Social and Political Views of Alexey Filippov and Russian National Democrats

M. V. Medovarov

For citation: Medovarov M. V. Social and Political Views of Alexey Filippov and Russian National Democrats. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History,* 2022, vol. 67, issue 1, pp. 44–61. https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2022.103

The purpose of the article is to analyze the social and political views of Alexey Filippov during the years of his cooperation with the Russian National Democrats. It reveals the achievements and gaps in the historiography of Filippov's ideological biography. Considerable attention is paid to the formation of the thinker's original views on the construction of the greatness of Russia by the hands of non-Russians. The reasons for the unpopularity of Filippov's "progressive nationalism" and the conditions of his activity in St Petersburg since 1912 are considered. The article analyzes the collaboration of Filippov with Alexander Gariazin; the chronology and circumstances of their publication of the weekly "Dym Otechestva" and the monthly "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" ("The Journal for All"). Filippov's sharp criticism of the leaders of the right-wing parties in Russia, the aristocracy, the ruling dynasty, ministers, the Holy Synod is emphasized. His loyalty to the monarchy as a form of government, and personally to Nicholas II, as well as the loyalty of other National Democrats, which they tried to use in confrontation with the All-Russian National Union and the Union of the Russian People, is pointed out. The positions of Filippov and his associates on Russian foreign policy, the reasons for their calls for the immediate war against Germany and Austria-Hungary are demonstrated. It is concluded that behind the eclecticism of Filippov's views was hidden his sincere conviction in the necessity of combining democracy, rights and freedoms with strong imperial power and national patriotism. The article demonstrates the continuity of Filippov's views throughout his life, including the Soviet period.

Keywords: Alexey Filippov, Alexander Gariazin, Russian National Democrats, Imperial People Party, *Russkoe Obozrenie*, *Dym Otechestva*, *Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh*.

Общественно-политические взгляды Алексея Филиппова и русские национал-демократы

М. В. Медоваров

Для цитирования: *Medovarov M. V.* Social and Political Views of Alexey Filippov and Russian National Democrats // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2022. Т. 67. Вып. 1. С. 44–61. https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2022.103

Целью статьи является анализ общественно-политических взглядов редактора журналов и газет, банкира, общественного деятеля Алексея Фроловича Филиппова (1869–

Maksim V. Medovarov — PhD (History), Associate Professor, Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod, 23, Gagarina pr., Nizhny Novgorod, 603950, Russian Federation; medovarov@imomi.unn.ru

Максим Викторович Медоваров — канд. ист. наук, доц., Национальный исследовательский Нижегородский государственный университет имени Н. И. Лобачевского, Российская Федерация, 603950, Нижний Новгород, пр. Гагарина, 23; medovarov@imomi.unn.ru

1936) в годы его сотрудничества с русскими национал-демократами (1912–1914 гг.). Выявлены достижения и пробелы историографии идейной биографии Филиппова. Существенное внимание уделено формированию в конце XIX — начале XX в. своеобразных взглядов мыслителя на построение величия России руками нерусских. Рассмотрены причины непопулярности «прогрессивного национализма» Филиппова в 1900-х гг. и изменившиеся условия его деятельности в Петербурге с 1912 г. В статье проанализировано сотрудничество Филиппова с А. Л. Гарязиным, хронология и обстоятельства издания ими еженедельника «Дым Отечества» и ежемесячного «Журнала для всех». Ввиду почти полного отсутствия писем Филиппова данного периода сделан акцент на его публицистике и статьях других национал-демократов в упомянутых органах печати. Подчеркивается острая критика Филипповым лидеров правых партий России, аристократии, правящей династии, министров, Св. Синода. Отмечается лояльность Филиппова и других национал-демократов к монархии как форме правления и лично к Николаю II. Это национал-демократы пытались использовать в своем противостоянии со Всероссийским национальным союзом и Союзом русского народа. Проанализированы причины резких атак Филиппова на его прежних кумиров: Льва Тихомирова и архиепископа Антония. Изучен вопрос о негативном отношении мыслителя к «Московским ведомостям». Продемонстрированы позиции Филиппова и его единомышленников по вопросам внешней политики России, причины их призывов к скорейшей войне с Германией и Австро-Венгрией. Уделено внимание активной поддержке имяславия Филипповым и национал-демократическими органами печати. Сделан вывод о том, что за внешним эклектизмом взглядов Филиппова скрывалось его искреннее убеждение в необходимости сочетаний демократизма, широких прав и свобод с сильной имперской властью и национальным патриотизмом. Показано, что можно говорить о преемственности взглядов Филиппова на протяжении его жизни, включая советский период.

Ключевые слова: Алексей Филиппов, Александр Гарязин, русские национал-демократы, Имперская народная партия, *Русское обозрение*, *Дым Отечества*, *Журнал для всех*.

The formation of a variety of different trends within the nationalist camp during the "June Third Monarchy" in Russia in recent years has repeatedly become the subject of researches; some anthologies of sources related to this issue have been published[1]. Particular attention was drawn to the works of Anton A. Chemakin on the small, but important in terms of study of ideology of the National Democratic Party (also known as the Imperial People's Party) and its faction[2]. The author managed to show the process of the emergence of National Democrats in 1912–1914 from the interaction between several activists of some earlier circles and groups that had existed previously in different parts of Russia. Along the way, Chemakin made some interesting comments about Alexei Frolovich Filippov and his place among the National Democrats[3] but did not consider his legacy specifically. Meanwhile, the figure of Alexey F. Filippov (1869–1936) and some striking episodes

[1] *San'kova S. M.* Russkaia partiia v Rossii: obrazovanie i deiatel'nost' Vserossiiskogo natsional'nogo soiuza (1908–1917). Orel, 2006; *Repnikov A. V.* Konservativnye kontseptsii pereustroistva Rossii. Moscow, 2007; *Ivanov A. A.* Vyzov natsionalizma: Lozung "Rossiia Gariazin russkikh" v dorevoliutsionnoi obshchestvennoi mysli. St Petersburg, 2016; Natsionalizm: pro et contra: Antologiia / compiled by A. A. Ivanov, A. L. Kazin, A. E. Kotov, M. V. Medovarov. St Petersburg, 2017.

[2] *Medovarov M. V.* Vozvrashchenie zabytogo napravleniia v russkoi politicheskoi zhizni // Istoricheskaia ekspertiza. 2019. No. 2. P. 262–268.

[3] *Chemakin A. A.* Istoki russkoi natsional-demokratii: 1896–1914 gody. St Petersburg, 2018. P. 442–445; 2) Russkie natsional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii: 1914 — nachalo 1920-kh godov. St Petersburg, 2018. P. 154–155.

of his biography have frequently aroused the interest of historians. The specifics of his editorial policy in the journal "Russkoe Obozrenie" ("Russian Review") in 1901 were touched upon by Anna A. Tarasova and Vladimir N. Chuvakov, who noted Filippov's unconventional position among the "rightists"[4]. However, there were also such obvious errors as the characterization of Alexander N. Bokhanov, in whose opinion "Filippov edited the rabid nationalist magazines "Russkoe Obozrenie" ("Russian Review"), "Dym Otechestva" ("Smoke of the Fatherland") and the "Chernomorskoe Poberezh'e" ("Black Sea Coast") newspaper"[5]. In reality, none of the listed publications was either "rabid" or even essentially nationalistic. Valery A. Fateev refused to consider the political views of Filippov but highlighted a number of aspects of his publishing activity[6].

Sergei K. Lebedev, the author of the largest biographical sketch about Filippov, unfortunately, also did not avoid serious inaccuracies when he wrote the following: "By convictions, he was a nationalist-sovereignist and began his career as a confidant of Konstantin P. Pobedonostsev; then he became an Octobrist and organically made his way to Bolshevism"[7]. Filippov was never a member of the Octobrist party and was not even close to them; his abrupt transition from nationalists to Bolsheviks in 1917 can hardly be called "organic"; finally, it is not clear what "Pobedonostsev's confidant" means as Pobedonostsev's relationship with Filippov had always been difficult. However, Lebedev was the first historian to draw attention to the activities of the thinker in the national democratic weekly "Dym Otechestva" ("Smoke of the Fatherland"). Now, since the publication of the works by Chemakin, there have emerged a need to fill such a significant gap in historiography as the consideration of the political views of Filippov — one of the few Russian publicists who held a very high position both before and after 1917, who was close to both the royal court and the Council of People's Commissars.

An analysis of Filippov's views before the beginning of the 20th century goes beyond the scope of this article. His obvious opportunism and duplicity in some episodes, his dual ethnic and class identity should not overshadow the fact that from his youth to the end of his life this native of Mogilev city dreamed of the imperial greatness of Russia ensured primarily by the efforts of the "foreigners" (inorodtsy) and was always skeptical about the ability of Russians to self-organize and independently promote their own culture and statehood. Filippov quite early came to the idea of building the Russian nationalism mostly by the hands of non-Russians. He wrote already in 1901: "But two Germans and a Jew can always create — and there are some examples of this — a purely nationalist organ of the press and push it forward with the same strength and skill with which they move the 'Russian Cause'"[8]. Such thoughts were conveyed not only in his private letters. In the official program of the renewed "Russkoe Obozrenie", Filippov, on the one hand, expressed "deep respect for nationalism", but on the other hand, promised "to treat carefully those estates and groups that establish internal order, to all nationalities and peoples (and not

[4] *Tarasova A. A.* Reaktsionno-okhranitel'naia zhurnalistika // Literaturnyi protsess i russkaia zhurnalistika kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka. 1890–1904. Burzhuazno-liberal'nye i modernistskie izdaniia. Moscow, 1982. P. 242–243, 257–259; Perepiska Gor'kogo i Andreeva (1899–1916) / comment. V. N. Chuvakova // Gor'kii i Leonid Andreev. Neizdannaia perepiska. Moscow, 1965. P. 86. (Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Vol. 72)

[5] *Bokhanov A. N.* Burzhuaznaia pressa v Rossii i krupnyi kapital. Moscow, 1984. P. 109–117, 140, 168.

[6] *Fateev V. A.* Zhizneopisanie Vasiliia Rozanova. St Petersburg, 2013. P. 275.

[7] *Lebedev S. K.* Aleksei Frolovich Filippov: literator, bankir i chekist // Iz glubiny vremen. St Petersburg, 1998. No. 10. P. 153.

[8] Rukopisnyi otdel Instituta russkoi literatury (RO IRLI). F. 166. Op. 3. D. 1049. L. 3 ob. — 4 ob.

only Russian one — that would be chauvinism!), contributing to Russian state building and leading Russia along the path to greatness"[9]. The thinker explained: "Any nationality has the right not only to its existence but also to its free development until it discovers the absence of its inner vitality or state vital activity. The introduction of foreigners to us is possible only through a comprehensive acquaintance with the forms of our original culture, in this case, if it is able to occupy one of the prominent places among the cultures of other peoples"[10]. Filippov doubted the latter circumstance so much that he subjected the ability of the Russian bourgeois elite to create an original culture to pejorative criticism for many years (in "Russkoe Obozrenie", in "Iskusstvo Stroitelnoe i Dekorativnoe" ("The Building and Decorative Art"), and in "Dym Otechestva"). On the pages of the first of these journals in 1901, Filippov paid great attention to his polemic with the nationalist Ivan Loginov, defending the multinational character of the Russian Empire and urging to "treat carefully" the rights and freedoms of all its peoples[11].

In a number of his works in 1903, Filippov proclaimed his belief that "Russia, as one of the greatest political phenomena in the world history, containing an amazing variety of elements of both the spiritual life of several hundred nationalities that are its parts, and external nature, including the immense space, will undoubtedly appear in the nearest future <…> as the center of the highest and best manifestations of the human spirit"[12]. The thinker boldly corrected the understanding of the well-known nationalist slogan, habitual at the beginning of the 20th century: "There is physical Russia and spiritual Russia. Yes, Russia, as a territory, is only for Russians, but spiritual Russia is for the whole world! Let the whole universe bask by this great fire of thought and spirit, cheerfully burning for tens of thousands of miles"[13]. From our point of view, it is precisely such declarations, unchanged throughout Filippov's whole career that should be taken as a basis for assessment of his views, while some of his private letters, where he presented himself to right-wing leaders as a "truly Russian" nationalist, "never yielding an inch to foreigners and everywhere, where possible, pushing them"[14], should be treated with skepticism as in front of the liberals he called himself a Jew who grew up among Poles and Germans[15].

Filippov's drama concerned his centrist and compromise program, combining devotion to the monarchy and historical traditions, dreams of prosperity and great power of a multinational empire with the support of civil and economic rights and freedoms. This program for a long time could not find a sufficient social base or the audience. Already in the early 1900s, Filippov systematically promoted those ideas of combining political liberalism with patriotism, which were rejected by both the right and the left. His involvement in George Gapon's adventure and the scandalous leadership of the "Kuban" and "Chernomorskoe Poberezh'e" newspapers in 1905–1911, when, for opportunistic considerations, he, as a publisher and editor, alternately published revolutionary, liberal, or articles of The Black Hundred, contributed, however, to the growth of his fame. In the spring of 1910, he made an attempt to turn "Chernomorskoe Poberezh'e" into a newspaper of moderate Rus-

[9] Otdel rukopisei Rossiiskoi gosudarstvennoi biblioteki (OR RGB). F. 135. R. II. K. 35. D. 35. L. 10.
[10] Ibid. L. 10.
[11] Iz pisem chitatelei // Russkoe obozrenie. 1901. No. 1. P. 261–263.
[12] Ibid. P. 6–7.
[13] *Filippov A. F.* Ot redaktsii // Ibid. 1903. No. 1–3. P. III.
[14] Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (RGALI). F. 459. Op. 1. D. 4428. L. 1–1 ob.
[15] OR RGB. F. 135. R. II. K. 35. D. 35. L. 3–6.

sian nationalists and contacted Alexey S. Suvorin and Alexey S. Ermolov[16]. The failure of this project did not stop Filippov. At the beginning of 1912, he returned to St Petersburg, where his career reached its peak.

For two years, before the outbreak of the First World War, Filippov had been a prominent banker and at the same time published or actually ran several financial newspapers devoted to stock news and quotes: "Banki i Birzha" ("Banks and Stock Exchange"), "Den'gi" ("Money"), "Birzha" ("Stock Exhange"), "Birzhevoy Ezhemesiachnik" ("Monthly publication of the Stock Exchange"), "Birzha v Peterburge" ("Stock Exchange in Petersburg"). Another important aspect of his activity during this period was his close friendship with Grigorii E. Rasputin. Finally, in 1912–1914, Filippov was actively engaged with the National Democrats and participated in the publication of their press. There were two main reasons for this rapprochement. The first of them was determined by the political views of Filippov, already known to us, which had already been clearly expressed a decade earlier. Now, in the early 1910s, centrist nationalism in the range from Progressive Party to "Vekhi" ("Landmarks") digest, from Petr B. Struve to Vasily V. Shul'gin, became quite popular and acquired its own circle of supporters. Returning to the Russian capital, Filippov as one of the earliest heralds of these tendencies had a chance to reassert himself. The second reason was his acquaintance with Alexander L. Gariazin, who, as the son-in-law of the head of the port in Novorossiysk, had been familiar to Filippov even before his moving to St Petersburg[17].

By that time, Gariazin had been a member of the All-Russian National Union (Vserossiiskii natsional'nyi soiuz — VNS), and Filippov also joined it at first. Later Filippov recalled: "At one time, being in the provinces, he was going to enroll as a member of the Petrograd National Club, since it gave rooms for free for those who came from the provinces, but did not get into the club"[18]. Meanwhile, from April to September 1912, Gariazin published "Vestnik VNS" ("Herald of All-Russian National Union", 10 issues in total), placing the editorial office at its own home address (Zagorodnyi prospect, 36, apt. 5)[19]. In November 1912, Gariazin and Filippov began to publish a new 16-page weekly — "Dym Otechestva" (in our opinion, it would be more appropriate to call it a newspaper than a magazine). By the end of the year, six issues had been published, and in the first of them the editors still announced their membership in the VNS. By the end of 1912, out of 800 members of the St Petersburg branch of the VNS, only about fifty remained[20], and then "Dym Otechestva" severed ties with this party and the National Club[21] and self-determined as a national democratic body.

Gariazin and Filippov often alternated in their positions as an editor and publisher. Filippov was the editor of "Dym Otechestva" from November 1912 to July 1913 (with a short break in May and June 1913), while he held the post of the publisher only in December 1912 and January 1913. Over this time, the newspaper was subjected to censorship persecution: a number fines of 500 rubles each; confiscation of printed issues; criminal cases against Gariazin and Filippov. Filippov's last article in "Dym Otechestva" dates to

[16] RGALI. F. 459. Op. 1. D. 4428. L. 9–12.

[17] *Chemakin A. A.* Russkie natsional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii… P. 468.

[18] Arkhiv UFSB po Sankt-Peterburgu i Leningradskoi oblasti. D. P-93201. T. 5. L. 81 ob.

[19] *Chemakin A. A.* Istoki russkoi natsional-demokratii… P. 444–445.

[20] *Filippov A. F.* Sila oppozitsii // Dym Otechectva. 1912. No. 4. 6 December. P. 2–4; V delovykh sferakh // Ibid. No. 5. 13 December. P. 17–19.

[21] *Chemakin A. A.* Russkie natsional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii… P. 154–155.

October 1913 (No. 41); afterwards he founded a new newspaper "Dengi" ("Money") and focused on it. However, at the end of the year, "Dym Otechestva" advertised a subscription to "Dengi", which testifies to the informal continuation of cooperation between Gariazin and Filippov.

At the same time, the "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" ("Journal For All") fell into their hands. This once famous organ of Viktor S. Miroliubov, in which works by Chekhov, Gor'kii, Kuprin, Andreev, Briusov, and Bal'mont were published, ceased its activity in 1906. It is worth noticing that then Filippov spoke disparagingly of this magazine[22]. Since 1908 Miroliubov had begun to publish the less popular "Novy Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh", the editors of which changed several times. Since June 1913, this edition, having dropped the word "New" in its title, unexpectedly passed into the hands of Gariazin with the active assistance of Filippov, one of whose letters was written on the letterhead form of the editorial board of this journal. For a short period Gariazin as a publisher and Mikhail A. Illiashevsky as an editor, gave "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" a national-democratic orientation, which was preserved even after their formal resignation in October 1913. Gariazin's home address was also announced as the address of the editorial office of the magazine.

Filippov, with all his energy, could not help here: at his home address (Sadovaia st., 18) the board of the banking house "Avgust I. Zeidman & Co." and the editorial staff of the related newspapers had already been situated. However, he tried to involve in the case his former competitor, from the times of "Russkoe Obozrenie", — Nikolai N. Chernogubov. On 28 June 1913 Filippov invited him to resume their cooperation: "Now in the hands of A. L. Gariazin, with whom I'm working, there is 'Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh', widely distributed, popular and, of course, known to you. Will you find, in the name of from old memory, any interesting material, but not earlier than the 1850s, otherwise the audience would be bored. Are there any correspondence and, most importantly, memoirs? Is there any correspondence between Babst and Pobedonostsev on Alexander III (remember — we have spoken [about it]) or Katkov, with Tolstoy about Anna Karenina; are there any letters from Boleslav Markovich describing individuals of the 1870s? You have everything — I know"[23]. The letter ended with a recollection of Nikolai F. Fedorov: Filippov asked Chernogubov to send recently published materials about their common teacher.

Filippov's memoirs about Gapon were published in the very first issue of the "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" under the new editorial board[24], and a month later they were published as a separate book[25], at the end of which advertisements were attached with an appeal to subscribe to this magazine. Gapon's memories and an anonymous brochure about Pososhkov (written by someone under pseudonym of Konstantinov) were included in the "Library for All" series and were widely disseminated throughout St Petersburg[26]. The political nature of the work about Pososhkov, in the spirit of National Democratic party, was openly declared, and, in essence, Filippov's apology for Gaponovism as an unsuccessful but natural step in the development of Russian political life also fit into the mainstream of the general line of the National Democrats. Thus, we can say that the 16-page weekly

[22] RGALI. F. 459. Op. 1. D. 4428. L. 8.

[23] OR RGB. F. 328. K. 9. D. 13. L. 16–16 ob.

[24] *Filippov A. F.* Stranichki minuvshego. I. Neskol'ko slov o Gapone // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1913. No. 6. P. 105–122.

[25] *Filippov A. F.* Stranichki minuvshego. I. O Gapone. St Petersburg, 1913.

[26] [*Konstantinov P.*] Krest'ianin-gosudarstvennik Ivan Tikhonovich Pososhkov. Kratkaia biografiia i ego gosudarstvennye mysli. St Petersburg, 1913.

"Dym Otechestva", the thick monthly "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" (issues of 128–144 pages in three columns), and the brochures of the "Library for All" were considered by Gariazin and Filippov as three different forms for promoting National Democratic ideology, for the time being covered with phrases about non-partisanship (for example, "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" was positioned as "a monthly, publicly available journal of literature, science, art, public life, and self-education").

Let us now turn to the examination of the political position of these press organs, mainly focusing on the articles of Filippov (his letters for the period under review have hardly been preserved in the archives).

Gariazin in "Dym Otechestva" welcomed the evolution of some liberals and even revolutionary radicals towards Russian patriotism and "progressive" nationalism. He supported the consolidation of elements of three ideologies in the program of the National Democrats from the circle of P. V. Vasilyev (former newspaper "Slavianin" ("The Slav")). "Dym Otechestva" derived from Russian conservatism an emphasized devotion to the monarch, the defense of a single and indivisible Russian empire, adherence to Orthodoxy, and the demands for church reforms in the Slavophile spirit (there was an impact of Alexander A. Kireev and Lev A. Tikhomirov on Filippov as their disciple). From the programs of the liberal parties they borrowed, for example, adherence to the State Duma and even to a "representative form of government", the requirements for basic rights and freedoms, guarantees of the rights to national culture for all peoples of Russia. The slogans of democratization and the equality of the estates, priority attention to the peasants, workers, petty bourgeoisie, Cossacks — came from the radicals [27]. In January 1914, in the new program of "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh", Gariazin emphasized "the artistry, seriousness and popularity of presentation, and the *progressiveness of thought*". He promised his readers to cover the events of "all phenomena of social, economic and political life from a democratic progressive point of view, *alien to any bias and partisanship*"[28]. The last slogan also coincided with the programs of all previous publications of Filippov, from whom Gariazin could borrow such discourse.

At the same time, "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" propagated again promises "to rally Russian people who are in disarray", so typical of Filippov's previous editions[29]. Gariazin in the very first issue of the journal proclaimed: "Only with the triumph of Russian self-awareness and the domination of the Russian people on the imperial territory and at all levels of state power the calm progress is possible for hundreds of ethnic groups interspersed with the Russians. Until now, we have not known this celebration. And only from the epoch of the unforgettable Tsar Alexander III we began to dream of it and wish for such a triumph of the Russian cause"[30].

According to the stated goals, the enemies of "Dym Otechestva" were also determined — not so much liberals and leftists, as competing groups in the right camp, in the fight against whom the newspaper editors had recourse to all means: minced no words, ridiculed and flung mud at some right-wing politicians. At the same time, Filippov in his financial newspapers spoke from a more leftist position, at the same time contriving to maintain communication with the Imperial Court through Rasputin and to have some

[27] *Chemakin A. A.* Istoki russkoi natsional-demokratii… P. 440.
[28] Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1914. No. 1. 3rd page of cover.
[29] *Koniaev N. M.* Gibel' krasnykh Moiseev. Nachalo terrora. 1918 god. Moscow, 2014. P. 278.
[30] *Gariazin A. L.* Moia vera // Dym Otechestva. 1912. 15 November. No. 1. P. 2.

kind of agreement with Alexander I. Dubrovin: "Dym Otechestva" did not criticize his party, unlike the other rightists.

In this context, Filippov's sharp attack on Lev Tikhomirov, with whom he had studied, had friendly relations until 1901, and idolized him, looks extremely unpleasant. When at the end of 1913 it was announced that Tikhomirov was to resign from the office of editor of "Moskovskie Vedomosti", Filippov published in "Dym Otechestva" a long article on the history and current situation of "Moskovskie Vedomosti", in which he had begun his career as a journalist twenty years before[31]. This article is very indicative of determining what repelled Filippov as a National Democrat from his former comrades in the monarchist camp.

Filippov noted that "Moskovskie Vedomosti" received 75–100 thousand rubles annually due to mandatory paid-for announcements and notices and was considered a "cushy job". He recalled the times of editor Sergei A. Petrovsky (1887–1896) and the circumstances of the court intrigue that led to the appointment of Vladimir A. Gringmut. The late Gringmut was in a hostile relationship with Filippov, testified against him at the trial in 1900[32], and now the publicist characterized him sharply: "A foreigner by birth, a stubborn self-taught by education and a limited interpreter of Katkov's catechism, beyond which he could not and did not dare to go, — Gringmut was valuable only in the sense of explaining the wishes of a narrow circle of conservative leaders who did not foresee either the defeat in the Manchurian War, or 1905 with subsequent 'fermentation'"[33]. According to Filippov, "after a short period of Professor Budilovich, a Slavist who was least of all a writer and a very strong Slavophile-dreamer — and after his death, L. A. Tikhomirov, as a long-term and permanent, and most importantly, valuable employee of this newspaper, managed to take up over the reins of government"[34] (i. e., to become the editor of "Moskovskie Vedomosti").

Having repeatedly sworn allegiance to Tikhomirov, and only three months ago having praised him in "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh"[35], now Filippov turned to cynical slander against him: "If we evaluate the efforts in which the work of this man took place, who went through a diverse and discordant life, starting from a half-educated student of a revolutionary type, going through participation in a conspiracy against the Tsar, ending with the rank of a real state councilor for a two-volume study of the issue of 'On Autocracy' and with a fortune of at least half a million again formed from the exploitation of mandatory paid-for announcements and notices <…>, then we can decisively declare that Tikhomirov was even less able to use his position in the sense of influencing the society; he failed to create even a weak influence on the government and achieved the only goal — his personal enrichment"[36]. The accusation of enrichment, dubious even in relation to Gringmut, was unequivocally false in relation to the poverty-stricken Tikhomirov.

The leader of the right-wing Duma faction Andrey S. Viazigin and two members of the All-Russian National Union, Chairman of the Moscow Censorship Committee A. A. Sidorov and an official of the Ministry of Internal Affairs L. V. Polovtsev, were con-

[31] *Filippov A. F.* Moskovskie vedomosti // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 40. 3 October. P. 6–8.

[32] *Medovarov M. V.* Popytki vozobnovleniia izdaniia zhurnala "Russkoe obozrenie" glazami L'va Tikhomirova i "delo Piramidovoi" // Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Seriia Istoriia. 2016. No. 3 (34). P. 42–51.

[33] *Filippov A. F.* Moskovskie vedomosti. P. 7.

[34] Ibid. P. 7.

[35] *Filippov A. F.* V. G. Korolenko // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1913. No. 7. P. 84.

[36] *Filippov A. F.* Moskovskie vedomosti. P. 8.

sidered possible successors to Tikhomirov as the editor of "Moskovskie vedomosti". On this occasion, Filippov exclaimed: "But is it not obvious, to the point of pain, that the very newspaper will remain in a state of catalepsy as before? For what is Sidorov if not a cunning official who paved his way with good intentions; what is Vyazigin? — one of the greatest mediocrities, the premature baby of the National Union; and how deep the oppositional spirit of Bucephalus-Polovtsev accustomed to wearing bureaucratic blinkers is can only be judged by those who have once heard his speeches in the State Duma". "All these and similar individuals should be prevented from attempting at Katkov's chair, which had been occupied and discredited by his epigones, and which requires repair and cleansing", Filippov asserted categorically. He was worried that "under the given direction of conservative thought that leads to its inevitable shallowing, the government may again bypass such forces as Professor Gerye (member of the State Council) or A. N. Engel'gardt, professor-publicist, or A. A. Bashmakov; by the will of the officials of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, who decide the sad fate of this newspaper, if any clerk from the food department can even be appointed the editor, and the result will be the same as it has been up to now: the appointed editor will place well-intentioned trash, rake in cash, highlighting some of it to the people for whom "it is necessary to know these things"[37]. It is worth noticing that Alexander A. Bashmakov was an employee of "Russkoe Obozrenie" back in the 1890s, and Filippov's positive assessment of whom twenty years later is quite remarkable.

Filippov warned that under the bureaucratic editor, only "shreds of the feuilletonists' phrases" would be published in "Moskovskie Vedomosti" since with guaranteed profits from advertisements there was simply no stimulus to improve the small-circulation newspaper. The thinker openly denied representatives of the right camp who "set themselves the task, under the flag of supporting patriotism, to *strengthen their own position and pocket*. For a quarter of a century or more, they have proved that among nationalists there are great fornicators and practitioners, but few selfless and not subsidized fighters for the idea. <…> And the government, if it does not stick to the desire to suppress at all costs an independent national thought, placing it at the disposal of political eunuchs, has to abandon what has been done so far and embark on a new path, adapting to the requirements and requests of modern times and our days"[38]. Genetically, these invectives go back to the positions of the late Slavophiles, but in the context of 1913 they were an expression of the position of the emerging National Democrats. Of course, in the article under review, Filippov hinted that he and his new associates would be much better suited as editors of "Moskovskie Vedomosti": "The country needs a national and independent organ, an organ independent of the offices of St Petersburg press. The public hoped that the nationalists would create it moving ahead of everyone on the path of progress and the implementation of the manifesto of October 17th. But when it became clear that Messrs. Balashevs, Gizhitskys, Polovtsevs and *tutti quanti* are capable of spending other people's money and care only about their own glory — then we all must tell the government: release 'Moskovskie vedomosti' for normal, useful work and hand them over to the selfless and convinced persons!"[39] The latter were understood as National Democrats who broke away from the allegedly corrupt All-Russian National Union.

[37] *Filippov A. F.* Moskovskie vedomosti. P. 8.
[38] Ibid. P. 8.
[39] Ibid. P. 6.

Filippov was ready to yield the subsidies and paid-for announcements to the treasury at the sum of up to 10,000 rubles in exchange for the editorship of the newspaper. He exclaimed: "Then we will not see Sidorov, or Viazigin, or Polovtsev where no large profit is secured; we will not hear feigned sugary assent to the current composition of the government; but then we will have a press organ that reflects the voice of convinced people, a convinced part of society. All parties, without distinction, will consider such a voice; its inner work will be aimed at creating a whole cadre of useful workers in the press, experts on everyday life and political life in Russia". "Then we will hear genuine and not purchased criticism of the current life from honest people, while now, by giving sycophants the privilege of receiving hundreds of thousands [rubles] for doing nothing, we, at the expense of the treasury, using the people's funds, are creating and strengthening the conviction that there is no neither talent among the conservative part of society in Russia, nor honesty and even loyalty — for so far what has been allowed by the editors of 'Moskovskie Vedomosti' is treason to both the fatherland and the tsar's oath", concluded Filippov turning his article into a political denunciation of Lev Tikhomirov to the authorities[40].

The second declarative article by Filippov in "Dym Otechestva", published in a week's time after the first one, was called "The Sarafan Culture". Filippov accused Russian Conservatives of the fruitlessness of their cultural activities, of only dressing up in boyar caftans and sarafans, holding gatherings in the Russian Assembly (where Alexey Frolovich was never accepted in the early 1900s), etc. The publicist sternly criticized the "Society of Zealots of Enlightenment in Memory of Emperor Alexander III" for its inaction under the leadership of S. D. Sheremet'ev, whom he himself unsuccessfully tried to join in the late 1890s[41]. The Russian Assembly and the All-Russian National Union under the leadership of Petr N. Balashev, according to Filippov, disgraced and "ate up" hundreds of thousands of rubles of state subsidies, and the Union of the Russian people, consisting of "modest elements", limited itself to street demonstrations. Filippov kept silent about how he himself had repeatedly asked Nicholas II and Pobedonostsev for subsidies in the early 1900s.

The publicist was indignant at the fact that the cosmopolitan spirit dominated the higher spheres. He reproached the aristocracy for indifference to everything Russian. This was an old accusation that had been constantly present in the Russian literature since the time of Fonvizin, but now Filippov dared give specific names. He accused Grand Duke Nicholai Nikolaevich, the Caucasian governor Illarion I. Vorontsov-Dashkov, Prince Alexander P. Oldenburgskii[42]. Also, he reproached the ruling aristocracy of assisting the Finnish and Baltic German nationalists, adding that the non-Russians allegedly owned 89 % of the capital in Russia, and that 76 % of the publicists in the country were ethnically non-Russian (it is not clear where such figures were taken from). He was worried about the penetration of British capital into the North Caucasus and Transcaucasia, as well as about German colonization in the south of Russia. Of course, many of these questions were often brought up in the Russian press of that time, and the National Democrats, who raised on a shield Ivan T. Pososhkov, were only part of the conservative criticism of the presence of Western capital in Russia.

However, a unique feature of "Dym Otechestva" was its sober realization of the inevitability of the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary already in October 1913. Filip-

[40] Ibid. P. 6–7.

[41] *Filippov A. F.* Sarafannaia kul'tura // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 41. 10 October. P. 3–5.

[42] *Filippov A. F.* Svobodomysliashchie farisei // Ibid. No. 21. 23 May. P. 7–9.

pov predicted that such a war would lead to the elimination of the German colonies in Russia and the evacuation of the Germans inland. He drew attention to the growth of German nationalism and state programs of patriotic education in Germany (facts which had already been mentioned in his "Russkoe Obozrenie" in 1903). Filippov believed that the condition of victory in the upcoming war was the rejection of Westernism by the Russian elite, without which the situation of 1812 would be repeated: "Gentlemen, patriots from all Russian assemblies and unions, change your mind and think about this before going to Austria and conquering it. Defeat yourself; let's not conquer the Balkans and Persia, but Central Russia and bring into it at least some kind of culture, just not the Sarafan one"[43].

Therefore, it is not surprising that Filippov often accused right-wing politicians of incompetence. Addressing the nationalist faction on the occasion of the opening of the IV State Duma, he exclaimed: "Stop clowning… Russia faces major tasks and the greatest danger to its external and internal security. Pay attention to the protracted war that threatens us both in the West and in the South-East. Consider the state of our industry, seized by foreigners with the force of a hurricane, whereby we risk becoming a second Turkey; contemplate the mood of the masses already in turmoil, and see if the crew of the state ship is able to cope with the approaching storm. While you grimace in front of each other in ceremonies, the country is indignant"[44]. According to Filippov, some left-wing deputies had proved to be more competent than bankrupt nationalists. Gariazin's journal showed a particularly negative attitude towards the leader of the well-known Bessarabian political clan, a member of the Duma faction of the nationalists Pavel Krupenskii, not restricting themselves in caricatures and offensive epithets[45]. The "Novoe Vremia" newspaper, whose position was close to nationalists[46], and the Union of the Russian People led by N. E. Markov, were also criticized by "Dym Otechestva": Filippov (who often covered criminal cases in this magazine) accused the Black Hundreds of having links with the Caucasian criminal world[47]. Of the old monarchists, only the deceased Konstantin F. Golovin and partly Prince Vladimir P. Meshcherskii were honoured by some kind words from "Dym Otechestva"[48].

The National Democrats, who created their own faction of the Progressive People's Party in the State Duma, declared themselves an alternative to the discredited rightists. "Dym Otechestva" was the first to openly advertise it at the end of 1913[49], and at the beginning of 1914 it was supported by "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh", whose authors combined in their papers many elements: conservative, national, and religious with revolutionary democratic and "progressive". Ivan I. von Seck, for example, was the first to publish Lamennais's "Words of a Believer" in Russian[50]; M. Fedulov praised Konstantinov's book about

---

[43] *Filippov A. F.* Sarafannaia kul'tura. P. 5.

[44] *Filippov A. F.* Priskorbnye podschety // Dym Otechestva. 1912. No. 2. 23 November. P. 8–9.

[45] *Gariazin A. L.* Dumskii Taleiran — Pavel Krupenskii // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 8. 21 February. P. 7–8.

[46] See: Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 25. 20 June.

[47] *M. T-skii*. Intriga pravykh // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 11. 14 March. P. 4–5; *Filippov A. F.:* 1) Iustitsiia ili veshalka? // Ibid. 17 January. P. 3–5; 2) Prasolovshchina // Ibid. No. 6. 7 February. P. 4–6; 3) Tainy Sherlokov // Ibid. No. 8. 21 February. P. 5–6; 4) Delo Alekhina // Ibid. No. 20. 16 May. P. 5–6; 5) Iuris prudentis // Ibid. No. 38. 19 September. P. 3–5.

[48] K. F. Golovin (nekrolog) // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 38. 19 September. P. 12–13.

[49] *Vechevoi* [*Zek I. I.*]. Progressivnaia narodnaia partiia // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 51. 19 December. P. 5–6.

[50] *Lamennais F. R. de*. Slova veruiushchego / transl. by I. I. von Zek // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1914. No. 2. P. 74–80; No. 3. P. 80–89; No. 4. P. 89–96; No. 5. P. 97–100.

Pososhkov[51]. P. Pisch extoled Apollon Grigoriev who was quite suitable for the role of a cult figure for the National Democrats[52]. N. Leonidov campaigned for a new faction of the "People's Party" led by Mikhail A. Karaulov in the State Duma[53].

The logic of Filippov's articles in "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" also fitted within this context. On July 15, 1913, he wrote an article dedicated to the anniversary of the life and literary activity of Vladimir G. Korolenko[54], whom he himself in 1900 could not persuade to cooperate with "Russkoe Obozrenie". Filippov, as before, sympathized with Korolenko, spoke positively about him in his memoirs about Gapon, and now he lauded the writer for the nobility of his manners, fearlessness, responsiveness to questions of life, for his support of the "spontaneous violent protest of the youth", his accusation of the "thinness" of modern intellectuals. The critic exclaimed: "Korolenko is the very embodiment of the active principle of Russian life and the whole harmony of action with the ideals and convictions that he professes"[55]. According to Filippov, there was not a single other writer in Russia except Korolenko who would not be politicized and who, in his Olympic serenity, would supposedly be equal to Goethe, Kant, Pushkin, Mozart, and Glinka.

In the next obituary, Filippov unexpectedly glorified and extolled the deceased leader of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), August Bebel, for his democracy, popularity and "plebeianism"[56]. Filippov's unrestrained imagination turned even Bismarck into an "attentive and friendly companion" of Bebel. Measuring SPD by the yardstick of the Russian National Democrats, Filippov wrote: "Bebel's strength lies in his organic nature and soil, along with progressive thought and relentless energy surging… He knew that the future belongs to the masses, not to groups. We will add that to the cultural masses, like the German, and with leaders like him, the immortal Bebel"[57].

Thanks to Filippov, Alexander I. Novikov, the notorious nephew of General Kireev who made his way from a conservative to a revolutionary with very vague views[58], began to publish his articles in "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh". After Novikov's death, his books were sold by the editorial staff of Gariazin and Filippov; a review of one of them was written by Filippov's old acquaintance from "Russkoe Obozrenie", Grigorii P. Georgievskii[59].

Given the abovementioned information, it is not surprising that Filippov, who had experience in censorship persecution and criminal cases even when publishing his newspapers in 1905–1911, openly challenged in "Dym Otechestva" not only the right-wing and liberal parties but also the government. Filippov's accusations of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers Vladimir N. Kokovtsov of corruption, coordinated with Rasputin's

---

[51] *Fedulov M.* Krest'ianin-gosudarstvennik (Ivan Tikhonovich Pososhkov) // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1914. No. 4. P. 39–41.

[52] *Pish P.* Tragicheskii odinochka (pamiati A. A. Grigor'eva) // Ibid. P. 36–39.

[53] *Leonidov N.* Narodnaia partiia v Rossii // Ibid. P. 41–43.

[54] *Filippov A. F.* V. G. Korolenko. P. 77–90.

[55] Ibid. P. 80.

[56] *Filippov A. F.* Iz mraka k svetu (Neskol'ko slov o Bebele) // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1913. No. 8. P. 113–120.

[57] Ibid. S. 119–120.

[58] See more on him: *Tikhomirov L. A.* Teni proshlogo. Vospominaniia. Moscow, 2000. P. 672–678; "Dreams On Russia" documentary (directed by P. M. Fattakhutdinov, written by M. V. Medovarov, 2019). URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mrc8yx2TfcU (accessed: 14.05.2021).

[59] See: Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1913. No. 9. P. 127; 1914. No. 3. P. 59.

speeches, eventually contributed to his resignation[60]. The most right-wing members of the government were also targeted by Filippov who reproached the Minister of Internal Affairs Nicholas A. Maklakov and Minister of Education L. A. Kasso for their inability to cope with the student riots[61].

The National Democrats were seriously concerned about nationalist movements on the periphery of the Russian Empire. Actually, "Dym Otechestva" as a whole adhered to the course of an agreement with the Poles and spoke about Polish politicians mostly positively. The influence of the experience of Filippov, who edited in Reval (Tallinn) in 1905 the newspaper "Baltiiskie Otgoloski" ("Baltic Echoes") with revolutionary programs in Estonian, now led to the alarm voiced in "Dym Otechestva" about the rise of Estonian nationalism[62], and also established "courses on the study of Finland" (Filippov also always interested in the latter). At the same time, "Dym Otechestva" rejected anti-Semitism and condemned the "anti-state nature of the current purely nationalist course" with its restriction of the rights of the Judaists[63]. "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" criticized the anti-Semitic theories of Werner Sombart and Houghston S. Chamberlain[64]. However, Filippov took a cautious, rather neutral position with regard to the "Beilis trial" [65].

The most serious target of the National Democrats was the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It might have seemed that Filippov had to adhere to a pro-German position and not support the Balkan Slavs since such a position was then held by Grigorii E. Rasputin and a friendly magazine "Grazhdanin" ("Citizen") of Prince Meshchersky, and even Filippov's own newspaper "Birzha" ("Exchange") articulated the same views.[66]. However, contrary to expectations, "Dym Otechestva" took pan-Slavist, anti-German and militaristic position. While Filippov went to the Austrophile salon of Countess Maria E. Kleinmikhel', his newspaper simultaneously demanded that such salons be banned[67]. The thinker himself dared openly argue with Rasputin precisely on the question of the Slavs and Germans[68].

On the pages of "Dym Otechestva" in 1913, publicists under the pseudonyms Irbe (identified by us with General Konstantin I. Druzhinin, a member of the National Democratic Party), Veshchun, and Old Diplomat most vehemently criticized Russian foreign policy[69]. All of them expected an imminent war between Germany, Austria-Hungary, Tur-

---

[60] *Filippov A. F.:* 1) Dva velikana (Kokovtsev i Manus) // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 4. 24 January. P. 9–10; 2) Denezhnyi nasos // Ibid. No. 24. 13 June. P. 1–4.

[61] *Filippov A. F.:* 1) Ministr na ekzamene // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 10. 7 March. P. 3–4; 2) Razval vlasti // Ibid. No. 11. 14 March. P. 2–4.

[62] *Mikhailov M.* Estontsy skandaliat // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 37. 12 September. P. 13–14.

[63] *Chemakin A. A.* Russkie natsional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii… P. 154.

[64] See: Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1914. No. 5. P. 62.

[65] *Filippov A. F.* Ubiistvennoe delo // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 39. 26 September. P. 4–8; No. 44. 31 October. P. 1–2.

[66] Birzha. 1914. No. 12. 23 March.

[67] V salone gr. M. E. Kleinmikhel' // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 19. 9 May. P. 15.

[68] See Filippov's testimony in the book: *Radzinskii E. S.* Rasputin. Moscow, 2011. P. 217, 232.

[69] *Irbe:* 1) K momentu. Neskol'ko myslei po povodu balkanskikh sobytii i russkoi politiki // Dym Otechestva. 1912. No. 1. 15 November. P. 4–7; 2) Wo ist der Hund // Ibid. No. 2. 23 November. P. 3–4; 3) Istoriia povtoriaetsia // Ibid. No. 3. 29 November. P. 4–5; 4) Politika i diplomaty // Ibid. No. 4. 6 December. P. 7–10; No. 6. 20 December. P. 4–5; 5) Vo sne ili naiavu? // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 1. 4 January. P. 3–4; Prostratsiia vlasti // Dym Otechestva. 1912. No. 3. 29 November. P. 3–4; *Veshchun:* 1) Evropa i Avstro-Vengriia. Politicheskii obzor // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 11. 14 March. P. 9–10; 2) Rossiia i Evropa posle Bukharestskogo mira // Ibid. No. 43. 24 October. P. 3–4; No. 44. 31 October. P. 6–7; 3) Novyi diplomaticheskii konfuz // Ibid. No. 48. 28 November. P. 8–9; *Staryi diplomat:* 1) Dve diplomatii // Ibid. No. 42. 17 October.

key and Russia, called Kokovtsov's government pro-German and reproached the Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei D. Sazonov for a sluggish and timid policy. Filippov also stated that Russian diplomats were trailing behind Austria, and on behalf of editorial board of "Dym Otechestva" announced a competition for readers: "We are awarding a prize — Tallinn a gold cigarette case with a corresponding inscription — to the one who will guess the innermost thoughts and goals of the leaders of our foreign policy"[70].

The belligerent tone of "Dym Otechestva", its calls for a broad coalition of Balkan countries, apparently, reflected personal views of Filippov. It should be noted that in 1903 he published an article in his journal "Russkoe Obozrenie" about long-standing Russian-Romanian relations[71], and now "Dym Otechestva" under his editorship demanded the establishment of close economic ties with Romania and published articles by the famous Romanophile Nicholai N. Durnovo on ecclesiastical topics. Since the days of "Russkoe Obozrenie", Filippov had also been impressed by the program of imperialist expansion into Western Armenia, Northern Iran, and Mongolia proclaimed again in "Dym Otechestva"[72]. Finally, it is curious that the obituary of Vladimir I. Lamanskii — one of the teachers of Filippov, who instilled in him sympathy for the unity of the Slavic peoples — emerged in "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh"[73].

The direct influence of one of the articles once published in Filippov's "Russkoe Obozrenie"[74] is felt in the journalism of K. I. Druzhinin in "Dym Otechestva". He suggested following an example of military sports events and torchlight processions of the German youth in order to strengthen the militarization of education in Russia modelling it on Germany (but against Germany itself), replacing the humiliating phrase "conscription" with the proud "military service". In this regard, Druzhinin's New Year Eve article at the end of 1913 entitled "Remember the war! It is close"[75] was characteristic. With the outbreak of the First World War, "Dym Otechestva" ceased to exist on 17 (30) July 1914, and General Druzhinin immediately went to the front and heroically died in East Prussia on August 27 (September 9).

Of course, the Russian government responded with reprisals to such sharp criticism of domestic and foreign policy by "Dym Otechestva": for example, once Filippov served three days in a cell for 50 people, together with the editors of the Bolshevik newspaper "Pravda" and "Groza" of the Black Hundreds[76]. The thinker constantly boasted of such persecutions and even made up incorrect details of his previous mishaps to the readers[77].

"Dym Otechestva" invariably emphasized its loyalty to Nicholas II, and on the 300th anniversary of the Romanov dynasty dedicated a special issue (The Royal Chronicle) to the illustrated history of the ruling house; Filippov proposed to create a museum of "zemstvo (local government) and people" of the Romanovs in Tver'[78]. Nevertheless, loyal

P. 4; 2) Rossiia i Bolgariia // Ibid. No. 48. 28 November. P. 1–2; 3) Politika neprotivleniia zlu // Ibid. No. 52. 25 December. P. 1–4.

[70] *Filippov A. F.* Nravy Rasteriaevoi ulitsy // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 12. 21 March. P. 1–3.

[71] *Iatsimirskii A. I.* Blagotvoritel'nost' russkikh gosudarei v Rumynii v XVI–XIX vv. // Russkoe obozrenie. 1903. Issue 1–3. P. 1–19.

[72] Rossiia, Angliia i Germaniia // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 47. 21 Novamber. P. 1–3.

[73] *Cherkasskii P.* V. I. Lamanskii (nekrolog) // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1914. No. 12. P. 57.

[74] *D. A.* Patriotizm // Russkoe obozrenie. 1903. Issue 1–3. P. 80–81.

[75] *Druzhinin K. I.* Pomni voinu! Ona blizka // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 52. 25 December. P. 2–4.

[76] *Filippov A. F.* K nashim chitateliam // Ibid. No. 9. 28 February. P. 7–8.

[77] *Filippov A. F.* Chernye kabinety // Ibid. No. 28. 11 July. P. 5–6.

[78] *Filippov A. F.* Narodnyi pamiatnik // Dym Otechestva. 1912. No. 3. 29 November. P. 8–9.

statements did not fit well with the sharpest criticism of the government's domestic and foreign policies. Actually, Filippov placed part of the blame for the degradation of the Russians on the society itself mired in drunkenness and luxury: "The vulgarization of our society is proceeding with such a decisive pace and with such irrevocability that any observer of modern morals comes to the idea of the inevitability of a dictatorship in the field of public life and restrictions that can restore or at least restrain a few healthy elements of the people's organism"[79]. However, such words meant a return to the projects of the dictatorship of a strong personality under a weak monarch, like in the utopian novels by Sergei F. Sharapov. Such reasoning indirectly hit Nicholas II, although Gariazin published an editorial on autocracy as a formula for the state life of the Russian people[80]. This article appeared next to another one on the educational significance of the Romanovs' anniversary[81]. Paradoxically, the National Democrats, who had always stood for increasing the role of the Duma, now began to accuse the factions of the rightists and nationalists of wanting to dissolve the State Duma bypassing the emperor and even preparing a new revolution[82]. Gariazin even called on the monarch to deal with these deputies: "The government of the Great Empire does not dare be condescending to the fragmented, not united by anything, not recognizing anyone and disobeying a handful of people who came to the Tauride Palace for a funny game of parliamentarians and forget about the misfortunes of the people, about difficulties of the state, about the greatness of the throne"[83].

"Dym Otechestva" not once spoke directly about the maturing revolution in Russia, the "collapse of power", its separation from the people and imminent fall. Any strike of workers or unrest of gymnasium students was interpreted by the magazine as a sign of treason and the collapse of the state[84]. Filippov repeatedly spoke about the return to the country of the political climate of the times of irreconcilable populist opposition of the time of his youth: "Apparently, we are again entering a period of political Nadsonism, a kind of relapsing fever, which in the late 1880s and early 1890s destroyed several generations and made them incapable of productive work"[85]. The thinker called for educating and upbringing of a new generation of courageous and strong-willed politicians in Russia[86]. Filippov's prediction of the future revolution of 1917 expressed in his memoirs about Gapon can be considered his most extreme radicalism during this period: "The Gaponiade, if you look at it in detail, is profoundly instructive. It tells us openly that we did not and do not have historical figures from the people; that the authorities, passively referring to events, never had the talent and instinct to prevent them or even use them; that the security and police bodies are, as usual, corrupt and passive; that the intelligentsia in all such actions can and will play the most insignificant role; and, finally, that the spontaneous movement of the masses in Russia is always capable of assuming such unexpected and

[79] *Filippov A. F.* Vstrecha novogo goda // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 1. 4 January. P. 12–13.

[80] [*Gariazin A. L.*] Peterburg. 31 ianvaria 1913 g. // Ibid. No. 5. 31 January. P. 1–2.

[81] *Nekrasov P. A.* Prazdnik russkoi monarkhicheskoi idei i ego vospitatel'noe znachenie // Ibid. P. 4–5.

[82] *Novikov I.* Nakanune revoliutsii? // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 10. 7 March. P. 6–7.

[83] [*Gariazin A. L.*] K Gosudarstvennoi Dume chetvertogo sozyva // Dym Otechestva. 1912. No. 3. 29 November. P. 1–3.

[84] *Solonevich A. M.* Tragediia russkoi zhizni // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 30. 25 July. P. 2–4; *Filippov A. F.* Izmena Otechestvu // Ibid. P. 4–6.

[85] *Filippov A. F.* Nedetskie drapy // Ibid. No. 14. 4 April. P. 3–5.

[86] *Filippov A. F.* Toskuiushchie i tolkuiushchie // Ibid. No. 36. 5 September. P. 4–5.

grandiose forms, a miserable shadow and a faint resemblance of which was the January 9 procession"[87].

Another important aspect of the socio-political views of Filippov and his associates was the church issue. In his articles in "Dym Otechestva", he touched upon various topics: he took under his protection the newly appointed "pro-Rasputin" bishops[88]; covered the struggle for Orthodoxy in Austrian Galicia, Orthodox relations with Roman Catholics, and the first visit of the Antiochian Patriarch to Russia since the schism of the 17th century [89]. Gariazin, Filippov and other authors of "Dym Otechestva", in connection with the beginning of the Pre-Council Session, actively spoke out in defense of the restoration of the Patriarchate in Russia[90] although the extreme harshness of Nicholai N. Durnovo Sr., who attacked the Chief Prosecutor of the Holy Synod Vladimir K. Sabler, entailed frequent censorship harassment of this newspaper, up to the confiscation of its issues[91].

However, the most acute theme from May 1913 to the spring of 1914 in "Dym Otechestva" was the "Athos Troubles". Filippov and other journalists resolutely supported the onomatodoxy and from the very beginning harshly criticized the actions of the Holy Synod and Onomatomach bishops[92]. Some issues of "Dym Otechestva" in 1913 (for example, No. 35, No. 38) were almost entirely filled with materials about the Onomatomach bishops. After the defeat of Russian monasticism on Mount Athos and the expulsion of the monks to Russia, "Dym Otechestva" came out in their defense[93] and repeatedly published articles by the leading ideologist of the Onomatodoxy — Hieroschemamonk Anthonii (Bulatovich)[94]. Back in 1901, he was mentioned on the pages of "Russkoe Obozrenie" and was known to Filippov, who now actively supported him in his bright pamphlets[95]. Despite the new fines, the editorial board of "Dym Otechestva" began to publish advertisements for the sale of Onomatodoxist compositions. "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh" also actively

[87] *Filippov A. F.* Stranichki minuvshego. I. O Gapone. P. 36.

[88] *Filippov A. F.* Slaboumie v pechati // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 42. 17 October. P. 4–7; *Zvantsov P.* Travlia arkhipastyria // Ibid. No. 48. 28 Novamber. P. 5–6.

[89] *Filippov A. F.* Episkop Nikandr i katoliki // Ibid. No. 7. 14 February. P. 11; Sobranie Galitsko-Russkogo obshchestva // Ibid. No. 13. 28 March. P. 12.

[90] *Gariazin A. L.* Patriarshestvo // Ibid. No. 5. 31 January. P. 2–4.

[91] *Durnovo N. N.:* 1) Nominal'noe patriarshestvo // Ibid. No. 17. 25 April. P. 2–3; No. 19. 9 May. P. 3–4; 2) Pravitel'stvuiushchii Sinod // Ibid. No. 44. 31 October. P. 9–10; 3) Neskol'ko slov o pomestnom sobore // Ibid. No. 47. 21 November. P. 6–7; *Veruiushchii*. Tserkovnoe bessilie // Ibid. No. 41. 10 October. P. 6–7.

[92] *Pravoslavnyi*: 1) Bolee ser'ezno, chem kazhetsia // Ibid. No. 21. 23 May. P. 6–7; 2) Nakanune razvala Tserkvi // Ibid. No. 22. 30 May. P. 4–5.

[93] *Pravoslavnyi*: 1) Russkii monastyr' // Ibid. No. 28. 11 July. P. 9–10; 2) Pribytie afonskikh monakhov v Odessu // Ibid. No. 29. 13 July; 3) Ne ponimaem // Ibid. No. 39. 26 September. P. 9; 4) Delo Innokentia // Ibid. No. 34. 22 August. P. 8; 5) Afonskaia tragediia // Ibid. No. 35. 29 August. P. 3–4; *Tumanov G.* S Afona // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 33. 15 August. P. 3–4; *Krupenskii G. D.* Oklevetannyi arkhiepiskopom Nikonom // Ibid. No. 36. 5 September. P. 11; *Karaulov M. A.* Plody politikanstvuiushchego dukhovenstva // Ibid. No. 38. 19 September. P. 8–9; *K. F.* Novoe ob Afone // Ibid. P. 5–6; Pis'mo monakha Konstantina k ieromonakhu Antoniiu // Ibid. No. 40. 3 October. P. 13–14; Afonskoe delo // Ibid. No. 43. 24 October. P. 8–12; Rezoliutsiia russkikh monakhov na Afone // Ibid. No. 46. 14 November. P. 11; Zlobstvuiushchii arkhiepiskop // Dym Otechestva. 1914. No. 26 (84). 24 June. P. 5–7; Afonskie monakhi v Moskve // Ibid. No. 27 (85). 3 July. P. 7–8.

[94] *Bulatovich A.:* 1) Pis'ma k arkhiepiskopu Nikonu i arkhiepiskopu Misailu // Dym Otechestva. 1913. No. 35. 29 August. P. 6–9; 2) Pravda ob Afone // Ibid. No. 41. 10 October. P. 8–12.

[95] *Bulatovich A.* Stydno // Ibid. No. 30. 25 July. P. 1–2; *Filippov A. F.:* 1) Sugubo stydno // Ibid. No. 31. 1 August. P. 5–6; 2) Paki i paki // Ibid. No. 37. 12 September. P. 2–4; *Gariazin A. L.* Nadtresnutyi kolokol. Malaia opechatka ili "velikoe iskushenie" // Ibid. No. 34. 22 August. P. 5–6; *Durnovo N. N.* Zhivy li my? // Ibid. No. 45. 7 November. P. 7–8.

participated in the propaganda of the Onomatodoxy[96]. Such unanimity of the National Democrats can hardly be explained only by natural sympathy for the persecuted monks. The young political party tried to oppose itself to the "old rightists" who supported the decisions of the Synod against the Onomatodoxists. As for Filippov himself, the break with Archbishop Anthonii (Khrapovitskii), who had previously worked in his press organs, was painful to him but in such a difficult situation, and given his friendship with Rasputin, he had to make a choice and to openly oppose the synodal majority.

Thus, the political views of Filippov, whimsically combining loyalty to the monarchy with sharp criticism of the government and right-wing parties; democracy — with imperialism and a course for preparation for a world war; Orthodoxy — with criticism of the Church hierarchy; elements of liberalism — with patriotism, had developed by the beginning of the twentieth century, but did not stand the chance of popularity in the then Russian society. By 1912, the situation had changed: "progressive nationalism" began to acquire its own social base and active supporters, and Filippov was able to join the circle of the young National Democratic Party, actively promoting its ideas on the pages of "Dym Otechestva" and "Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh". His bright articles largely determined the appearance of the Gariazin publications. The First World War forced Filippov to suspend his journalistic activities, but his views on the whole did not change. This is clearly seen in his project in the spring of 1918 to publish the "Velikaia Rossiia" newspaper in the "National Bolshevik" spirit[97], in his pamphlets in 1920[98], and in a letter to Vera Figner in 1931[99] when he announced the combination of the heritage of Tikhomirov and Gapon, Nicholas II and Lenin in his own ideological synthesis. This is not so surprising: if one defines Russian National Democracy at the beginning of the twentieth century as "commitment to the interests of the broad masses and protection of the social rights of the common people" in combination with "Russian nationalism and progressivism" and Western socio-political theories[100], then the difference between Filippov's views and the Soviet patriotism will turn out to be small.

References

Bokhanov A. N. *Burzhuaznaia pressa v Rossii i krupnyi kapital*. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1984, 152 p. (In Russian)

Chemakin A. A. *Istoki russkoi natsional-demokratii: 1896–1914 gody.* St Petersburg, Vladimir Dal' Publ., 2018, 651 p. (In Russian)

Chemakin A. A. *Russkie natsional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii: 1914 — nachalo 1920-kh godov.* St Petersburg, Vladimir Dal' Publ., 2018, 606 p. (In Russian)

Fateev V. A. *Zhizneopisanie Vasiliia Rozanova*. St Petersburg, Pushkinskii Dom Publ., 2013, 1056 p. (In Russian)

Ivanov A. A. *Vyzov natsionalizma: Lozung "Rossiia Gariazin russkikh" v dorevoliutsionnoi obshhestvennoi mysli*. St Petersburg, Vladimir Dal' Publ., 2016, 511 p. (In Russian)

---

[96] *Antonii (Bulatovich).* Pravda ob afonskoi tragedii (Pis'mo v redaktsiiu) // Zhurnal Dlia Vsekh. 1913. No. 10. P. 105–115; *Vechevoi I.* Afonskoe delo // Ibid. 1914. No. 4. P. 44–51.

[97] Arkhiv UFSB po Sankt-Peterburgu i Leningradskoi oblasti. D. P-93201. T. 5. L. 86–86 ob.

[98] *Filippov A. F.* Sviattsy i trudovoi kalendar' na 1920 god. Perechen' imen i dnei, pamiatnykh dlia zhizni Rossii / compiled by A. Filippov. Moscow, 1920. P. 16–24.

[99] RGALI. F. 1185. D. 797. L. 1–3 ob.

[100] *Chemakin A. A.:* 1) Istoki russkoi natsional-demokratii… P. 27; 2) Russkie natsional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii… P. 492.

Koniaev N. M. *Gibel' krasnykh Moiseev. Nachalo terrora. 1918 god*. Moscow, Veche Publ., 2014, 509 p. (In Russian)

Lebedev S. K. Aleksei Frolovich Filippov: literator, bankir i chekist. *Iz glubiny vremen,* 1998, issue 10, pp. 153–171. (In Russian)

Medovarov M. V. Popytki vozobnovleniia izdaniia zhurnala "Russkoe obozrenie" glazami L'va Tihomirova i "delo Piramidovoi". *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Serija Istoriia*, 2016, no. 3 (34), pp. 42–51. (In Russian)

Medovarov M. V. Vozvrashhenie zabytogo napravleniia v russkoi politicheskoi zhizni. Review of: Chemakin A. A. Istoki russkoi natsional-demokratii: 1896–1914 gody. St Petersburg, Vladimir Dal', 2018, 651 s.; Chemakin A. A. Russkie nacional-demokraty v epokhu potriasenii: 1914 — nachalo 1920-h godov. St Petersburg, Vladimir Dal', 2018, 606 s. *Istoricheskaia ekspertiza,* 2019, no. 2, pp. 262–268. (In Russian)

Radzinskii Je. S. *Rasputin*. Moscow, AST Publ., Astrel' Publ., 2011, 576 p. (In Russian)

Repnikov A. V. *Konservativnye kontseptsii pereustroistva Rossii*. Moscow, Academia Publ., 2007, 520 p. (In Russian)

San'kova S. M. *Russkaia partiia v Rossii: obrazovanie i deiatel'nost' Vserossiiskogo natsional'nogo soiuza (1908–1917)*. Orel, Izdatel' Svetlana Zenina Publ., 2006, 370 p. (In Russian)

Tarasova A. A. Reaktsionno-okhranitel'naia zhurnalistika. *Literaturnyi process i russkaia zhurnalistika kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka. 1890–1904. Burzhuazno-liberal'nye i modernistskie izdaniia*. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1982, pp. 234–260. (In Russian)

Tikhomirov L. A. *Teni proshlogo. Vospominaniia*. Moscow, Moskva Publ., 2000, 720 p. (In Russian)

Статья поступила в редакцию 18 декабря 2020 г.
Рекомендована к печати 17 декабря 2021 г.
Received: December 18, 2020
Accepted: December 17, 2021