

The tsar's wearisome notes—endlessly repetitive—show him devoid of wit, imagination, and perhaps even true feeling. The basis of the relationship emerges clearly enough. Alexander was what is usually described as a “sensualist.” “Oh dear friend,” Katia writes (of course in translation) to her beloved, “I wish it were already tomorrow evening, to be able to throw myself into your arms and forget the whole world. I want to do bingerle [an expression hitherto unknown to your reviewer] with you, it is so sweet and cosy to stretch out next to my angel and to torment him” (p. 122). Alexander writes, “I see that the lack of our bingerles is already beginning to have its usual effect on you, and that those insupportable discharges of yours, which had nearly disappeared last winter, have started again and I am very distressed about it” (p. 136). The historical value of all this is, of course, negligible. References to political events are rare, though it is nice to come across the odd reference to “that swine of a Beakensfield [*sic*] who decides everything according to what he has in his noddle” (p. 185). The psychological interest of the affair is reduced to near zero by the triviality of the protagonists. As to the taste of the entire publication . . .

George (Gogo), the only male offspring of the liaison, eventually enlisted in the Imperial Russian Navy. After he had failed an important examination, the Naval Staff issued instructions to the commanding admiral “to examine him until he passes” (p. 283). In 1893 his squadron visited the United States in connection with celebrations of the fourth centenary of the discovery of America. In Tarsaidzé's words, “At the same time, the world's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, celebrating with a year's delay Columbus's discovery of America, welcomed warships of other nations, culminating in a brilliant international naval review of the Hudson” (p. 281). And with this review it seems best to draw a veil over the whole sorry affair.

W. E. MOSSE
University of East Anglia

“VPERED!” 1873–1877: MATERIALY IZ ARKHIVA VALERIANA NIKO-LAEVICHIA SMIRNOVA. 2 vols. Edited by *Boris Sapir*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1970. Vol. 1: “Ocherk istorii ‘Vpered,’” pp. 1–212. “On the History of ‘Vpered,’” translated by Brian Pearce, pp. 213–395. 403 pp. Vol. 2: “Dokumenty.” 556 pp. 215 Dfl.

In these two volumes the specialist in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement will find material that vividly portrays the difficulties of émigré revolutionary journalism in the 1870s. The clashes and splits illuminated by the documents and Boris Sapir's brief history of the journal *Vpered!* were mainly over revolutionary strategy. The first volume contains Sapir's history in both Russian and English. It is a good piece of scholarship, based mainly on the excellent materials in the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, and taking into account recent Soviet scholarship dealing with the origins of *Vpered!* Given the author's evident mastery of the sources, the following observations have to do with their interpretation rather than the thoroughness of the scholarship.

Sapir's account of Lavrov's position between 1870 and 1872 is an oversimplification. There is much evidence in Lavrov's correspondence that he might have chosen something other than a revolutionary career if it had not been for several overwhelming historical and personal events. Thus the nature of Lavrov's commitment to the revolutionary movement might have been more carefully examined for the period 1870–72.

Turgenev did indeed have insight when he described Lavrov as a dove trying to pass himself off as a hawk. Nonetheless, it is wrong to assume that Lavrov was expressing his own views about strategy when he wrote the first program of *Vpered!* in 1872. Curious as it may seem, he was really trying to serve a group who believed in legalistic strategies, although at a critical, theoretical level he believed in the historical necessity of violent revolution. One can verify this in his correspondence about the Paris Commune in 1871. Lavrov's account of the prehistory of *Vpered!* is therefore accurate. His flexibility about strategy is well known, and the documents in the second volume shed further light on that trait.

The most questionable section of Sapir's history (and also the most original part of it) deals with the relations between Lavrov, V. N. Smirnov, the remainder of the London commune which published *Vpered!*, the St. Petersburg circle of Lavrovists who supported the journal financially and distributed it, and the former Chaikovskiists who were trying to forge a revolutionary union in 1875–76. Suffice it to say here that the clash between Lavrov and Smirnov, Lavrov's attempt to reorganize *Vpered!*, and the split within the commune were for the most part related to large strategic issues in the revolutionary movement, and this was equally true of the split between Lavrov and the *Peterburgtsy*. Lavrov broke with Smirnov over relations to the "Union" and over relations with St. Petersburg. He was trying to reorient the journal and to attach both himself and the journal to a more vital movement, even if it meant less personal control for him. Smirnov had to fight both the Chaikovskiists and Lavrov, and believed that he was doing it in both the journal's and Lavrov's best interests. Even though the "Union" made unreasonable demands which Lavrov could not accept, and failed to develop directly into a unified organization, its appearance presented him with an alternative to the St. Petersburg circle, which he came to despise. Sapir also plays down the extremely bad feelings that developed between Lavrov and Smirnov and the factions within the commune. At one point Smirnov feared physical violence. Smirnov's letters depict something other than a serene socialist monastery, even before the final disintegration of the commune.

To sum up, Sapir's summaries and conclusions are generally excellent, but the documents upon which the first volume is based support a different version of alliances, orientations, and intentions at given moments in the history of the *Vpered!* commune.

The second volume (of documents in Russian) is very useful not only for a minutely detailed history of the journal but for a study of the changing tenor of the revolutionary movement during the 1870s. Though it could never be for the Russian intelligentsia of the 1870s what *Kolokol* had been for the intelligentsia of the late 1850s and early 1860s, *Vpered!* was the closest thing to a communications center that the revolutionary intelligentsia possessed. Revolutionaries representing every tendency had some association with the journal, as contributors or critics. The materials dealing with the period 1875–76, when the revolutionaries were trying to organize their scattered forces, are of special interest. Some of the documents shed light on the prehistory of the second *Zemlia i Volia*. Only a small portion of the documents have ever appeared in print before. Taken together, the two volumes are an important contribution to the history of the Russian revolutionary movement during the 1870s.

PHILIP POMPER
Wesleyan University