

REVISITING BAKUNIN: REFLECTIONS ABOUT THE PANDEMIC

DOMINIK KULCSÁR, Institute of Philosophy, Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i., Bratislava, Slovak Republic

KULCSÁR, D.: Revisiting Bakunin: Reflecting about the Pandemic
FILOZOFIA, 78, 2023, No 9, pp. 719 – 731

Jon Stewart's revisitation of Bakunin in *Hegel's Century* offers an opportunity to reflect on contemporary libertarian expressions of individual freedom. The most alarming support of such freedom found its expression in revolts against COVID-19 public health measures. The goal of this paper is to reflect on Bakunin's concept of freedom and revolt, in order to answer the question whether this form of rebellion is a rational expression of human freedom. I proceed by explaining Bakunin's theory of freedom in community and the concept of revolt. Then I move on to the critique of authority and science. In the concluding section, I present his critique of the State and point at the economic inequalities to show how they exacerbate the effects of COVID-19 pandemic. Lastly, I answer the question if revolt against pandemic measures can find justification in Bakunin's premises.

Keywords: Bakunin – Revolt – Freedom – Pandemic – COVID-19

In revisiting Bakunin, Jon Stewart highlights the philosophical significance of this anarchist's theory of rebellion, opening the door for reflection about contemporary problems of freedom.¹ In the recent years we have observed both individuals and

¹ Another thinker whose philosophy can be of value for Covid discussion is Albert Camus. The obvious connection between his work and Covid lies in his novel *The Plague*, where the main characters rebel against the deadly bacteria of *yersinia pestis* that ravages Oran. However, it is in *L'Homme révolté* where Camus states that revolt is a natural human impulse. The rebel, in recognizing and affirming an inner part of himself or herself that is common to all, refuses to endure coercion and oppression. Recognition of this value of common humanity means that rebellion naturally has a solitary character. But in order to remain such, revolt must remain faithful to this impulse that gave birth to it. "In order to exist, man must rebel, but rebellion must respect the limits that it discovers in itself – limits where minds meet and, in meeting, begin to exist" (Camus 1991, 30). Gaston Leval noted that Camus' and Bakunin's concepts of revolt are strikingly similar. During the pandemic, a group of Polish Covid-deniers misappropriated Camus's quote to justify their refusal of pandemic measures, prompting the founder of Polish *Albert Camus Society*, Maciej Kałuża, to address an open letter to this group: <https://wyborcza.pl/7,162657,25936658,w-walce-z-zaraza-trzeba-by-uczciwym-i-nie-przekrecac-slow.html>

groups strongly advocating the libertarian form of freedom, i.e., demanding that the individual should have inviolable personal liberty to be able to express any opinion, regardless of its truth or validity, and strong rejection of authority.² These demands found alarming support during the recent COVID-19 pandemic, and we have witnessed open revolts against state-imposed health regulations.

Bakunin's theoretical and practical efforts were devoted to a revolutionary cause, but these contemporary demands evoke his writings. In the pamphlet *Revolutionary Catechism*, Bakunin calls for the "absolute rejection of every authority including that which sacrifices freedom for the convenience of the State" (Bakunin 2002, 76). Elsewhere, the following passage from a manuscript *Letters to a Frenchman on the Present Crisis* states: "there is in men an inborn irresistible urge – the source of all freedom – to rebel against any arbitrary measure, even if imposed in the name of liberty" (Bakunin 2002, 194). But while we possess this instinct for rebellion, the tenets of his philosophy see society and its social conditions as necessary for the emergence of the individual, for there can be no freedom outside of it. We are interconnected, and "none of us is an atomic individual who alone can realize themselves" (Stewart 2021, 242). Is then a revolt against pandemic regulations a legitimate expression of freedom? If so, can Bakunin's premises justify it, or do they actually suggest compliance? It is the aim of this study to answer these questions. I will start by explaining Bakunin's theory of freedom and revolt.³ Then I will explain his idea of the rejection of authority by presenting his criticism of science. Finally I will examine his critique of the State to show how economic inequalities worsen the consequences of the pandemic to answer the question whether the revolt against public health measures can find justification in his philosophy.⁴

I. Community, Freedom, and Rebellion

Human nature consists of three parts – *animality, thought, rebellion*. This instinct for revolt is the driving force in the quest to attain freedom. Thanks to the dialectical movement which combined reason and rebellion, humans have suppressed their animality, developed their humanity, and mastered nature. Our human history began "by an act of disobedience and science – that is, by rebellion and by thought" (Bakunin 1970, 12). Originally we were "ferocious beasts," who gradually, by the slow suppression of animality, attained an awareness of their humanity and freedom. Through this dialectic

² Libertarianism is not identical with anarchism, but they converge in the rejection of political power, which threatens individual freedom.

³ I will use the terms *freedom* and *liberty* interchangeably. The same goes for *rebellion* and *revolt*.

⁴ For the purposes of this article, I will focus primarily on Bakunin and his writings.

we have developed alongside an animal existence a second existence, which is “a human existence” (McLaughlin 2002, 125 – 126).⁵ Reason and abstraction set us apart from nature and signal the “beginning of science and what we might regard as human culture generally” (Stewart 2021, 234). At the end of this dialectic lies the ultimate goal of history, and that is the “conquest and realization of human liberty” (Bakunin 1970, 21), meaning the full development and enjoyment of one’s faculties, as is implicit in the social nature of man, making Bakunin’s conception of liberty a positive one. It means emancipation through “collective labour, rational upbringing and education, and the reciprocal awareness and recognition of one’s humanity and rights in the consciousness of equally free human beings” (Graham 2013, 176).

Without society, I would be alienated from other people, who in recognizing my humanity create the conditions for it. “The freedom of others, far from limiting or negating my liberty, is on the contrary its necessary condition and confirmation” (Bakunin 2002, 237). Being forced to remain in isolation, being prohibited from traveling, or from visiting one’s family or friends are violations of human rights, such as freedom of movement or association. “Every enslavement of men is at the same time a limit on my own freedom” (Bakunin 1970, 9). I cannot be free if we are all subjects to coercive restrictions. As Stewart demonstrates, Bakunin appropriates Hegel’s theory of alienation and recognition, and he also reinforces the negative dialectic, claiming that destruction is an inherently creative passion. This passion finds expression in the tearing down of any authorities that threaten human freedom. Zweerde complements Stewart by writing,

[I]t was Bakunin who turned Hegel’s retrospective justification of violence as the birthplace of a new order, freer than the previous one, into a prospective legitimization of the violent destruction of existing institutions like state and church, thus performing a switch from theory, as a call for understanding, to praxis as a call for change, under simultaneous neglect of *poièsis* (Zweerde 2022, 26).

There are two types of authority: natural and human. Natural laws represent natural authority, submission to which is nothing demeaning – it makes us who we are. For example, gravity ensures that the blood in our body maintains the optimal levels of blood pressure. “Man’s relations to this universal Nature cannot be external, cannot be those of slavery or of struggle; he carries this Nature within himself and is nothing outside of it” (Bakunin 1964, 91). Recognizing our dependence on natural conditions,

⁵ With this evolutionary approach “Bakunin denied any dualism between spirit and matter” (Morris 1993, 79).

Bakunin rejects the metaphysical notion of *free will*. We use our reason to modify our natural needs and ignore those that can be detrimental, and as such it can be said we possess “free will.” “Of course, his will is only relatively free; man cannot arbitrarily determine nature or the totality of interactive and developmental causality” (McLaughlin 2002, 128). Bakunin was aware of different contributing factors like genetic predisposition or attributes, and so he placed “an important emphasis on the individual as a creative agent, both determining as well as being determined by natural and social conditions” (Morris 1993, 81). By voluntarily submitting to natural authority, we are protected from it being imposed on us externally by others. That is the only rational meaning of liberty, “that is, the rule over external things, based upon the respectful observation of the laws of Nature. It is independence from the pretensions and despotic acts of men” (Bakunin 1964, 96). Any authority invested with coercive power which tries to impose upon me its will, to deceive or to manipulate me, is for Bakunin evil and to be rebelled against. The Church and its ruler, God, see in humanity merely a race of slaves. The State in its centralized form, after the absorption of medieval cities and communes is contrary to the natural tendencies of humanity. Both are enemies of humanity, both protect, enrich, and support the ruling minority. Even if someone tries to make me perform a certain act, he undermines my liberty, regardless of the fact that such an act on my part would be beneficial to me:

for every command slaps liberty in the face; because when the good is decreed, it becomes evil from the standpoint of human morality and liberty. Freedom, morality, and the human dignity of the individual consist precisely in this; that he does good not because he is forced to do so, but because he freely conceives it, wants it, and loves it (Bakunin 2002, 240).⁶

My freedom consists in the ability to make a decision, and it is I who chooses to do it, and no one else. Human authority is something foreign to the individual, as it uses power to oppress and coerce. Believing that everyone who occupies a place of power will be corrupted by it, Bakunin vehemently denied any fixed authority. The only authority he does recognize is the authority of one’s own reason, and in order for the community not to be enslaved, only a voluntary exchange of authority is permitted. No single “fixed and constant authority, but a continual fluctuation of mutual, temporary, and above all voluntary authority and subordination” (Bakunin 2002, 229 – 230).

There are two kinds of revolt. The first is directed against God. The second revolt is against the tyranny of men, and Bakunin makes a critical distinction here. Either it

⁶ If I am pressured to a certain act whose result increases my freedom, such outcome in retrospect redeems that.

is waged against the State and official authorities, or it is waged against social tyranny. The individual is born into an already existing society, which is formed by the customs, traditions, prejudices and habits that make up the public opinion. Social conditions, like natural laws, shape the individual by constantly exerting their influence over them. As a result, we are the society's products, its subjects, in the same way we are subject to the natural laws. Public opinion "permeates every facet of life, so that each individual is, often unknowingly, in a sort of conspiracy against himself" (Bakunin 2002, 239). As we mature, we challenge these ideas, prejudices and conceptions that are inculcated in us from birth, and by successfully revolting against them, we forge our identity, autonomy, and attain our freedom. Rebellion "is absolutely necessary for the full realization of our highest faculties and indeed our very humanity" (Stewart 2021, 257). Social conditions play an even larger role during the pandemic. If an individual lives in poverty, lacks access to education, does not trust the official authorities or is skeptical of science and medicine, they are more prone to ignoring the dangers of Covid.

We must rebel against all external authorities, divine or human, and revolt even against ourselves, in order to establish our autonomy and humanity. Any command, any coercion not dictated by my own reason is a violation of my liberty, which according to Bakunin is *indivisible* and "extends to infinity" (Bakunin 2002, 238). The pandemic measures limit the freedom of *all*. Is revolt against them a rational expression of freedom?

II. Critique of Authority

Bakunin and Stewart emphasize the importance of our interconnectedness. As Butler notes in her essay *What World is This? A Pandemic Phenomenology*, this very link carries the potential for its destruction. "We lose sight of that overlapping and reciprocity when, for instance, we forget that being infected and becoming infectious are linked together" (Butler 2022, 12). If my freedom is the necessary condition of your freedom and vice versa, then *my health* is the necessary condition for *your health* and vice versa.

What if someone maintains that it is their right and freedom to get infected? A libertarian may choose to ignore all warnings and take a chance with the infection. Bakunin encourages learning about natural laws so that one can take the necessary steps to defend "against their unwelcome and harmful consequences" (Bakunin 1964, 90). Learning about the effects of the virus and taking necessary precautions is a rational expression of our freedom, for this freedom must be wrested from nature. But Covid is not a purely natural force, it needs carriers to replicate itself, and the only thing that can stop it are the actions of the individual as well as of the collective. The carrier may not

be aware of the infection, making caution paramount. Most transmissions “involved unintentional transmission from those who were asymptomatic but knew of the risks of exposing others and put themselves in close proximity with others anyway” (Davis 2022, 1). Or they may be infected and choose to spread the virus to someone else.

Masks, vaccines, quarantines, lockdowns, social distancing, or a simple handwashing are designed to halt or at least slow down the spread of a deadly airborne virus. The authors of an erudite study *Human Behavior in Pandemics* write that compliance with interventions depends on how much people trust the decision makers. During COVID-19, due to conflicting statements on the part of decision makers, this trust often gave way to doubt. Public directives involving complex “legal rules and regulations, which change over time and are communicated in a nebulous and/or equivocal fashion, may be poorly or improperly understood and, as a result, virtually ignored (Kossowska et al. 2022, 25). People lacking education or access to verified sources are forced to rely on the opinions of public figures, and these may not know whom to trust and how to determine what is true. Another danger lies in polarization. Instead of solidarity, a society that is divided by political opposition is “reluctant to engage in cooperative efforts, and lacks an understanding of the idea of the common good since it appears not to exist” (Kossowska et al. 2022, 59). Abundance of information and lack of unity characterize the recent pandemic, where nationalist leaders fueled distrust towards the World Health Organization and science in general, downplayed the dangers of Covid, and urged people to resist and to think for themselves. As the pandemic progressed, the situation deteriorated. A study on the relation between pandemics and rebellions by United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research states:

protests across the world increased by almost 30 per cent between January 2020 and January 2021. Media accounts describe how restrictive measures on population mobility have fueled public demonstrations and sometimes violent protests in several countries since the start of the pandemic (Iacoella et al. 2021, 3).

Far-right political parties, public figures (like Donald J. Trump or Jair Bolsonaro), extremist movements, and conspiracy theorists spreading false information all fueled dissent and favored an isolationist approach. It appears that all these factors pushed some groups to embrace more extreme political positions, “particularly among those who perceive preventive measures, such as wearing face masks or staying at home, as unjustified interventions that threaten human rights and individual freedoms (Iacoella et al. 2021, 6). Severe measures such as lockdowns are drastic curtailments of individual freedom, and if they are merely proposed, they may be rejected or ignored. Letting people

freely decide would be in line with Bakunin, but during a pandemic, coercion may often be necessary.

That said, the need for controversial regulations may arise at various stages of a pandemic and the concomitant crisis, so it is critical that decision makers' actions do not cause a loss of legitimacy as a result of their implementation (Kossowska et al. 2022, 66).

In *Revolutionary Catechism* Bakunin writes: "Freedom can and must be defended only by freedom: to advocate the restriction of freedom on the pretext that it is being defended is a dangerous delusion" (Bakunin 2002, 79 – 80). This means that enforcement of compliance ought to be rejected, leading us to Bakunin's critique of science.

Science itself is not detrimental to freedom, and he did not reject the authority of experts; he rejected enforcement of their authority. "I listen to them freely and with the respect merited by their intelligence, their character, their knowledge, reserving always my incontestable right of criticism and censure" (Bakunin 1970, 32). The expertise of specialists, combined with critical thinking and skepticism on our part allow us to make informed choices. We need a multitude of opinions to decide which one is the best. This is not always easy since we are the products of our environment, and it is often difficult to distinguish between what we want to do and what we are told is the best. Those who do not trust their government or doctors are naturally going to be skeptical, and forcing them *to be free* can backfire. A system where a minority of specialists rule "would quickly become repressive since they would justify any action at all with their alleged superior specialized knowledge." (Stewart 2021, 247). Responding to libertarian arguments, McLendon argues that if people have recourse to Bakunin's philosophy and ask legitimate questions about vaccination, and the scientific community does not offer suitable answers, "then his philosophy suggests they should absolutely refuse a vaccine" (McLendon 2021). The same goes for using masks. "If the scientific community cannot effectively communicate why masks are still needed, then people should not be expected to wear them" (McLendon 2021). Outright denial of evidence just as blind faith in a single person is irrational.

Such a faith would be fatal to my reason, to my liberty, even to the success of my undertakings; it would immediately transform me into a stupid slave, the tool of other people's will and interests (Bakunin 2002, 229).

Covid-deniers often simply dismissed the government views without rationally looking at the evidence, going against the criteria posed by Bakunin. It is vital to seek verified and fact-checked scientific data and information, to listen to experts in good

faith and to be willing to change our minds. We need to apply the same critical approach to those who spread lies or polarize society.

One should protect the community, regardless of what the public officials say. But even our combined efforts do not ensure success. “This is due to the specific nature of pandemics, where even relatively few people violating pandemic-related rules may lead to the spread of the disease” (Kossowska et al. 2020, 78). Those who spread outright lies on social media or who voluntarily expose themselves to Covid can cause someone else’s death (or their own). This contradicts the very tenet of his theory. “I am a free man only so far as I recognize the humanity and liberty of all men around me. In respecting their humanity, I respect my own” (Bakunin 1970, 9). Compliance with regulations means that one recognizes their protective role, and Butler is critical of variants of liberty that are practiced at the expense of others. “When personal liberty permits the destruction of others and the earth, then personal liberty claims destruction as its prerogative” (Butler 2022, 3). Surprisingly the refusal of masks, rejection of vaccines or lockdown violations, while in conflict with the good of community, appears to be justified in *Revolutionary Catechism*. Here Bakunin demands:

Absolute freedom to organize associations even for allegedly immoral purposes including even those associations which advocate the undermining (or destruction) of individual and public freedom (Bakunin 2002, 79).

This includes absolute freedom of speech and press. While Bakunin strongly disapproves of an individual’s conduct that threatens the well-being and liberty of other people, he nevertheless maintains the position that they have a right to do so, for it is an expression of their liberty.

It is impossible for me to respect his villainy, his stupidity, his utility; they are repugnant to me and arouse my indignation. ... But even in the midst of the most violent and bitter, even mortal, combat between us, I must respect his human character. (Bakunin 2002, 146).

It is the social and material conditions that push people to deplorable acts, and Bakunin’s position is one of compassion for the humanity of the acting party. Extreme negative freedom is rejected as incoherent and impossible, for by the nature of living in a society, the agent is never a solipsistic and unrestrained individual.

III. The Pandemic Revolt

Coercion, the metaphysical essence of the State, is the antithesis of the social instinct of humanity, and provokes revolt. Attacking Rousseau, Bakunin writes that God was

replaced by the *general will*, and people must be forced *to be free*. The general will is “the collective well-being and the rights of all as opposed to the disintegrating action of the egoistic interests and passions of the individual” (Bakunin 1967, 206). It is the sacrifice of the particular (the individual) to the universal (the collective). By this very nature, the State suppresses two basic needs of the people: “material wellbeing and liberty” (Morris 102). This social dimension separates Bakunin, for example, from Stirner’s anarchism. The question arises – how to reconcile his position with emergency situations that require quick action? The State and the anarchist may find a common enemy in the virus, prompting cooperation. Yet Bakunin, and Kropotkin after him, argued that humans naturally practice mutual aid, making the State not only redundant, but also detrimental to our inherent social tendencies. Its danger is more apparent in the fact that the state of emergency can be prolonged indefinitely, and remain in effect after the pandemic ends.

As a materialist, Bakunin bases his attack against the State on rejection of idealism. Idealists start from the universal and then proceed down to the particular. The experts decide on what is best, and then issue regulations. The State represents only the interests of the ruling minority, a position that caused a rift between Bakunin and Marx. The masses are ignorant, and “it would be ill advised to allow them to organize political affairs” (Stewart 2021, 247). If freedom is significantly restricted “and if the legitimacy of the state and its institutions is at a low level, this may increase the necessity of the use of coercive measures (Kossowska et al. 2022, 65 – 66). The State then naturally resorts to coercion, and Bakunin calls for its unconditional annihilation. “Somewhere within it resides the power and the possibility of coercion; at some time or other it might or must be employed” (Reznek 1927, 275). During the pandemic, this was exemplified as the economy was treated as a living entity in need of protecting.

If one reads our big media, the impression one gets is that what we should really worry about are not the thousands who have already died and the many more who will, but the fact that “markets are panicking” – the coronavirus is ever more disturbing the smooth functioning of the world market (Žižek 2020, 44).

In the period of 2020 – 2021 many countries reopened their economies, knowing that people will be at an increased risk of infection and death. The policy makers understood “that those who would be disproportionately exposed to illness and death were precisely those who were not only without adequate health care but also had no choice but to work (Butler 2023, 50). Systemic racism exposed some groups to greater risk of infection than others, and not everyone can afford to stay at home. “The people who can’t must make terrible choices: Stay home and risk starvation or go to work and risk contagion” (Blow 2020, 39). Many lack access to health care, and a lockdown and

quarantine cut people off from income; moreover, rich countries hoarded vaccines, leaving the poor ones defenseless. Those struggling with poverty may not have the option of practicing social distancing. Despairing, they can take drastic actions, as it “at least presupposes a more or less clear awareness that better conditions are possible” (Bakunin 2005, 31 – 32), and individuals may seek infection in order to, for example, obtain an immunity passport, which grants exceptions during a state of emergency:

It is perfectly rational for them to seek infection, despite the health risks associated with infection, and obtain an immunity passport. Those worse-off persons often belong to disadvantaged groups that reflect gender, race, and ethnic inequalities. Thus, immunity passports might intensify the existing socioeconomic inequalities (Hirose 2022, 93).

It seemed that the protests were initially driven by anger at governmental regulations that curtailed individual as well as collective liberties, but later results suggest that they were driven primarily by persistent inequalities, structural divisions and discrimination.

Although media accounts associate these protests to politically motivated positions against the use of masks and limits to private liberties, the evidence provided in the paper suggests that these protests were motivated by the drastic economic effects of such policies on living standards (Iacoella et al. 2021, 18).

Bakunin struggles with reconciling “individual liberty with social obligation of obedience” (Reznick 1927, 286), for the individual is in a state of perpetual revolt. The strain between freedom *from*, dependence *on*, and responsibility *for* a community, leads to a conclusion, based on his writings, that any measures, if enforced, ought to be rejected, for freedom is *indivisible*. “This little part you are curtailing is the very essence of my liberty; it is all of it” (Bakunin 2002, 129). But as Love writes, Bakunin’s radical vision of freedom in an anarchist society consists of “the harshest critique of self-interest, not in the promotion of individual liberty at the expense of all others” (Love 2021, 153). Recognizing that your health is the condition for mine then leads to the realization that authentic revolt against Covid lies in the suppression of self-interest and in the recognition of a higher unity. This higher unity is the safety of my community since that is the only place where I can be free. Rational pandemic revolt does not mean freedom *from* external restrictions; it is the freedom *to* act autonomously based on one’s rationality, in recognizing the protective function of said regulations. In protecting my health, I protect yours, and vice versa. Ignoring the responsibility we have towards each other can only lead to alienation and destruction of our liberties.

The difference between “saving” and “protecting” carries weight. In *Pandemic Ethics: From COVID-19 to Disease X*, Kamm suggests that labeling compliance as “saving lives” may cause the libertarian to object, because “a libertarian objecting to being interfered with merely to aid others is objecting to being interfered with merely to make others overall better off relative to their baseline (Kamm 2023, 124). The need for different messaging is also suggested by Davis. Protection is “a way for me to avoid potentially causing another’s death – that is, to avoid killing someone” (Davis 2022, 473). To demand liberty without limits when the hospitals are full undermines the freedom of everyone. The disadvantaged groups, such as the immune-compromised or the elderly are at an increased risk of infection from those who express their liberty by risking infection. Ignoring the safety of community, while an expression of freedom, is a position of entitlement, and “the right to get sick and to make others sick, the right to spread death if that is one’s wish, if spreading death is the expression of personal liberty” (Butler 2022, 108). If people would spread the virus freely, while at liberty to do so, it would lead to an “inevitable negation and annihilation of all liberty, and of all individual and collective interests” (Bakunin 1964, 207). Kamm’s critique of Covid libertarianism is resolute.⁷

Each person’s moral right to noninterference gives rise to correlative moral duty on the part of each not to interfere with others. If one fails to carry out the duty (e.g. by spreading the disease when doing so is easily preventable), it can be a morally permissible for others to interfere in self- or other-defense when interference is necessary and proportionate (e.g. imposing use of a mask if only that prevents transmission) (Kamm 2023, 124).

Is revolt against pandemic regulations a legitimate expression of freedom, if it has a recourse to Bakunin’s philosophy? If one recognizes that Covid endangers not just me but my community, and if the medical professionals, scientists, and even politicians, explain the situation, its dangers, risks, and advantages of collective struggle, and do not coerce me or curtail my liberty, then one would voluntarily take active protective measures on one’s own. Coercion ought to be rejected, and if the person seeks answers for their questions and legitimate concerns, and the authorities and specialists do not provide them, or restrict individual liberty without explanation, then a voluntary refusal is justified.

Conclusion

Bakunin’s premises encourage resistance against coercive measures, and also encourage protection against Covid. The existing economic inequalities provide a fertile ground for

⁷ The measures may be ethically justified using Mill’s harm principle, which permits a limit of one’s freedom if it prevents the harm of others.

the spread not just of Covid, but of any other future disease of the same or greater magnitude. A rational way of fighting Covid means recognizing it as an external force that imperils the freedoms of everyone and prevents the full realization of our humanity. At the same time, it is vital to remain vigilant, as the states may use emergency situations like pandemics to increase their own power, and with far-right leaders in power, they threaten to dismantle the very fabric of democracy. COVID-19 was but a prelude to future crises, whether they be pandemics, the war against Ukraine, or the looming climate catastrophe. As individuals and society, we need to consider the cost of personal freedom as the interests of a minority threaten the well-being and survival of the majority. Imagine Bakunin, leading a crowd of protesters, battling state coercion and structural inequalities, while simultaneously wearing a mask and maintaining social distancing.

Bibliography

- BAKUNIN, M. (1964): Freedom and Equality. In: Maximoff, G. P. (ed.): *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 263 – 271.
- BAKUNIN, M. (1964): Man as Conqueror of Nature. In: Maximoff, G. P. (ed.): *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 88 – 92.
- BAKUNIN, M. (1964): Mind and Will. In: Maximoff, G. P. (ed.): *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 92 – 97.
- BAKUNIN, M. (1964): The State: General Outlook. In: Maximoff, G. P. (ed.): *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 206 – 209.
- BAKUNIN, M. (1970): *God and the State*. New York: Dover Publications.
- BAKUNIN, M. (2002): Authority and Science. In: Dolgoff, S. (ed.): *Bakunin on Anarchism*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 226 – 233.
- BAKUNIN, M. (2002): General Problems of the Social Revolution. In: Dolgoff, S. (ed.): *Bakunin on Anarchism*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 184 – 208.
- BAKUNIN, M. (2002): Man, Society and Freedom. In: Dolgoff, S. (ed.): *Bakunin on Anarchism*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 234 – 242.
- BAKUNIN, M. (2002): Revolutionary Catechism. In: Dolgoff, S. (ed.): *Bakunin on Anarchism*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 76 – 97.
- BAKUNIN, M. (2002): Rousseau's Theory of the State. In: Dolgoff, S. (ed.): *Bakunin on Anarchism*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 128 – 147.
- BAKUNIN, M. (2005): *Statism and Anarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BLOW, CH. M. (2020): Social Distancing Is a Privilege. The Idea That This Virus Is an Equal-Opportunity Killer Must Itself Be Killed. In: Schwartz, M. C. (ed.): *The Ethics of Pandemics*. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 38 – 40.
- BUTLER, J. (2022): *What World is This? A Pandemic Phenomenology*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- CAMUS, A. (1991) *The Rebel: An Essay on the Man in Revolt*. New York: Vintage Publishing.
- DAVIS, J. (2022): The Ethics of Killing in a Pandemic: Unintentional Virus Transmission, Reciprocal Risk Imposition, and Standards of Blame. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 39 (3), 471 – 486. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/japp.12574>
- GRAHAM, R. (2013): The Role of Contract in Anarchist Ideology. In: Goodway, D. (ed.): *For Anarchism: History, Theory, and Practice. Volume 2*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 164 – 190.
- HIROSE, I. (2023): *The Ethics of Pandemics. An Introduction*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.

- IACOELLA, F., JUSTINO, P., MARTORANO, B. (2021): Do Pandemics Lead to Rebellion? Policy Responses to COVID-19, Inequality, and Protests in the USA. *United Nations University UNU WIDER, WIDER Working Paper 2021 (57)*, 1 – 42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35188/UNU-WIDER/2021/995-2>
- KAMM, F. M. (2023): Handling Future Pandemics: Harming, Not Aiding, and Liberty. In: Wilkinson D. – Savulescu J. (eds.): *Pandemic Ethics: From COVID-19 to Disease X*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 119 – 138. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192871688-003.0007>
- KOSSOWSKA, M., LETKI, N., ZALESKIEWICZ, T., WICHARY, S. (2022): Group Perspective. In: Kossowska, M. – Letki, N. – Zaleskiewicz, T. – Wichary, S. (eds.): *Human Behaviour in Pandemics: Social and Psychological Determinants in a Global Health Crisis*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 49 – 64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003254133-4>
- KOSSOWSKA, M., LETKI, N., ZALESKIEWICZ, T., WICHARY, S. (2022): Individual Perspective. In: Kossowska, M. – Letki, N. – Zaleskiewicz, T. – Wichary, S. (eds.): *Human Behaviour in Pandemics: Social and Psychological Determinants in a Global Health Crisis*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 7 – 48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003254133-3>
- KOSSOWSKA, M., LETKI, N., ZALESKIEWICZ, T., WICHARY, S. (2022): Societal Level. In: Kossowska, M. – Letki, N. – Zaleskiewicz, T. – Wichary, S. (eds.): *Human Behaviour in Pandemics: Social and Psychological Determinants in a Global Health Crisis*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 65 – 84. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003254133-5>
- LOVE, J. (2021): Hegel's Philosophy of Freedom in Nineteenth-Century Russia. In: Bykova, M. F. – Forster, M. N. – Steiner, L. (eds.): *The Palgrave Handbook of Russian Thought*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 139 – 158. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62982-3_7
- MCLAUGHLIN, P. (2002): *Mikhail Bakunin: The Philosophical Basis of His Anarchism*. New York: Algora Publishing.
- MCLENDON, M. L. (2021): Why a 19th-century Russian Anarchist is Relevant to the Mask and Vaccine Debate. [Online]. *The Conversation*. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/why-a-19th-century-russian-anarchist-is-relevant-to-the-mask-and-vaccine-debate-163618> (Date of visit: 19.6.2023)
- MORRIS, B. (1993): *Bakunin: The Philosophy of Freedom*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- REZNECK, S. (1927): The Political and Social Theory of Michael Bakunin. *The American Political Science Review*, 21 (2), 270 – 296. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1945179>
- STEWART, J. (2021): *Hegel's Century: Alienation and Recognition in a Time of Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ZWEERDE, E. V. D. (2022): *Russian Political Philosophy: Anarchy, Authority, Autocracy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- ŽIŽEK, S. (2020): *Pandemic! COVID-19 Shakes the World*. New York, London: OR Books.

This work was produced at the Institute of Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, within the project VEGA: 2/0130/23.

Dominik Kulcsár
 Institute of Philosophy
 Slovak Academy of Sciences, v. v. i.
 Klemensova 19
 813 64 Bratislava
 Slovak Republic
 e-mail: dominik.kulcsar@savba.sk
 ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1355-6696>