.

The Conservative Christian Anarchist

In a description that might apply to Andrei Bely too, Jackson Lears describes Henry Adams as an "antimodern modernist" whose yearnings for authenticity and faith coincided with "his acceptance of a fragmented self in a fragmented universe"; accordingly, "Adams prefigured the `modern consciousness` celebrated by many avant-garde artists and intellectuals in the twentieth century."[8]

Adams`s disturbing anti-Semitism (particularly evident in his letters), hostility to immigrants, and nostalgia for the past are among his reactionary traits. His intellectual heroes ("high priests") were Alexis de Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill; according to Adams`s biographer Ernest Samuels, "he had come wholly under the sway of his [Mill`s] libertarian

doctrines." [9] The two figures are suggestive of the complexities and potential contradictions of Adams`s politics. Tocqueville combined aristocratic loyalties and a belief in the organic ties of feudal communities with a dislike of the cash nexus and a fear of what he famously called the "tyranny of the majority." The author of On Liberty, Mill was a libertarian and an individualist who advocated a fairer distribution of wealth and who admired the American anarchist Josiah Warren, but who feared democracy, revolution, and socialism. [10]

Critics have had difficulty understanding Adams`s description of himself as a "conservative Christian anarchist." Peter Conn explains it as follows: "If we understand Adams`s witty formulation properly and loosely, if we take it to summarize a profound internal dialectic, a conflict between tradition and innovation, between control and independence, between order and liberation, then we might accept Adams`s phrase as an epigraph to the cultural history of the period." [11] Conn`s is an interesting response, but it leaves the political dimension of Adams`s "witty formulation" unexplored. Katherine Hayles reads Adam`s phrase as "a three-part structure marked by a void," a "paradoxical antithesis." [12] Other possible formulations, however, would have provided the same tripartite structure or seeming antithesis—"pacifist revolutionary aristocrat," for example—so why this particular choice?

It is not difficult to accept Adams`s characterization of himself as "conservative." What immediately distinguishes him from other boys is

not character, he explains in the beginning of The Education, but education "as a result of that eighteenth-century inheritance which he took with his name" (EHA, 7). It is this sense of belonging to the past that grounds Adams`s conservatism for the rest of his life, so that even as an "anarchist" he must be "conservative." His loyalties lie with Quincy, the eighteenth-century home of his grandfather John Quincy Adams, not with Boston, home of his capitalist grandfather Brooks (EHA, 21-22). In the first chapter of The Education, these themes are already suggested: "The atmosphere of education in which he lived was colonial, revolutionary, almost Cromwellian," Adams writes, "as though he were steeped, from his greatest grandmother`s birth, in the odor of political crime" (EHA, 7). Resistance to authority, as both a New England and Adams family trait, first evinces itself in the boy Henry`s "rebellion" one day against going to school, "the education that he hated" (EHA, 12). His grandfather, John Quincy Adams, walks him silently to school. A series of doublings and oppositions is introduced: New England summers contrasted with New England winters, "mercantile Boston" with agrarian Quincy, giving the boy a "double nature" (EHA, 9). The boy Henry takes sides early: "Town [Boston] was restraint, law, unity. Country, only seven miles away [Quincy], was liberty, diversity, outlawry" (EHA, 8). The young conservative Christian anarchist prefers liberty and outlawry. "The first part of The Education," observes Carolyn Porter, "reveals the incoherence

of the authoritative systems—social, political, intellectual—presiding over nineteenth-century society." [13]

The word "anarchist" encodes for Adams "American," "antistatist," "scientist," and "anticapitalist." It is remarkable that Adams would label himself thus in light of his ancestry — direct descent from two heads of state — and despite the 1901 assassination of McKinley by a self-proclaimed anarchist. Adams`s anticapitalism is explicit in The Education: "he had, in a half-hearted way, struggled all his life against State Street, Banks, Capitalism altogether as he knew it in Old England or New England"[EHA, 335] and "Of all forms of society or government, this [capitalism] was the one he liked least"[EHA, 344].

Adams also specifies that he is a "Christian" anarchist, thereby presumably distinguishing his attitude from the atheism common in anarchist thought. "Christian" could also function as an ethnic marker to distinguish him from Jewish anarchists, but Adams seems to refer to some vocational calling. "Nature had given to the boy Henry," he writes, "a character that, in any previous century, would have led him into the Church" (EHA, 26). But nature was apparently overcome by culture, since Adams later admits, "neither to him nor to his brothers or sisters was religion real ... The religious instinct had vanished and could not be revived" (EHA, 34). As is apparent in Mont St. Michel and Chartres, Adams`s Christianity is profoundly aesthetic, taking the

form of an attraction to the thought and architecture of the Middle Ages. But the Church finds itself at odds with modern science, whose theories prompt Adams`s most profound engagement with anarchy.

Bely's Political Contradictions

Because of his attraction to the occult, his occasional anti-Semitism, and his fear of the East, Andrei Bely might be taken as yet another modernist reactionary, appropriate company for Eliot and Pound. Bely is, however, closer to Joyce, whose interest in anarchism has been mentioned. In Literature and Revolution, Leon Trotsky analyzes the politics of Bely and his fellow Russian Symbolists scathingly but with insight, observing: "Bely`s roots are in the past. But where is the old harmony now? On the contrary, everything seems shaken up to Bely, everything is aslant, everything is thrown out of equilibrium. " [14] According to Trotsky, Bely is a conservative, nostalgic for the aristocratic, pastoral Russia of Tolstoy, Goncharov, and Turgenev:

> Bely`s apparent dynamics mean only a running around and a struggling on the mounds of a disappearing and disintegrating old regime. His

> verbal twists lead nowhere. He has no hint of ideal revolutionism. In his core he is a realistic and spiritual conservative who has lost the ground under his feet and is in despair...Torn from the pivot of custom and individualism, Bely wishes to replace the whole world with himself, to build everything anew from himself and through himself, to discover everything anew in himself—but his works, with all their different artistic values, invariably represent a poetic or spiritualist sublimation of the old customs. [15]

Despite his idealism and his valorization of subjectivity, Bely is more complex than Trotsky grants. Between 1905 and 1908 Bely was politically active. His biographer, John Elsworth, writes, "Since the autumn of 1905, when he had witnessed the rising in Moscow and voted for the transformation of the university into a revolutionary tribunal, and even taken an active part when the university was then besieged, Bely`s sympathies had been on the side of the revolutionary movement." [16] Among Bely`s friends in this period were young men who identified themselves as anarchists, such as Lev Lvovich Kobylinsky and Leonid Semenov. [17] In a letter to Blok in December 1911, Bely wrote, referring to

the influence of Gregory Chulkov and Ivanov, "We were all mystical anarchists" at that time. [18]

A personal acquaintance of Bely, Nikolai Berdyaev (1874-1948) describes him as a revolutionary, not a reactionary, a "literary cubist" and "the only genuine and significant futurist in Russian literature." [19] In a passage that evokes the bomb, Berdyaev declares: "Bely belongs to a new era where the perception of man as a whole has been shaken and man is passing through a process of fission. Bely plunges man into cosmic infinity, he hands him over to be torn by cosmic whirlwinds." [20]

Thematic Connections

"Who does not desire his father`s death? " asks Ivan Karamazov. Both Adams and Bely represent anarchism as a revolt of the sons against the ruling fathers. In keeping with a master trope of Russian literature, Bely figures political strife as intergenerational. The plot of Petersburg turns on the assignment of Nicholas Apollonovich to assassinate his father, Apollon Apollonovich, a powerful government minister. Because an anarchist is above all an anti-statist, Adams, who was descended from two heads of state, is implicated in an anti-patriarchal stance.

The native lands of Bely and Adams, Russia and the United States, share some obvious but striking similarities: their immense size and diverse populations, ambivalent attitudes toward Europe, the institutions of serfdom (abolished in 1861) and slavery (abolished in 1863). Both also

have an indigenous tradition of anti-statist thought. The anarchists Bakunin, Kropotkin, Tolstoy, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were all Russian by birth. Both Henry Adams and Joseph Conrad articulate the rather startling notion that the United States is a country particularly hospitable to anarchism. The anarchist Professor in Conrad`s The Secret Agent remarks that "they have more character over there, and their character is essentially anarchistic. Fertile ground for us, the States—very good ground. The great Republic has the root of the destructive matter in her. The collective temperament is lawless." [21] The tension between the powerful tsarist bureaucracy and the anarchic Russian people echoes the founding American struggle between the urban centralism of Alexander Hamilton and the decentralized rural life championed by Jefferson.

One version of Russian anti-statism is nihilism, often confused with anarchism and made infamous by Bakunin`s disciple Sergei Nechaev.[22] Nihilists, Peter Kropotkin explains, insist on reason and on absolute sincerity, on the rejection of "the conventional lies of civilized mankind," including religion and sentimentalism; art was also negated, since "every object of art was bought with money exacted from starving peasants or from underpaid workers." [23] The Russian nihilists appear in numerous famous nineteenth-century novels, including Turgenev`s Fathers and Sons, Dostoyevsky`s The Devils, Chernyshevsky`s What is to be Done? and Goncharov`s Precipice. Turgenev and Dostoyevsky

represent nihilism as a rebellion of the sons against the fathers, a theme that Bely adopts in Petersburg.

Anti-statism has a distinguished lineage in American history and literature. Historians and proponents of anarchism have found evidence of anti-statist thought in Antinomianism (Anne Hutchinson), Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine, Brockden Brown, and Transcendentalism (Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman). "In America," Adams writes in The Education, "all were conservative Christian anarchists; the faith was national, racial, geographic. The true American had not seen such supreme virtue in any of the innumerable shades between social anarchy and social order as to mark it for exclusively human and his own. He had never known a complete union either in Church or State or Thought, and had never seen any need for it." (EHA, 408) It is in this sense, the revolutionary nature of the American character in the absence of the crushing European institutions of Church and State, that every American is an anarchist.

But while Russian anarchism is collectivist, American anarchism is predominantly individualist. At Walden Thoreau does not start a commune but separates himself from his fellows. American anarchist and Wagner buff Benjamin Tucker was a leading exponent of individualist libertarian thought. In "Anarchy and Authority in American Literature," Irving Howe cites the propertyless status and wandering propensities of Natty Bumppo,

Huck Finn and Jim, all fleeing the encroaching state in "the clash between anarchic yearning and fixed authority."[24]

According to Adams, Russia is even more anarchic than the United States. He calls Russia`s "opposite condition" a "more interesting phase" of conservative Christian anarchy, citing the dominance, not the absence, of a powerful Church and State, the presence of orthodox Jews and Virgin-adoring peasants, of nomads and tribes. The contrast is between America`s "hasty and unsure acceleration" and Russian "inertia" (EHA, 411). It seems to Adams that this "inertia" is virtually racial: "The Russian people could never have changed—could they ever be changed?" (EHA, 409). The "primitiveness" of the Russians causes Adams to doubt the truth of evolution and progress.

In The Russian Idea Berdyaev substantiates some of Adams`s intuitions about the Russian character, devoting a chapter to Russian anarchism, the causes of which, he suggests, are both historical and psychological:

> Throughout the nineteenth century the Intelligentsia fought against the Empire and professed a stateless non-authoritarian ideal, and created extreme forms of anarchist ideology ... An original anarchic element may be discerned in all social tendencies of the Russian nineteenth century, both religious and

> anti-religious; in the great Russian writers, in the very make-up of the Russian character, a make-up which certainly did not lend itself to being organized ... Among a people who were anarchist in their fundamental bent, there existed a State that developed to a monstrous degree, and an all-powerful bureaucracy surrounding an autocratic Tsar and separating him from the people ... The Russian feeling for freedom was connected with anarchism rather than with the strict principle of liberalism. [25]

According to Berdyaev, Russian anarchism and mysticism are not strange bedfellows as they would be in the West. They are combined in the Christian anarchism of Lev Tolstoy, whom Bely knew as a child. In The Law of Love and The Law of Violence (1908), a text closely contemporary with The Education and Petersburg, Tolstoy wrote: "People are so accustomed to the political structure in which they live that to them it seems an unavoidably permanent form of human existence. But it only seems so; people have lived and do live, outside the political structure ... The State is only a temporary thing and in no way a permanent feature of human life." [26]

Political Petersburg

Russian writers of the nineteenth century tended to fall into two camps: those who, like Turgenev, admired European culture and institutions and the Slavophiles who, like Dostoyevsky, feared that European influences would destroy Russian culture and religion. [27] The focus for some of this debate was the city of Petersburg, the "Venice of the North," built by Peter the Great according to a European model in the marshes and fog of western Russia. Marshall Berman provides a generous, informed account of Petersburg`s history and literary culture in All That is Solid Melts Into Air. Petersburg, the unnatural city,is contrasted with Moscow, the old capital: "Petersburg representing all the foreign and cosmopolitan forces that flowed through Russian life, Moscow signifying all the accumulated indigenous and insular traditions of the Russian narod [folk]; Petersburg as the Enlightenment, and Moscow as anti-Enlightenment; Moscow as purity of blood and soil, Petersburg as pollution and miscegenation; Moscow as sacred, Petersburg as secular (or perhaps atheistic); Petersburg as Russia`s head, Moscow as its heart."

As the city was founded by and named after a czar and became the site of a vast government bureaucracy, it is an appropriate image for that State which anarchists sought to destroy. Alexander Pushkin`s poem "The Bronze Horseman" (the title refers to a statue of Peter) describes the flooding of the city and the resulting madness of a poor clerk who

imagines that the statue comes to life and pursues him. As one critic writes, "From Pushkin onward, the Petersburg cityscape, centering around the Neva [River], would embody the image of a Cosmos never wholly safe from the incursions of that Chaos from which it was wrested." [28] Nikolai Gogol, whose famous story about a government clerk, "The Overcoat," is set in Petersburg, wrote to his mother, "Petersburg is not half what I expected—I had thought of it as much more beautiful, magnificent ... All the civil servants and officials can talk about is their department or government office; everything seems to have been crushed under a great weight. " [29] In Notes from Underground Dostoyevsky called Petersburg "the most abstract and premeditated town on the whole terrestrial globe." [30]

The novel Petersburg is as formally innovative and politically ambivalent as almost any of its canonical Anglo-American counterparts.[31] It contains at least two related major plots, one concerning the assignment of a young man to blow up his father, a government official, with a bomb, the other concerning the same young man`s thwarted love for a married woman. Both plots play upon familiar thematics of Russian literature and both interweave the public and the private, the political and the metaphysical.

As with Joyce`s Ulysses and Kafka`s novels, however, literary critics have tended to neglect the political dimension of Petersburg in favor of its color symbolism, Freudianism, appropriation of mystical

systems, and indebtedness to Gogol, Dostoyevsky, and other Russian novelists. Also like Ulysses, Petersburg might seem anarchic at first reading but it contains a complex, orderly network of relationships. These in turn are subverted, even jeopardized, by the imminence of explosion.

Because Petersburg`s fictional and historical context is a revolutionary one, a reading of its politics is necessary to its interpretation. No single reading can exhaust the possible interpretations of such a multifaceted novel. But as the copious notes to the authoritative translation of the novel suggests, Bely did have contemporary social issues and political figures in mind as he wrote. Like Marshall Berman in All That is Solid Melts Into Air, therefore, I want to situate the novel in the context of the 1905 revolution and to recover its political unconscious. Unlike Berman, however, I am arguing that anarchy and anarchism are constitutive of the aesthetics and politics of the novel.

It might even be argued that the political unconscious of Petersburg is anarchist in the broadest sense of the word, at the level of narration. In a recent article on the linguistic features of the novel, Cynthia Simmons considers Bely`s use of "non-authoritarian discourse"—meaning that characters are not speaking through the author. [32] "Non-authoritarian narrative forms," she explains, "create an atmosphere of verbal, as well as material, chaos and discourse failure." In particular, she notes the presence of free indirect discourse, the form of non-authoritarian discourse "most conducive to the intermingling of codes (Bahkhtin`s

polyphony)." Accordingly, Bely`s own philosophical and political ideas are not imposed on the characters: "the individualization of codes serves to counter the authority and personality of the narrator." Since authority was the chief target of anarchists, Simmons`s argument is suggestive for a reading of Petersburg`s politics. Indeed, both authority and authorship are thematized and problematized. The narrative strategy of Petersburg is radical precisely in what might be regarded as its anarchist refusal to endorse any single authority or point of view. If indeterminacy and nonauthoritarian features are coded into the very fabric of the narration, anarchy is the decentering center of Bely`s aesthetic.

The 1905 revolution`s most infamous event took place in Petersburg on January 9th — Bloody Sunday, when hundreds of workers who marched on the Winter Palace to plead with the czar were murdered in the streets. The successful Russian revolution of 1917 has overshadowed the failed revolution of 1905, but according to Adam Ulam, "the revolution of 1905 was the most elemental and all-encompassing of the three the country was to experience in this century. The volume and ubiquity of revolutionary turbulence surpassed anything which was to be witnessed either in February or in October 1917." [33] And while the Russian Revolution has also become falsely synonymous with a single group, Lenin`s 13,00 Bolsheviks, these were by no means the only revolutionaries on the Russian scene. [34] In addition to the 18,000 Mensheviks there was the much larger group of Socialist Revolutionaries,

whose "program and tactics were a curious blend of old populism, Marxism, and outright anarchism." [35]

There were also anarchists proper — anarchist-communists, anarcho-syndicalists, and individualist anarchists, among them members of avant-garde circles in the arts and disaffected former members of the Socialist Revolutionaries and Social Democrats. [36] One historian of the 1905 revolution describes the anarchists` role in events as follows:

> Once the revolution of 1905 began, some Social Democrats and SRs came under the spell of the anarchist creed ... Although a few anarchist groups followed the more benign teachings of Kropotkin and devoted themselves to propaganda and agitation among the masses, in 1905 the advocates of terrorism held sway within the movement. Adhering to Bakunin`s well-known dictum that `the urge to destroy is also a creative urge,` and convinced that their acts of violence would stimulate the yearning for revenge by the masses against their exploiters, the terrorists carried out numerous armed robberies to enable them to secure weapons, which they used to assassinate officials. In the last months of 1905 hardly a day passed

without some anarchist outrage being reported in the daily press. [37]

It is the SR, with its anarchist wing and tendencies, who, I suspect, figure as the conspirators in Bely`s Petersburg. The novel`s historical referents to anarchism are first, the actual presence of anarchist terrorists in the 1905 revolution, secondly the philosophical presence of "mystical anarchism," with which Bely was familiar, and thirdly, the metaphor of the bomb, which in this period is always an anarchist signifier.

Another historical footnote to the novel is the importance of double agents and provocateurs to the 1905 Revolution. The secret police, in the form of the agent-provocateur Lippanchenko, are also present in Petersburg. In a misguided strategy, the secret police chief Serge Zubatov, who had been a member of the radical People`s Will, sought to unionize workers and align them with the czar, but succeeded primarily in educating them about the Western labor movement and raising their class consciousness. [38] It was Zubatov`s secret agent Evno Azef, who participated in the assassination of Plehve; the name Lippanchenko was one of Azef`s aliases. [39] Again, as in Conrad, a secret agent rather than a genuine anarchist is at the heart of a nefarious bomb plot.

The revolutionary context is explicit at various points of the novel. In Chapter Six, for example, the scope of revolutionary activity throughout Russia is described: bomb-making in Tiflis, agitation at the universities

("the universities of Russia were one big mass meeting"), red flags at the Reval iron works, strikes on the Moscow-Kazan railway line,factory workers and longshoremen on strike in Petersburg. Yet as Berman recognizes, "for all the book`s panoramic scope, it never really gets close to the workers who compose so much of the swarming `myriapod,` and who are the driving force behind the 1905 revolution." [40] Certainly this distance distinguishes Petersburg not only from Gorky`s Mother (1907), which Berman dislikes, but also from another "bomb novel," Frank Harris`s The Bomb.

Petersburg pits Apollinian order and hierarchy against the Dionysian chaos of the bomb, revolution, anarchism. Of the state bureaucrat Apollon Apollonovich, Bely writes, "Only his love for the plane geometry of the state had invested him in the polyhedrality of a responsible position" (P, 11). As the state and Petersburg are aligned with the forces of order, the islands that surround the city are aligned with revolution and anarchy. Apollon Apollonovich`s name comes from Nietzsche`s The Birth of Tragedy, as do Dudkin`s references to the Dionysian. Dudkin says to Nikolai Apollonovich, "We are all Nietzscheans, and you are a Nietzschean, though you wouldn`t admit it" (P, 57). Apollon Apollonovich rides through Petersburg in a carriage, like Plehve, and like him fears assassination from someone on the streets. In one scene he espies Dudkin, the terrorist who will later give Nikolai Apollonovich the bomb intended for his father:

> Contemplating the flowing silhouettes, Apollon Apollonovich likened them to shining dots. One of these dots broke loose from its orbit and hurtled at him with dizzying speed, taking the form of an immense crimson sphere—
>
> —among the bowlers on the corner, he caught sight of a pair of eyes. And the eyes expressed the inadmissible. They recognized the senator, and having recognized him, they grew rabid, dilated, lit up, and flashed.
>
> Subsequently, on delving into the details of the matter, Apollon Apollonovich understood rather than remembered that the upstart intellectual was holding a bundle in his hand (P, 14).

Among the anarchist ideas present in the novel are those articulated by the "upstart intellectual" Alexander Ivanovich Dudkin, "whose mind is a virtual compendium of anarchist theories popular at the turn of the century." [41] Dudkin is a representative of the so-called "mystical anarchists" whose ranks included Vyacheveslav Ivanov, the Wagnerian Georgy Chulkov, and the symbolist poet Alexander Blok. [42] Their existence provides further confirmation of the link between anarchism and

modernism, as Mirsky notes: "the ascendancy of Ivanov over the modernist circles of Petersburg became unquestioned and lasted for six or seven years." [43] In his pamphlet on mystical anarchism, Chulkov mentions by name and sometimes quotes Max Stirner, Nietzsche, Tolstoy, Ibsen, and Georg Brandes.[44] In apparent agreement with Chulkov and with Emma Goldman, Bely writes in his essay "Revolution and Culture": "The real revolutionaries are Ibsen, and Stirner, and Nietzsche, not at all Marx and Engels." [45] "We are all Nietzcheans," Dudkin tells Nikolai Apollonovich," and you are also a Nietzschean, although you wouldn`t admit it" (P, 57). An assumption that crucially links Bely to the anarchists is an insistence on the importance of a transformation in consciousness, not only in institutions.

Petersburg has yet another political dimension in its Orientalism, its preoccupation with the Mongol, yellow faces, Oriental attire, and predictions of an invasion from the East. The 1904-05 war between Japan and Russia, which Adams alludes to in Chapter 32 of The Education, is one specific historical referent for Bely`s preoccupation with Orientalism, as is the geographical expanse of the Russian Empire, extending from the Baltic to the Pacific. Allusions to the East occur throughout the novel. One way that the son rebels against the father in Petersburg is in his preference for Asian dress. The terrorist Dudkin has a recurrent hallucination of "a fateful face with very narrow little Mongol eyes" (P 26). Near the end of the novel, Nikolai is living in Tunis, wearing a blue

gandurah and a red Arabian chéchia; later he visits Egypt where he does research at the museum of Bulaq and sits in front of the Sphinx: "Yes, yes, Nikolai Apollonovich has been engulfed by Egypt. He foresees the fate of Egypt in the twentieth century. Culture is a moldering head: everything in it has died; nothing has remained. There will be an explosion: everything will be swept away" (P 292, italics added).

Under the sign of the bomb, which is always the sign of anarchy, Western apocalypse and Eastern menace are conjoined.

Adams on Anarchy and Science

Henry Adams`s understanding of anarchy is inflected by the scientific theories of his era. In the course of his discussion of conservative Christian anarchism, Adams meditates on the opposition between anarchy and order, observing pessimistically: "Chaos was the law of nature; Order was the dream of man. " (EHA, 451) Anarchy and order, he recognizes, are not antinomies, because in the Hegelian sense they are interdependent, constantly synthesizing to produce new contradictions. What is at stake in turn-of-the-century debates about anarchy and order is, ultimately, the nature of human nature and of the cosmos itself.

Peter Kropotkin argues in Mutual Aid against the Social Darwinist slogan of "survival of the fittest," citing the importance

of cooperation, rather than competition, in the survival of all social species. Both Kropotkin and his opponents (Spencer, Huxley) understand the social as grounded in nature, and human nature in turn as inseparable from the environment. While Social Darwinists sought to ground capitalism in nature, anarchists understood capitalism as, like the state, a disruption of the natural order, as encouraging "the war of all against all" rather than the pursuit of common interests and the achievement of common goals.

Both The Education and an earlier work, Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres (1904), demonstrate that Adams`s use of "anarchy" is not a mere metaphor, not disconnected from awareness of contemporary anarchism. In a chapter on Aquinas in Mont-Saint-Michel, Adams articulates the modern individualist anarchist position precisely as Max Stirner does in The Ego and Its Own, namely: "Absolute liberty is absence of restraint; responsibility is restraint; therefore, the ideally free individual is responsible only to himself."[46] Adams proceeds to imply a continuity between anarchism and nature:" This principle is the philosophical foundation of anarchism, and, for anything that science has yet proved, may be the philosophical foundation of the universe; but it is fatal to all society and is especially hostile to the State." [47]

It is also in Mont-Saint-Michel that Adams opposes science, which he aligns with the recognition of natural chaos, to the Church. Medieval humans, he explains, could not countenance "an anarchical—a dual or multiple—universe" and insisted on unity. [48] It is not that the past actually possessed a unity that the present lacks, but rather that the Church provided a doctrine of order. In this, however, the Church is mendacious, deceptive, since order is not primary, does not underlie everything, as it does in the Christian view of creation. Medieval thought and architecture, the Summa Theologiae and Beauvais Cathedral, Adams asserts, share the same "singular unity" which he describes in explicitly political terms: "The essence of it—the despotic central idea—was that of organic unity both in the thought and the building. From that time, the universe has steadily become more complex and less reducible to a central control" [italics added]. [49]

Adams even recognizes the implications of this stance for aesthetics, observing that both modern science and modern art have abandoned organic unity, in practice as well as theory. Scientists and artists are therefore anarchists, acknowledging the multiverse and the despotism of centrality, whether the centrality of God and the church, or of Renaissance perspective and the omniscient narrator. Adams was not the only writer to think of this; in Chesterton`s The Man Who Was Thursday one detective

"is certain that the scientific and artistic worlds are silently bound in a crusade against the Family and the State."[50]

Presumably, then, anarchism as an explicit politics exists at the beginning of the twentieth century because the sea of faith has withdrawn, because the multiple nature of the universe is no longer veiled, and because new technology—the dynamo, the bomb—participates in the destruction and chaos already inherent in nature. But in The Education it is less clear that this is the case. Adams`s construction of the natural opposition of anarchy and order is not a simple, static polarity but Hegelian and millenarian :

> Adams proclaimed that in the last synthesis, order and anarchy were one, but that the unity was chaos. As anarchist, conservative and Christian, he had no other motive or duty but to attain the end; and to hasten it, he was bound to accelerate progress; to concentrate energy; to accumulate power; to multiply and intensify forces; to reduce friction, increase velocity and magnify momentum, partly because this was the mechanical law of the universe as science explained it; but partly also to get done with the present which artists and some others complained of; and finally—and chiefly—because

> a rigorous philosophy required it, in order to penetrate the beyond, and satisfy man`s destiny by reaching the largest synthesis in its ultimate contradiction. [51]

Adams`s claim above that "anarchy and order were one" has a genuine anarchist ring, but political anarchists had a different understanding of the terms. They defined the word "anarchy" according to its epistemology—absence of political leadership—not its conventional use as a synonym for "chaos." Proudhon famously remarked that order was the daughter, not the mother, of liberty. "As man seeks justice in equality," he wrote, "so society seeks order in anarchy." [52] Walter C. Hart wrote in the March 1896 issue of Liberty: "The common belief that disorder must necessarily ensue on the cessation of government, is based on the erroneous assumption that order reigns in our existing society ... Is this [examples of human misery and exploitation] order? Then chaos and confusion are preferable. Yes, Anarchy is Order!" [53] Alexander Berkman agrees, writing "anarchy means order without government and peace without violence. " [54] To the extent that we can correlate anarchy with the sublime and order with the beautiful, the sublime—revolution—is a path to the beautiful—a harmonious, orderly, utopian future. [55]

According to Adams, however, the true anarchists are modern scientists, hence their persecution by society and by the Church, which burned Giordano Bruno and condemned Galileo: "as science goes on repeating to us every day—it condemned anarchists, not atheists." (EHA, 484). Adams describes Curie as an anarchist bomber: "the man of science must have been sleepy indeed who did not jump from his chair like a scared dog when, in 1898, Mme. Curie threw on this desk the metaphysical bomb she called radium." [56] New inventions, such as the telescope, microscope, compass, and gunpowder, serve only to destroy the illusion of a unified universe, and as a result of them "the press drenched Europe with anarchism" (EHA, 485). The dawning scientific recognition that nature is not an orderly and closed system and is therefore not analogous to an ideal Church or State poses a threat to the existing social order, which has always depended on naturalized appeals like that of the divine right of kings.

If heretic mystics and modern scientists are the true anarchists, the Church has always been the party of order. Debates about the nature of good and evil and God`s role in each posed problems that theologians and scholastics sought to solve: "Good was order, law, unity. Evil was disorder, anarchy, multiplicity. Which was truth? The Church had committed itself to the dogma

that order and unity were the ultimate truth, and that the anarchist should be burned." (MSMC, 409). Elsewhere: "The Church alone had constantly protested that anarchy was not order" (EHA, 451). Anarchy had flourished in the Middle Ages, whose ideological contours were, Adams asserts, much more "elastic" than ours. But St. Thomas Aquinas "was working for the Church and the State, not for the salvation of souls, and his chief object was to repress anarchy." (MSMC, 411).

According to Adams, the belief of contemporary anarchists that "anarchy is order" is medieval, not modern; the minds of Kropotkin and Reclus belong to the priestly class. While representing modern scientists as anarchists, Adams explicitly distances himself from actual anarchists of the fin de siècle: "To the conservative Christian anarchist, the amiable doctrines of Kropotkin were sentimental ideas of Russian mental inertia covered with the name of anarchy merely in order to disguise their innocence; and the outpourings of Elisée Reclus were ideals of the French ouvrier, diluted with absinthe, resulting in a bourgeois` dream of order and inertia." (EHA, 407). Ironically, political anarchists, in their belief that lawlessness would restore order, lack the modern scientific awareness of an anarchic universe, thinking instead that the postrevolutionary world will be orderly and unified. For anarchists, according to Adams, nature is orderly:

> With them [Kropotkin and Reclus], as with the socialist, communist or collectivist, the mind that followed nature had no relation; if anarchists needed order, they must go back to the twelfth century where their thought had enjoyed its thousand years of reign. The conservative Christian anarchist could have no associate, no object, no faith except the nature of nature itself. (EHA, 407) [italics added]

Paul Feyerabend, who proposes an anarchistic epistemology in Against Method, also deplores the failure of real anarchists, specifically Kropotkin, to recognize the application of their ideas to science and nature. [57] Anarchists, Kropotkin in particular, did claim a privileged theoretical insight into "the natural," but they imagined "nature" differently from Adams—not as cosmic chaos, but as a world order of a more earthly sort. Both Elisée Reclus and Kropotkin were recognized geographers. Kropotkin wrote articles on geography and natural history for the London journals Nineteenth Century and Nature, and for the Encyclopedia Britannica. In his memoirs, he not only praises machines but expresses aesthetic pleasure in their "grace" and "poetry"; his

views are clearly not reactionary. [58] As a geographer working for the Russian Geographical Society, Kropotkin studied the mountain ranges of Asia to determine their main structural lines. He describes this project in the rhetoric of chaos and order that Adams employs, and his findings are in accordance with the anarchist position that "anarchy is order":

> There are not many joys in human life equal to the joy of the sudden birth of a generalization, illuminating the mind after a long period of patient research. What has seemed for years so chaotic, so contradictory, and so problematic takes at once its proper position within a harmonious whole [italics added] [59]

Thus for the scientist-anarchist Kropotkin, order is still latent and discoverable within the only seemingly chaotic world, whereas for Adams, order is only human, only a "dream." For Kropotkin, nature is primarily good, whereas for Adams it is cruel and capricious. After the painful death of his sister from lockjaw, Adams sees nature in its true light, not as beautiful, but as destructive. The unacknowledged text with which he debates

nature is Shelley`s poem "Mont Blanc" and the buried allusion is to Bakunin`s dialectic of creation and destruction:

> For the first time, the stage-scenery of the senses collapsed; the human mind felt itself stripped naked, vibrating on a void of shapeless energies, with resistless mass, colliding, crushing, wasting, and destroying what these same energies had created and labored from eternity to perfect ... For the first time in his life, Mount Blanc for a moment looked to him what it was—a chaos of anarchic and purposeless forces [italics added] (EHA, 289).[60]

Religion has failed as an explanatory principle, a system of endowing the world with meaning; it is replaced by modern science, which can explain that the world means nothing. For scientists in 1900, Adams writes, the workings of the world are "a toss-up between anarchy and order." Meanwhile "the new forces would educate," he writes (EHA, 497); "bombs educate vigorously" (EHA, 496). Anarchist propaganda by the deed is transformed into scientific theory. To Adams, as to Bely and other writers of this era, anarchy and anarchism are tropes for the social and epistemological revolutions of modernity. Their imaginative

appropriations of anarchy are, as Feyerabend`s critique implies, more modern and more radical than anarchism itself.

Bely's Anarchist Sublime

The dynamite bomb is often concealed or encoded in post-Kantian texts about the sublime. In The Truth in Painting, Derrida, after explaining that "the true sublime ... inadequately presents the infinite in the finite and delimits it violently therein," writes:

> The content (the infinite idea, in the position of signified and no longer of symbolized) destroys the signifier or the representer. It expresses itself only by marking in its expression the annihilation of expression. It smashes to smithereens the signifier which would presume to measure itself against its infinity. [61]

The bomb is both a form of expression and the annihilation of expression. Just as the sublime, encapsulated in the bomb, exceeds representation, the anarchist rejects representation, both as a form of government and in the aesthetic.

The specific Kantian language of the sublime—abysses, expansion, infinity, immeasurability—is prominent in Petersburg, not surprisingly since Bely was a student of Kant. [62] In token of this, Nikolai Apollonovich, also a neo-Kantian, has a bust of Kant in his room. "True sublimity, " writes Kant, "must be sought only in the mind of the judging Subject, and not in the object of nature that occasions this attitude." [63] The bomb in Petersburg participates in the logic of the sublime, partly because it is terrifying and partly because its function is ultimately to explode limits, to expand and destroy consciousness.

As such, it has an affinity with Apollon Apollonovich, of whom Bely writes: "Everyone was astonished at the explosion of the mental forces which poured forth from this particular cranium in defiance of all Russia" [P, 5]. The mind itself is destructive; thought has material effects. Revolutionary agency is eclipsed, and revolutionary consciousness comes to the fore. According to John Elsworth, "the image of explosion was always one of Bely`s favorite ways of expressing the idea of an apocalyptic transformation, and the identification of the self that undergoes spiritual transformation with a bomb recurs [in his] later [work], too." [64]

The bomb that is intended to kill Apollon Apollonovich is intimately linked with both statist father and anarchist son. Early in

the novel, when the government minister first espies the terrorist Dudkin, "his [AA`s] heart pounded and expanded, while in his breast arose the sensation of a crimson sphere about to burst into pieces" (P, 14). The bomb is already present in his own body. The dialectic of chaos and order is therefore not only to be found externally, in the relations of father and son, bureaucrat and terrorist, or Petersburg and the islands, but is also constitutive of the very source of authority and order. The bomb concealed in the sardine tin eventually becomes a "mental bomb" (P, 173). After Nikolai Apollonovich actually sets the time bomb, he becomes intellectually identified with it: "if his head was thinking, then it too had turned into the sardine tin which ... was ticking with thoughts" (P, 218).

For Nikolai is also dynamite. At the end of a complex symbolic dream, Apollon Apollonovich in the guise of Saturn/Chronos converses with his son:

> The chronology was running backwards.
>
> "What then is our chronology?"
>
> But Saturn, Apollon Apollonovich, roaring with laughter, replied:
>
> "None, Kolenka, none at all: the chronology, my dear boy, is—zero."

"Oh! Oh! What then is `I am`?"

"A zero."

"And zero?"

"A bomb."

Nikolai Apollonovich understood that he himself was a bomb. And he burst with a boom (168).

The zero, which is a double of the bomb, is a little-known trope of the turn of the century; it also appears in Stevenson`s The Dynamiter and Robert Walser`s Jakob von Gunten (1909). Both Nikolai Apollonovich and Jakob imagine themselves as zeros. As a child, Nikolai "would start shrieking nonsensical things: that he too was becoming spherical, that he was a zero, that everything in him was zeroing—zeroing—zero-o-o..." (P, 158). Jakob von Gunten, a deliberately downwardly mobile member of an aristocratic family, says of himself "in later life I shall be a charming, utterly spherical zero" (JvG,24). And there are anarchist bombs in Walser's novel too; referring to the famous anarchist bomber Jakob says, "in another time, it was in the days of Ravachol, we young people told each other that bombs would soon be getting thrown in our part of the world as well" (JvG, 51).

The zero suggests Russian nihilism—nihil—negation, the destruction that accompanies creation. Like the bomb, or as a version of

the bomb, it is a trope of the turn of the century. The zero is the Greek letter Omega, with its promise of the End: the zero, into which infinity is compressed, always explodes the square of matter. The personality that recognizes itself as a zero is the human bomb. A Russian contemporary of Bely, the Constructivist artist Kasimir Malevich wrote in 1915, "in view of the fact that we are preparing to reduce everything to nothing, we are going to call the journal Zero" [italics added].[65]

The Explosive Mind

Andrei Bely develops the trope of the human mind as explosive device and procreative force at length and in detail throughout Petersburg. In the following passage, Apollon Apollonovich and Dudkin are said to have procreative consciousness, in which thoughts take on material reality:

> The cerebral play of the wearer of diamond-studded decorations [AA] was distinguished by very strange, extremely strange qualities: his cranium was becoming the womb of thought-images, which at once became incarnate in this spectral world... Apollon Apollonovich was like Zeus: out of his head flowed goddesses and genii. One of these genii (the stranger with the small black moustache),

> arising as an image, had already begun to live and breathe in the yellowish spaces. And he maintained that he had emerged from there, not from the senatorial head. This stranger turned out to have idle thoughts too. And they also possessed the same qualities.
>
> They would escape and take on substance (P, 20).

The emphasis on procreative consciousness in Bely`s Petersburg may have an historical origin. As Marshall Berman puts it,"[the city of] Petersburg itself is the product of thought" in ideas of Peter I, "the city`s creator-God." [66] Bely is an idealist, finding the specific "imaginative construct" to be art. In "Revolution and Culture," Bely argues that "the realm of our freedom ... is already here now with us; it `externalizes,` hidden in the world of art." [67] Consciousness, a common word in Petersburg, precedes material reality; ideas are more real than things. The novel often refers to people as "shadows," a reference to Plato`s cave.

Thus Bely himself, as author and demiurge, invents characters who in turn "author" events and characters. But at the same time it is not clear who is authoring whom: once authored, the stranger disputes the "authority" of Apollon Apollonovich. As author and readers "spy on" characters, both become secret agents: "we ourselves become this agent

[of the secret police]" (P, 22). For Bely, as for Conrad in The Secret Agent, authority poses as a voyeur, working behind the scenes.

Bely`s secret sharer Henry Adams not only writes about authorities, anarchism, and bombs in The Education but also in his letters, where he maintains his identification with anarchists, an identification that seems more literal, although also more humorous, here. In September of 1899 he writes of the Dreyfus affair, "Thus far, all has gone to disappoint us anarchists. We sacked a church, it`s true, but Paris did not care." [68] A week later he confesses: "I found a tea-party in Lady Abinger`s ball-room ... Heaven pardon me!—but I wanted a bomb!" [69]

Like G.K. Chesterton, the subject of the following chapter, whose fictional anarchist exclaims that a man's brain is a bomb, Adams postulates a connection between the brain and explosion. Human knowledge is increasing exponentially as new discoveries and concepts like the laws of thermodynamics, X-rays, and radium appear. The universe, which had once seemed orderly and finite, has become infinitely complex and chaotic, ruled by invisible and impersonal forces that are almost beyond human comprehension:

> If any analogy whatever existed between the human mind, on the one hand, and the laws of motion, on the other, the mind had already entered a field of attraction so violent that it must immediately pass

> beyond, into new equilibrium, like the Comet of Newton, or else suffer dissipation altogether, like meteroids in the earth's atmosphere. If it behaved like an explosive, it must rapidly recover equilibrium; if it behaved like a vegetable, it must reach its limits of growth; and even if it acted like the earlier creations of energy—the saurians and sharks—it must have nearly reached the limits of its expansion. If science were to go on doubling or quadrupling its complexities every ten years, even mathematics would soon succumb. An average mind had succumbed already in 1850; it could no longer understand the problem in 1900. (EHA, 496).

In allying itself with the natural forces of chaos, the human mind will become the ultimate source of destruction. The anarchist sublime is the ancestor — or in Bely and Adams`s terms, the father—of the nuclear sublime. One of Bely`s poems, according to a biographer, foretells the nuclear bomb. Writing after the invention of the atomic bomb, Herbert Read observed, "The bomb is now the symbol, not of anarchy, but of totalitarian power."[70] Adams is also such a prophet, writing to his brother Charles in 1862: "the engines he [man] will have invented will be beyond his strength to control. Some day science may have the existence of

mankind in its power, and the human race commit suicide by blowing up the world." [71]

In this passage science and anarchism are even further identified; science takes on the role of the anarchist bomber. The alliance between science and authority was an issue presciently raised by Bakunin and feared by another ambivalent anti-anarchist, Gilbert Keith Chesterton, who, like Matthew Arnold before him, associated anarchy with the decline of Christianity.

---

[1] Simon Karlinsky praises Bely's erudition: "certainly, no other twentieth-century poet has Belyj's grasp of physical and mathematical sciences, of speculative philosophy, of aesthetics, of linguistics, and of musical theory and practice." Simon Karlinsky, "Symphonic Structure in Andrej Belyj's 'Pervoe Svidanie' California Slavic Studies VI, edited by Robert Hughes and Simon Karlinsky, 1971, 61.

[2] Adams, The Education, 679 n.

[3]Leon Trotsky, 1905, translated by Anya Bostock (New York: Random House, 1971) 59.

[4]Edward Judge, Plehve: Repression and Reform in Imperial Russia (Syracuse. NY: Syracuse UP, 1983) 218-37.

[5]"Few political assassinations, even in Russia have been greeted by society with such general approval. " Ulam, 155.

[6]Judge, 242.

[7]In their footnote on Plehve, Slavicists and translators Macguire and Malmstad write, "Plehve is presented in the novel as Apollon Apollonovich's closest friend and protector in the bureaucracy," Petersburg, 308. They also note the physical resemblances—small stature, big ears—shared by Apollon Apollonovich and another famous reactionary Konstantin Pobedonostsev (299).

[8]T.J. Jackson Lears, No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) 296.

[9]Ernest Samuels, Henry Adams (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1989) 63.

[10]Peter Marshall, Demanding the Impossible 163. "Mill came very close moreover to the anarchist goal of communal individuality," Marshall writes, "in this famous formula: ' The social problem of the future we considered to be, how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labour' " 164. Marshall calls On Liberty "one of the great classics of libertarian thought" but adds that "Mill's belief in the guiding role of an intellectual elite ... prevents him from being regarded as an anarchist," 164-65.

[11]Peter Conn, The Divided Mind, 1.

[12] N. Katherine Hayles, Chaos Bound: Orderly Disorder in Contemporary Literature and Science (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990) 72.

[13]Carolyn Porter, Seeing and Being, 193.

[14] Trotsky, Literature and Revolution, trans. by Rose Strunsky (New York: International Publishers,1925) 47.

[15] Trotsky, 48.

[16]Elsworth continues as follows: "He had never moved so far to the political left as to regard social change as a sole prerequisite for human happiness, and he criticized Marxism for propounding such a view and thereby regarding man not as free, but completely determined by his environment. But during the following two or three years he tried to maintain the view that the movement for social revolution was pursuing the same essential ends as the Symbolist movement, which was concerned with the transformation of human consciousness. Indeed, as late as August 1908 he attacked the philosopher Berdyayev for regarding the revolutionary movement as a continuation of human spiritual bondage, a view to which he very soon afterwards came himself. "

[17]Konstantin Mochulsky. Andrei Bely: His Life and Works. Translated by Nora Szalavitz. (Ann Arbor, Mich: Ardis, 1977). Of Kobylinsky, Mochulsky writes that he followed "anarchism in the spirit of Bakunin, pessimissm, occultism, Steinerism, and finally, conversion to Catholicism.

This ideological Proteus admitted only the extremes. 'There is no third way,' he cried. 'Either the bomb or Vlas-like submission; either anarchism or Catholicism" (30). Leonid Semenov was a student, "an anarchist and passionate admirer of Blok," who knew Bely in 1903. He too underwent transformations: "he published a collection of poetry in the style of Blok; then he became a terrorist, and finally a follower of Dobrolyubov; he went on foot to Tolstoi and perished tragically during the Civil War" (46).

[18]Quoted in Magnus Ljunggren, The Dream of Rebirth: A Study of Andrej Belyj's Novel Petersburg (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1982) 95 and note 333 on 152.

[19]Nicholai Alexandrovich Berdyaev, "An Astral Novel: Bely's Petersburg" in The Noise of Change: Russian Literature and the Critics (1891-1917), edited and translated by Stanley Rabinowitz (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1986), 200.

[20]Berdyaev, "An Astral Novel," 201.

[21] Joseph Conrad, The Secret Agent (Penguin: New York, 1988) 96.

[22]Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist, 194-95.

[23]Kropotkin, 195.

[24]Irving Howe, "Anarchy and Authority in American Literature" in Selected Writings (New York: HBJ) 1990.

[25]Nikolai Berdyaev, The Russian Idea, translated by R.M. French (London: Lindisfarne Press, 1992) 160-61.

[26] A Confession and Other Religious Writings, translated by Jane Kentish (London: Penguin, 1987) 207-08.

[27]Richard Freeborn writes: "From Turgenev's Fathers and Children to Dostoyevsky's The Brothers Karamazov the Russian novel consciously echoed and recreated not only the conflicts between generations but also those between East and West, radicalism and conservatism, atheistic socialism and Christian belief, metropolitan bureaucracy and rural communism, ever-increasing industrialism and decaying agrarian ideals." The Russian Revolutionary Novel (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982) 28.

[28]Sharon Leiter, Akhmatova's Petersburg (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press) 1983) 5.

[29]Quoted in translator's introduction, Diary of a Madman (Penguin: New York, 1987) 7.

[30] Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Three Short Novels, trans. Constance Garnett (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1960) 183.

[31]In this chapter I am using Maguire and Malmstad's highly praised and scholarly translation of Petersburg rather than attempting translations of my own. I have translated from relevant Russian texts when no translations were available.

[32]Cynthia Simmons, "Non-Authoritarian Discourse in Petersburg" in Russian Literature, May 15, 1990, XXVII (IV), 483-502.

[33]Adam Ulam, Russia's Failed Revolutions; From the Decembrists to the Dissidents (New York: Basic Books, 1981) 129.

[34]Trotsky mentions the anarchists only briefly in his account of revolutionary events. In a speech given in October of 1907, he said, "We are not anarchists, we are socialists. The anarchists call us 'Statists' because we recognize the historical necessity of the state and hence the historical necessity of state repression," 1905, 385.

[35]Ulam, Russia's Failed Revolutions, 182.

[36]Paul Avrich, The Russian Anarchists (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1967) 43 and 56.

[37]Abraham Ascher, The Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray. (Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1988) 192.

[38]Ulam, 153, 166.

[39]Berman, 257.

[40]Berman, 269.

[41] Robert A. Macguire and John E. Malmsted, introduction, Petersburg, by Andrei Bely (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978) xiii.

[42]See another reference to them in the previous chapter on Wagner.

[43]Mirsky, 449.

[44]Stirner, Tolstoy, and Bakunin, whom Chulkov mentions, were anarchists; Ibsen and Nietzsche were favorites of Emma Goldman; Georg Brandes was to some degree an anarchist sympathizer.

[45]My translation. Revolution and Culture (Letchworth, England: Prideaux Press) 1971, 24.

[46] Henry Adams, Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartes (New York: Library of America,1983) 685.

[47] Adams, Mont-Saint-Michel, 685.

[48] Adams, Mont-Saint-Michel, 685.

[49] Adams, Mont-Saint-Michel, 693.

[50]Chesterton 24.

[51] Adams, The Education, 407.

[52]Proudhon, "What is Property?" in The Anarchist Reader, 67.

[53] Liberty, March 1896.

[54] Alexander Berkman, Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1929) 173.

[55]William Morris's News from Nowhere describes a decentralized anarchist utopia, with occasional vague, brief references to the

revolutionary upheaval that preceded it. The inhabitants, physically handsome themselves, are admirers of beautiful landscapes and hand-crafted objects. Morris's attack on industrialism is focused as much from the destruction of the natural world (he mentions pollution) and the construction of ugly factories and dwellings as it is on the exploitation of labor and the misery of the poor.

[56]Adams, The Education, 452.

[57] Feyerabend writes: "It is surprising to see how rarely the stultifying effect of 'the Laws of Reason' or of scientific practice is examined by professional anarchists. Professional anarchists oppose any kind of restriction and they demand that the individual be permitted to develop freely, unhampered by laws, duties or obligations. And yet they swallow without protest all the severe standards which scientists and logicians impose upon research and upon any kind of knowledge-creating and knowledge-changing activity. Occasionally, the laws of scientific method, or what are thought to be the laws of scientific method by a particular writer, are even integrated into anarchism itself. 'Anarchism is a world concept based upon a mechanical explanation of all phenomena,' writes Kropotkin. 'Its method of investigation is that of the exact natural sciences ... the method of induction and deduction.' Against Method (London: Verso, 1975) 12-13.

[58]Peter Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist, ed. James Allen Rogers (London: The Cresset Library, 1988) 93.

[59] Kropotkin, Memoirs, 152.

[60]Not all anarchists were as optimistic as Kropotkin; the anarchist bomber Auguste Vaillant, like Adams, understands history as subject to larger, ungovernable forces. After describing the audience at his trial as "atoms lost in matter," Vaillant declared:

"How little a thing is your assembly and your verdict in the history of humanity; and human history, in its turn, is likewise a very little thing in the whirlwind which bears it through immensity, and which is destined to disappear, or at least be transformed, in order to begin again the same history and the same facts, a veritably perpetual play of cosmic forces renewing and transferring themselves forever." Quoted in Goldman, Anarchism, 97.

[61]Jacques Derrida, The Truth in Painting, trans. by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1987) 133.

[62]John Elsworth writes, "Bely turned to Kant, and between 1906 and 1908 devoted much effort to the study of contemporary German neo-Kantian philosophy." CS, p. 7.

[63]Immanuel Kant, The Critique of Judgment, translated by James Creed Meredith (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986) 104.

[64] John Elsworth, Andrei Bely: A Critical Study, 107.

[65]Kazimir Malevich 1878-1935 (Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1988) 157.

[66]Marshall Berman, All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity,(New York: Penguin, 1988) 182-83.

[67]Bely, Revolution and Culture (Letchworth, England: Prideaux Press, 1971). My translation.

[68] Henry Adams, Letters of Henry Adams 1892-1918, ed. Worthington Chauncey Ford (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1938) 239. The church referred to is St. Vincent de Paul, rue Chabrol, "sacked" on Sunday, August 20th.

[69] Henry Adams, Letters, 240.

[70] quoted in Marshall, 593.

[71] quoted in Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Idea in America (Oxford: Oxford UP,1967) 350.