

The Theory of Revolution According to Bakunin

MONDOUE Roger¹, DEMANOUMistrandUrrich²

¹(Department of philosophy, psychology, sociology, Professor-University of Dschang, Cameroon)

²(Department of philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Doctorate-University of Dschang Cameroon)

ABSTRACT :At the dawn of the third millennium, the question of revolution was at the center of debate. This problem, as we can underline, brings Bakunin back to life. A nineteenth-century author, Bakunin is in this century, through the importance of his work, a benchmark with regard to the epistemic requisite about the revolution. Thus, the theory of revolution as expounded by this thinker is a theory that emphasizes on anarchism. The revolution is, according to Bakunin, capital for the emancipation of mankind. Human well-being and development are only possible if, through a violent revolution, the proletariat overthrows the middle class. The revolution that Bakunin encourages is certainly violent, but it is far from terror. Terror unlike Bakunin's violent revolution, contributes not to the liberation of man, but to his destruction. By its violent nature, the objective, the role of the revolution, is the liberation of the working masses who languish under the domination of the bosses. This will be the condition for the advent of what Bakunin calls libertarian socialism, which is humanizing the value for man. But, the idea that we want to bring out here is that, according to which, the revolution contributes only to the destruction of man. For that, we propose an approach whovalorize the dialogue to solve the problems of domination and the crisis.

KEYWORDS: Anarchism, dialogue, Libertariansocialism, Revolution, Terror, Violent revolution

RESUME:À l'orée du troisième millénaire, la question de la révolution est au cœur de l'actualité. Cette problématique soulignons-le, fait ressusciter Bakounine. Auteur du dix-neuvième siècle, Bakounine est en ce siècle à travers l'importance de ses travaux une référence en ce qui concerne le réquisit épistémique au sujet de la révolution. Ainsi, la théorie de la révolution telle qu'exposée par ce penseur, est une théorie qui met en valeur l'anarchisme. La révolution est au sens de Bakounine capitale pour l'émancipation de l'humanité. Le bien-être et l'épanouissement de l'homme ne sont possibles que, si à travers une révolution violente, le prolétariat renverse la bourgeoisie. La révolution que promet Bakounine est certes violente, mais elle est loin de la terreur. La terreur contrairement à la révolution violente de Bakounine contribue non pas à la libération de l'homme mais, à sa destruction. De par sa nature violente, l'objectif, le rôle de la révolution est la libération de la masse ouvrière qui croupit sous la domination des patrons. Telle sera la condition de l'avènement de ce que Bakounine appelle le socialisme libertaire qui a une valeur humanisante pour l'homme. Mais, l'idée que nous voulons ressortir ici est celle selon laquelle la révolution ne contribue qu'à la destruction de l'homme. Pour cela, nous proposons une approche par le dialogue pour résoudre les problèmes de domination et de crises.

Mots clés :Anarchisme, dialogue, Révolution, Révolution violente, Socialisme libertaire,

I. INTRODUCTION

Revolution, it must be recognized that this concept is in the international news. Almost the entire population thinks only of this word. It has not only taken up residence in the forums of "specialists" in reflection, but it has also conquered the lives of men and henceforth directs its action. This is what justifies the outbreak of multiple uprisings against the authorities and the holders of capital today all over the world. In this context, we can see a set of revolution that has erupted in the world: the Arab Spring, the Yellow Vest Movement, the multiple strikes ... All of these protests bears witness to the fact that, the revolution occupies a central place in the change and improvement of living conditions. If we look into the history of revolutionary thought, Bakunin is one of the few thinkers who understood the need for revolution. This is why our reflection is on the theory of revolution and is placed in the context of Bakunin.

The problematic of the revolution seems to have taken shape with the thoughts of Bakunin. Thus our reflection poses the problem of the Bakuninian conception of the revolution. The Russian thinker subscribes to a logic according to which without a revolution, the overthrow of the ruling class will not be possible. To this end, he advises the working masses who are subject to domination to become aware of their situation and to overthrow

the dominant so that authority disappears. Bakunin's primary objective is to get man out of his prison so as, to emancipate him. The "Social Revolution" presents itself to Bakunin as the best way out of slavery. It is she who will be able to destroy "the religious beliefs and the habits of debauchery in the people" (Bakunin; 1882, p. 28). Only the Revolution is capable of closing the churches and cabarets which keep man in a situation of slavery, putting an end to all authority in order to promote the emergence of a collective society. What consideration does Bakunin have of the revolution? Isn't the valorization of the revolution in Bakunin a means of denaturing man to extent that no revolution can pass without leaving negative impacts in the human mind? Better still, shouldn't we favor a way that solves the problems without the contribution of weapons or bombs?

Thus, after having exposed the theory of violence according to Bakunin, we are going to demonstrate that it is a killing of the human species and not its valorization. Therefore, it will be wise to solve problems in society to think towards social dialogue which can lead to an agreement between men when it is conducted.

II. BAKUNIN AND THE FRENCH WAY: PROMOTING THE REVOLUTION

The development of Bakunin's philosophy in its relationship with materialism pushes him to promote the revolution. During our author's Hegelian period, revolution was not part of his theory. But, starting from his article of 1842, Bakunin operates a double reversal of what appeared in 1838 in the "foreword". In the first place, between the French way (revolutionary) and the German way (not revolutionary), "it is no longer Germany which is chosen as nation of reference, but France" (Angaut; 2007, p. 13). Secondly,

The choice between France and Germany changes meaning: in 1838, in accordance with the educational purpose of Hegel's texts that it was a question of introducing, the Russian public was supposed to choose between French education, denigrated for its lack of spiritual substance, and a German education, which led to a reconciliation between reason and effectiveness. In the article of 1842, France and Germany, on the other hand, embody two paths towards political and social modernity: in Germany theoretical education according to the reformist options defended more or less openly since Kant by its main representatives, in France a revolutionary practical way. (Angaut, 2007, pp. 13-14).

We can see here that the issue between France and Germany is posed differently. Indeed, unlike the German way which is pure theory, Bakunin prefers and advises the French way which is practical and leads to revolution. This is a path that will lead to individual emancipation and the passage of political practice. It is no longer a question of the Russian trusting a path which encourages the servile acceptance of political domination but, of relying on a path which allows the individual to refuse political, state domination through revolution. Jean-Christophe Angaut does not fail to point out that:

Turning away from the options that were temporarily his in Russia, Bakunin abandoned a right-wing occidentalism that recommended taking a model from Germany, to find a problem that is typical of the German political crisis: it is a question of choosing between theory German and the French practice of emancipation. (Angaut; 2007, p. 14).

The French way appears as the best for the revolutionary because, he affirms that "you know very well that humanity, according to its sublime destination, can be satisfied and find rest only in the universally practical principle, in a principle which unites powerfully in itself the thousand different appearances of the spiritual sight" (Angaut; 2007, p. 134). The French way gives power to the individual because, as we can see, through the slogan: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which became the motto of the French Republic, Napoleon had emerged victorious from the French Revolution. As a worthy son of the Revolution, he had broadcast "with a victorious hand throughout Europe" (Angaut; 2007, p. 134) these mysterious words.

The report of Bakunin and Moses Hess which is that of the "European triarchy" better expresses this choice of the French way in Bakunin. The "European triarchy" refers to three European capitals each with its own particularity; these are Berlin, Paris and London. This triarchy develops the three paths present in Europe: the French way (Paris) dominated by practice and revolution, the German way (Berlin) dominated by theory and inertia and the English way (London) which is that of socialism. Bakunin opts for the path of Paris and London and one day hopes to see Germany come out of its purely theoretical situation to embrace the revolution. In his correspondence of May 1843 to his friend Arnold Ruge, he wrote to him that, "I want to break your chains to you, Germans who want to become Greeks, me, the Scythian" (Angaut; 2007, p. 147). For that, he thinks that philosophy must play in Germany the same role that it played in France. Germany, along with all other European nations, must enroll in the school of French philosophy. You have to learn from France not only by being from the outside but also by being from the inside. We understand why Bakunin thinks that "a trip to France and even a prolonged stay in Paris would be of the greatest use to us" (Angaut; 2007, p. 146). If Bakunin advises the French way, it is because the German one, which is purely theoretical, has lost its power.

The questions running through the theories of Moses Hess and those of Bakunin at the time confirm this situation and make us understand what allows such a departure from German reality. Both thinkers are of the opinion that Germany learns from France. According to Hess, German philosophy has found its truth, but this truth must now be accounted for. On this subject, Eustache Kouvélakis affirms:

Such a task obliges us to go beyond the one-sidedness of the Hegelian left, to bridge the gap that has grown between philosophy and "life" [...]. It is a matter of going beyond the principle of freedom of mind alone, of going to school in France and of leading a real fight. (Kouvelakis; 2002, p. 184).

The concern of Hess and even Bakunin is to combine theory and practice in philosophy. This is what Marx was already thinking when he affirmed in the "eleventh thesis on Feuerbach" that "the philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, what matters is to transform it" (Marx; 1982, p. 54). For Marx, a purely speculative philosophy developed by German Idealism must be replaced by a practical one. Instead of looking only at the theoretical side of philosophy, we have to look at both. Ultimately, practice must be included in theory because, as Kwame Nkrumah said, "theory without practice is empty and practice without theory is blind" (Kwame; 1976, p. 97). We understand that it is a serious mistake to make philosophy only a theory which leaves no room for practice. It must not remain only in the books, it must be practiced in the social.

III. NATURE OF THE REVOLUTION: A VIOLENT REVOLUTION

The taking of freedoms hostage and continued exploitation are at the heart of all policies that refuse to guarantee human autonomy. Man, therefore, must not remain forever dependent on authority, on capital. Its objective must be the search for its autonomy in a society caught in the nets of capitalism. The most ideal way, out of the situation of domination, is revolution. The revolution must be able to change the situation of the workers and drive out the wealthy so that social equilibrium can be established. The invasion of France by Prussia is seen by Bakunin as an eradication of the freedom of the people. Unable to count on the bourgeoisie to liberate themselves, the French people must wage a bitter struggle against the bourgeoisie. After the destruction of France, only one way remains to save it. What must be done "is to oppose the militarily organized brutality of the Prussians with the brutality of a huge popular uprising" (Bakunin; 1910, p. 84). The popular uprising in question here is nothing more than a revolution.

If the French people really want to free themselves from Prussian oppression, they must be very careful. Note that the partisans of Bonapartism did not want the revolution and for that, they were ready to do anything to deceive and convince the masses of the ineffectiveness of the struggle. The Bonapartists, for the most part bourgeois, made the French people believe that a union was possible and important for the defense of French territory. The prudence of the masses will then have the task of identifying such a maneuver and taking precautions so as not to be deceived. Alone, the people must lead their revolution and let's say it, it must be violent. In Bakunin's view, social revolution cannot and must not take place without recourse to violence. Non violent revolution is no different from a dramatic turn that will have as its sole purpose the consolidation of the power of the dominant. For the Russian thinker, the revolution, in its first phase, must aim for destruction: it is necessary to act, to demolish what the bourgeoisie has built as a system for the advent of libertarian socialism.

It is important here to clear up any misunderstanding. Certainly, Bakunin is in favor of a violent revolution, but it must be against the installations of the bourgeoisie and not against the men who constitute this class. The violence promoted by Bakunin is against everything to do with state institutions (parliaments, courts, banks, barracks, prisons, etc.) and bourgeois possession. The revolution advocated by Bakunin,

May well be bloody and vindictive in the first days, during which popular justice will take place. But it will not retain this character for long and will never assume that of systematic and cold terrorism. She will make war on positions and things, much more than on men, certain that the things and the privileged and antisocial positions that they create, much more powerful than individuals, constitute and the character and strength of her enemies. (Bakunin; 2013, p. 67).

Bakunin follows the logic here that if you want to destroy someone, attack their possessions. Understandably, Bakunin's perspective is to avoid at all costs the "bloodthirsty revolution founded on the construction of a powerfully centralized revolutionary state [which] would inevitably result in [...] the military dictatorship of a new master" (Bakunin; 1868). The revolution in the meaning of Bakunin is concerned with the rights and freedoms of men. In the name of the revolution, we must not sacrifice human lives on the altar of barbarism. Regardless of the adversary, their rights must be respected and preserved. Thus, our author specifies that, "when we carry out the revolution for the emancipation of humanity, we must respect the life and freedom of men" (Bakunin; 1970, p. 97). Apart from respect for freedom and human life, everything else must be destroyed. We must tackle the stock markets since they are built on looting, theft and crime. This practice, Bakunin thinks it is even "more humane than cutting off heads, and at the same time it is a thousand times more useful" (Bakunin; 1970, p. 97). In truth, if Bakunin opposes the beheading of criminals, it is because he believes that by doing so, they will be made important figures and they will become martyrs. Destruction, on the other hand, makes it possible to wipe out the evil that is the bourgeoisie at its root. To shave the stock markets is to kill the means that could allow the bourgeoisie to defend itself.

Faced with an authoritarian conception of the revolution which develops by decrees, making use of the violence established by the State in order to perpetuate the reaction, Bakunin opposes an anarchist conception which wants to be explicit of the revolution, which, in inscribing it in the very organization of society, attributes to it

the need for a social fact. The notion of "revolutionary facts" sums up the idea of a fait accompli which is imposed on law and becomes difficult to reverse, and the idea of the fact as the result of a doing, of an act. It is only in this context that one can speak in the Russian thinker of propaganda by the fact. It must be said that this theory of "propaganda by fact" has a historical basis which is the French Revolution of 1789. This revolution is therefore presented as the model in terms of revolution and political lessons. To gain the sympathy of the peasants, the sale of the goods of the clergy is well received by the people. In 1870, Bakunin suggested revisiting the experience of selling clergy property inspired by the French Revolution. At the same time, he postulates the confiscation of the property of owners under the government of Bonaparte. This Bakuninian position, one can notice, is against any form of terrorism pushing it to refuse political assassinations. When it comes to state-administered Terror, Bakunin takes a more radical posture; posture which still results from the French Revolution. So in the Marseilles manuscript, he says:

I'm not saying that all these rascals should have been guillotined. This would be falling back into the mistakes of the Jacobinism of 1793 and 1794, an outdated and powerless system. . .]. This system has against it the historical test, because it produced the very opposite of what it wanted to achieve: the guillotine, this incisive instrument of the State, did not kill reaction, it brought it back to life. . [. . . Shedding cold blood, with all the necessary accompaniment of legal hypocrisy, is a loathsome and horrible thing. (Bakunin; 1970, p. 97).

Three reasons thus confirm the rejection of revolutionary Terror. In the first place, there is an inadequacy between the means and the ends: while the revolution proposes emancipation and the human species, it is inadmissible that it initiates this reign by what constitutes the height of inhumanity. , the legal sanction affixed to the suppression of human life. In this logic, the Terror inevitably leads to the development of the reign of authority. It should be noted here that Bakunin is no stranger to the usual arguments of theorists who are in favor of terrorism. His argumentation refutes from the root any form of Terror: revolutionary violence is used in the same way as state violence. Second, terrorist measures are ineffective and superfluous because they are not sufficiently radical. For that, cutting off food from the dominant faction and thus giving the revolution new means is better. Finally, the Terror is counterproductive since it arouses sympathy for those it executes. At the time of the Commune, Bakunin was fearful due to the presence of the Jacobins in his midst. It was at the end of 1871, in his Circular to my friends in Italy that Bakunin explained what in this context made the difference between socialism and Jacobinism:

Socialism is not cruel, it is a thousand times more human than Jacobinism, I mean political revolution. He is not against people, even the most villainous, knowing full well that all individuals, good or bad, are only the fatal product of the social position that history and society have created for them. [. . .] Socialism will wage an inexorable war on "social positions, not men; and once these positions are destroyed and shattered, the men who had occupied them, disarmed and deprived of all means of action, will have become harmless and much less. powerful, I assure you, that the most ignorant worker; for their current power does not reside in themselves, in their intrinsic value, but in their wealth and in the support of the State (Bakunin; 1912, pp. 286-287).

As we can see, even if Bakunin advocates a violent revolution, he is far from wanting to institute terror and crime in society.

IV. GOAL OF THE REVOLUTION: THE LIBERATION OF THE PROLETARIAT

The meaning Bakunin gives to the proletarian revolution is very clear: to contribute to the destruction of the bourgeoisie and to establish a more equal and free society known as libertarian socialism. At this level of this author's thinking, it is not surprising that this question finds an important place. This is the question that must now animate his mind because it is the only one that remains.

All the other questions: religious, national, political having been completely exhausted by history, there remains today only one question, in which all the others are summed up and the only one now capable of moving peoples: the social issue. (Bakunin; 2013, p. 6)

The social question is therefore the new theme that deserves all the attention. For the social question to gain momentum and be realized, the class struggle must be topical. Thus, from 1864, the Letter of a Democrat shows that the disagreement which occupies the greatest place in history is now that of capital and labor. In this disagreement, Bakunin recognizes, transformed, this great opposition between Revolution and Reaction which is at the center of his theory since 1842. What makes this opposition of capital and labor the most important issue of the time is its ability to be able to mobilize people from now on. For all supporters of freedom, it is therefore very important to understand that this struggle between capital and labor is also a struggle for the emancipation of peoples, and conversely that the taking into account of the social question. has become the only way to interest them in the cause of freedom. The fourth article written by the Russian thinker for *Il popolod'Italia* in September 1865 explains this idea better: the task of the democrats is henceforth to promote a "radical transformation, not only political, but also economic and social, without which freedom will remain always a vain word for the people" (Bakunin; 1865, p. 1).

The renewed interest in the social question from 1864 was based on the awareness that, the different aspects of emancipation, the economic aspect was the only one likely to interest people in the question of freedom in Europe. . The social question is also the dominant question in Europe because it takes a political turn and does not keep "an exclusively economic character, and, so to speak, private. (Bakunin, 2009, p. 68). The social question which includes the liberation of the people is now the main task of the revolution in Europe. Socialism as an answer to the social question therefore only has meaning for Bakunin to the extent that it militates for a more general emancipation. Echoing the progress of socialism in June 1848, Bakunin asserts:

Through underground work, which slowly made him penetrate the depths of the political life of all countries, he reached the point of making himself felt everywhere, as the latent power of the century. A few more years, and he will manifest himself as an active, formidable power. (Bakunin; 2009, p. 69)

If socialism did not disappear like state socialism, it is because it carried out groundwork which enabled it to resist the assaults of the bourgeoisie. Having become the orientation of the proletarian class and becoming one with it, socialism now was well structured in society. Once again, if one is to understand the rise of the revolution, 1789 is a date to remember:

Since the Revolution [...] proclaimed that all men are equal, all equally called to freedom and humanity, the popular masses throughout Europe, throughout the civilized world, gradually waking up from sleep who had kept them in chains since Christianity had put them to sleep with its poppies, are beginning to wonder if they are not entitled to equality, freedom and humanity. (Bakunin; 2009, p. 58).

What Bakunin does is take the promises it made from the revolution of 1789 and give them their true meaning. For this, he does not retain from this revolution the proclamation that men are free, but the idea that makes men beings of freedom. This formulation is in line with his philosophy which seeks freedom for men. Freedom is here terminus ad quem and not terminus ad quo. Bakunin's mention of Christianity makes the struggle for emancipation a millennial quest that has nothing to envy of the eternal opposition between freedom and authority in which it is inscribed.

Babeuf, who can be considered as a precursor of the revolution, is the incarnation of the filiation between the French Revolution and the social revolution: he represents the first as the foundation of the second. Starting from Babeuf, Bakunin undertakes, in *Federalism, socialism and antithéologism*, a history of socialism of which Proudhon is considered to be the one who emancipated socialism from the dogma of state power. It is now imperative that, in speaking of socialism, the state is no longer taken into consideration.

If there is one thing that people agree on, it is that revolution is important for liberation. Long maintained under domination, the people have grown tired of it; he no longer wants the exploitation to continue. That's why, no matter what this class becomes, the people will disagree. "Tired of being exploited and governed by others, the people no longer want an exploiting and tutelary class, whatever name they give themselves" (Bakunin, 1911, pp. 21-22). It could not be more important that the workers get rid of the exploitation of the bosses. Indeed, the solution to this domination must be revolution. Company workers must show their discontent through the strike because it appears to be a solution. Workers of all trades must come together to claim a right long violated by the bosses. "A general strike, with the ideas of liberation which reign today in the proletariat, can only end in a great cataclysm which would give a new skin to society" (Bakunin, 1911, p. 45). The workers' revolution is the way par excellence to make oneself understood in the midst of dominant capitalism. In 1789, to convince the leaders of the strength of the people, the French Revolution had broken out. It is not impossible that in 1869, in order to convince the bourgeoisie of the power of the mass, a social revolution was born.

To convince them [the bourgeois], there is only one way: it is the fact; it is the destruction of the very possibility of privileged situations, of all domination and all exploitation; It is the social revolution, which, by sweeping away all that constitutes inequality in the world, will moralize them by forcing them to seek their happiness in equality and solidarity. (Bakunin, 1911, p. 136).

If for a long time the people remained under the domination of the capitalists, it was because they did not know their rights. There is nothing more serious in the life of a man than ignorance of his basic rights. The workers are kept under bourgeois rule because of this ignorance. In the rest of his Letter to a Frenchman, Bakunin discusses the situation of French workers. For him, if "they do not have a sense of their right, nor faith in their own power; and because they have neither this feeling nor this law, they remain helpless slaves for centuries" (Bakunin, 1910, p. 27). Ignorance of their rights and lack of faith in their own power come from lack of theoretical science, that is, from lack of intelligence. It should not be understood by this that the workers are not educated. They certainly are, but the teaching they receive is not what they should normally know. In fact, they are taught to remain under domination, to remain eternal slaves of the bourgeoisie. In the process of social revolution, education is essential to ensure its success. In Bakunin's view, the people must educate themselves in order to take hold of bourgeois science which appears to be a means of domination. We understand with him that,

It is naturally to educate oneself, to seize this so powerful weapon of science, without which it could well make revolutions, but would never be able to establish, on the ruins of bourgeois privileges, this equality. , this justice and this freedom which constitute the very basis of all political and social aspirations.(Bakunin, 1911, p. 105).

This is the condition for the proletarians to lead a real revolution. Following Bakunin's logic, we learn that in order to overthrow an executioner, one must seize his weapon. This idea will also be found in the texts of Cheikh Amidou Kane. In his 1961 book *The Ambiguous Adventure*, Amidou Kane recommends that Africans through the Grand Royale steal the secret of the West. In fact, for several decades, Africans, has lived under Western rule. To assert itself, the West has used science and technology. The author of *The Ambiguous Adventure* asks the people of Diallobe who represent the African people to enroll in Western schools to learn the art of convincing without being right. In this sense, he writes:

The school I bring our children to will kill in them what we love and care about today, and rightly so. Perhaps our memory itself will die in them. When they come back to us from school, there are some who won't recognize us. What I am proposing is that we accept to die in our children and that the strangers who have defeated us take in them all the place that we will have left free. (Cheikh; 1961, p. 57)

It is not cheerfully that the Grande Royale requests the Western school. She is nevertheless convinced that only this school can allow Africa to revolutionize and be free even if the condition is to lose in the children what we would have put.

As we can see, the best way to defeat the enemy is to catch him in his own trap. In short, it is using the same weapons he used to bring us under his domination. Revolution is more than important when it comes to destroying everything that prevents people from being able to express themselves freely and live in a society where everything will be based on a level playing field. A society which combines the three most important virtues, namely equality, freedom and fraternity, is a society which through a revolution has been able to establish socialism. When the proletariat becomes threatening, the bourgeoisie is afraid, afraid of being driven out. When Bakunin wrote about Austria in the 1860s, he showed that the unrest in that country's labor movement was assuming remarkable proportions. The Austrian workers, like those of the world, seek the complete abolition of the political state which has as its vocation the defense of the bourgeoisie. It is following this abolition that the values of humanizations that we have mentioned will be possible. As long as the state continues to exist, the bourgeoisie will not be able to grant the workers the benefit of equal conditions. By demanding the abolition of the political state, the workers want:

The not only political but also economic abolition of classes; the economic and social equalization of individuals in education, in work and in the enjoyment of the products of labor, so that for all human individuals on earth, without difference of nation and sex, there is no longer that only one mode of existence, and that this new existence, is manifested by the greatest freedom of each one, founded on the closest solidarity of all. (Bakunin, 1911, p. 62)

All said, the abolition of the state will lead to a radical change in society. A bottom-up social organization will be the new social structure and individuals will be free and equal. We will now have a federalist and socialist society.

V. THE REVOLUTION: A DESTRUCTIVE SOLUTION TO HUMAN LIFE

The revolution of which Bakunin is the Apostles, even if it is against state installations, it cannot pass without leaving traces, aftereffects in the minds of men. Indeed, by wanting to protect man, Bakunin contributes rather to his destruction by waging wars. Instead of protecting man, Bakunin destroys him by resorting to violence, to revolution. All his thought can be summed up in the word revolution. Thus, in *Parliamentarism and Democracy*, Carl Schmitt, classifies Bakunin's anarchism among "irrational theories of the immediate use of violence". For Schmitt, the thought of Bakunin by valuing the use of force passes to be a thought in opposition to all rationality, on "a theory of immediate concrete life" [Schmitt; p. 83]. Politics is negative with Bakunin, because, by making use of the revolution, at no time does one privilege the dialogue which must involve the presence of the state. The revolution is highly valued in Bakunin's philosophy. For Bakunin, it is true, the revolution is a violent event and the liquidation of the established order cannot be achieved peacefully. It is very important that a peasant revolt is accompanied by big fires of property titles, armed struggles, rather than a boycott of the big landowners.

It is in this logic that it is possible to see in Bakunin a theorist of the immediate use of violence but also a practitioner. As we can see, the strike is not the method requested by the Russian thinker. To break with the chains requires the destruction of all the structures which contribute to maintain the domination.

Violence, when it is applied, only contributes to denature man, because it is not without consequences. It plunges humanity into barbarism, disorder, chaos, which ceaselessly produces piles of corpses along the streets. It is undoubtedly in this society that Bakunin asks us to live when the state is no more. Instead of being an apologist for violence like Bakunin, we opt instead for passive negotiation to find the solution to certain problems. The only end of violence is the denaturing of man. In the legal and even moral context, such a force-based practice is very ill-conceived because it aims to dehumanize man and, in turn, to dehumanize oneself. This is the reason why Georges Gusdorf affirms: "all violence, beyond the murder of the neighbor, pursues its own suicide" [Gusdorf; 1967, p.83]. This is to say that he who uses force is destroying not only others but he is destroying himself.

Dialogue is the foundation of a true inclusive social policy. It is almost impossible to live harmoniously in society by valuing war, violence, showdown. The use of speech in chaotic and critical situations will be a way to solve problems, to put an end to social frustration. As Charbonneau points out to us, "in an era of complexity, individualism and strained social relations, the time has come to speak and communicate differently in order to learn and then to resolve crises, solve problems and act effectively." [Charbonneau; 2005]. This way of seeing things will allow the establishment of a new approach to resolving social crises: it is about dialogue.

The term dialogue comes from the Greek *dia* and *logos* which respectively mean "between" and "speech, speech, reason". This is a saying shared by many people. Starting from its etymology, we note that the concept of dialogue involves reason, active listening which has the purpose of following a thought in order to extract the essential from it. In this exercise, the ultimate end of communication is not to be right about the other, but to put the propositions together in order to find what can be agreed upon. In view of this, we believe that dialogue is the royal road to try to resolve problems in society. The way of negotiation is more favorable to that of arms because its resolutions can last a long time. Allowing men to speak out when the situation is tragic is a means of appeasement, a first solution that we find. Thus, social dialogue, through its objective, aims to encourage and formulate a consensus between the main actors of society. The structures and processes of fruitful social dialogue are likely to provide solutions to resolve disagreements within the community. The state in this process must play a crucial role. He must not remain passive; he must be the major actor, for it is he who is in charge of solving the problems between men, of appeasing the hearts of men. To dialogue, we must appeal to all representatives of society, ranging from government to civil society, including men of the Church, those directly affected by the crisis, the heads of groups.

VI. CONCLUSION

The examination of the theory of revolution in Michel Bakunin has led us to pose the problem of the conception of revolution in this thinker. Thus, it was a question of analytically exposing Bakunin's ideas about the revolution. The conclusion that emerges from this analysis is that Bakunin is a revolutionary thinker. Revolutionary, he will become so in his period of contact with the Hegelians of the left. The Russian thinker shows that the revolution must be violent but, in this revolutionary violence, terror is to be avoided. In this context, we must not kill humans in the name of revolution because the aim of the revolution is the emancipation of humans and not their destruction. The Russian thinker is one of those philosophers who believe that only revolutionary action can break the chains that prevent humanity from evolving. What he forgot is that the revolution plunges families and society into desolation. Its effects cannot be erased. It is essential for man to turn his back on the revolution within the meaning of Bakunin, even if it is as he says, against the installations. The better it is to sit together, discuss calmly and find solutions to solve problems. The history of mankind will not show us the opposite because wars are destructive of mankind.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.-P. Charbonneau,, « De la démocratie sans le peuple à la démocratie avec le peuple », *Éthique publique* [En ligne], vol. 7, n° 1 | 2005, mis en ligne le 12 novembre 2015, consulté le 15 septembre 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/ethiquepublique/1969> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/ethiquepublique>.
- [2] M. BAKOUNINE, (septembre 1864), *Lettre d'un démocrate*.
 - *4ème article pour Il Popolo d'Italia*, (publié à Naples, 1865).
 - *Statuts secrets de l'alliance : Programme et objet de l'organisation révolutionnaires des frères internationaux*, automne (1868, lire en ligne).
 - *Lettre du 5 avril (1871) à Ozerov et Ogarev*.
 - *Dieu et l'État*, L'Altiplano, (1882).
 - *Œuvres*, t. IV, avec une préface, des avant-propos et des notes de James Guillaume, (Les éditions invisibles, 1910).
 - *Œuvres*, t. V, avec une préface, des avant-propos et des notes de James Guillaume, (Les éditions invisibles, 1911).
 - *Œuvres*, t. VI, avec une préface, des avant-propos et des notes de James Guillaume, (Les éditions invisibles, 1912).
 - *Œuvres*, t. I, avec une préface, des avant-propos et des notes de James Guillaume, (Les éditions invisibles, 2009).
 - *Principes et organisation de la Société Internationale Révolutionnaire*, (édition du Chat Ivre, 2013).
- [3] J.-C. ANGAUT, *Bakounine jeune hégélien. La philosophie et son dehors*, Lyon, (ENS Edition, 2007).
- [4] A. K. CHEIKH, *L'aventure ambiguë*, (Paris, Julliard, 1961).
- [5] E. KOUVELAKIS, *Philosophie et révolution. De Kant à Marx*, (Paris, PUF, 2002).

- [6] K. MARX et F. ENGELS, *L'idéologie allemande*, précédée de Karl Marx, Thèses sur Feuerbach, trad. De Gilbert Badia, (Éditions sociales, 1982).
- [7] G. Georges, *Vertu de la force*, Paris,(P.U.F, 1967).
- [8] NKRUMAH KWAME, *Le consciencisme*, (Éditions présence africaine, 1976).
- [9] S. Carl, *Parlementarisme et démocratie*, trad. J.-L. Schlegel, (Paris, Seuil1988).