

“defection” from unity occurred in the eleventh century and not, as he had argued earlier, under Photius in the ninth. Now he could put the blame for Russia’s backwardness on the Tatar yoke, a disaster made possible by the passivity of the Russian character.

Chaadaev’s later manuscripts examined by McNally show no retreat on the subject of Russia’s isolation from Europe. Peter continues as the providential hero of Russian history, and even some of Chaadaev’s initial doubts about his methods are laid to rest.

With regard to the European sources of Chaadaev’s ideas McNally is helpful and innovative. Although agreeing with Koyré that Chaadaev read the writers of the Catholic Reaction, he argues strongly for a crucial influence of Lamennais during Chaadaev’s transition from enlightened rationalism to quasi mysticism. This is documented by references to the two libraries collected by Chaadaev, the second of which was catalogued by Shakhovskoy in the 1930s.

McNally refuses to be perplexed by the seeming contradiction between Chaadaev as the dissenting hussar celebrated by Pushkin and Herzen, and Chaadaev as the supporter of the Holy Alliance. Indeed, this revised portrait confirms the impression that despite sympathies for Lamennais’s “social” Christianity and continued, if theoretical, opposition to serfdom, Chaadaev was at heart a self-styled Moscow Brahmin, chafing at any possibility of common people’s making history or contributing significantly to the spiritual physiognomy of a civilization.

MARIA BANERJEE  
*Smith College*

W KRĘGU POPRZEDNIKÓW HERCENA. By *Wiktoria Śliwowska*. Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1971. 365 pp. 70 zł.

The nineteenth-century history of East European nations cannot be properly understood without considering political emigrations. Wiktoria Śliwowska focuses attention on the group of lesser-known political émigrés who left Russia during the three decades between 1825 and 1855. This thirty-year period—the time of Nicholas I—was an era of particularly heavy oppression, which produced the first groups of political émigrés. Any reader acquainted with contemporary Russian and East European affairs can easily draw parallels between past and present. Therefore, only five hundred copies of the book have been published.

The author conducted her research mainly on the insufficiently known materials in the archives of the Russian intelligence and the French Ministry of Justice. The first chapter is a long but essential introduction, which clearly explains the historical conditions giving rise to Russian emigration. The Russian legal system treated as a traitor any person living abroad or remaining abroad longer than was permitted. The property of émigrés was sequestered, and they were often threatened with capital punishment. Beginning in 1844, permission to travel abroad could be given only to persons over twenty-five. Because the cost of a passport was equal to about one-third of a country physician’s yearly income, only members of the upper classes were able to travel.

Particularly interesting is a subchapter entitled “The Formation of the Secret Agency of the Third Section Abroad,” a subject that has never been studied before. Śliwowska’s work greatly enlarges our knowledge of Russian influence on public

opinion in the West. Aristocratic agents of the Third Section received money to pay foreign journalists for the printing of pro-Russian propaganda. Nikolai Tolstoy, first a political émigré and later the first agent of the Third Section abroad, is an excellent example of this kind of activity. An important role was also played by the salons of Russian aristocratic ladies, which, in the eighteenth-century French tradition, provided means of contact with the most influential figures of intellectual and political life.

Śliwowska's book is largely composed of biographical essays of the few outstanding men of the period. Nikolai Turgenev is presented as the "patriarch of the Russian political emigration." Ivan Golovin is depicted as a man who became an émigré in spite of himself. The author also competently corrects previous simplifications in biographical information concerning Golovin. The chapter on Nikolai Sazonov, "A Lost Chance," presents a dramatic story of a highly educated Russian émigré who died in poverty at forty-seven. Vladimir Pecherin, whom the author terms an "eternal escapist," a talented young intellectual, was the first Russian who left Russia by choice. Finally he committed the worst crime: he converted to Catholicism and joined the Redemptorist Order. The last in this early group of Russian émigrés, Prince Ivan Gagarin, had more opportunities than other members of the group. His aristocratic background and excellent education facilitated his career both in the diplomatic service and in Parisian salons. However, he also converted to Catholicism and became a Jesuit.

Of great interest is Peter Chaadaev's powerful influence on all dissident Russians of that period, particularly Gagarin. The author also describes interesting relations and cooperation between these earliest Russian emigrants and the Polish "great emigration," which appeared in the West after 1831.

Without idealizing them, Śliwowska throws light on the history of those independent minds who chose exile as a way of life and as a protest against the terror of Nicholas I. Her study reveals that their lives in exile were not always honest and faithful to the ideals for which they left Russia.

ALEKSANDER GELLA

*State University of New York at Buffalo*

M. K. LEMKE: *ISTORIK RUSSKOGO REVOLIUTSIONNOGO DVI-ZHENIIA*. By M. G. *Vandalkovskaia*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 219 pp. 1.07 rubles.

Mikhail Konstantinovich Lemke (1872–1923) played an important role in the development of the historiography of the Russian revolutionary movement and made lasting contributions to the study of such figures as Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and their associates. Although Lemke wrote voluminously on various subjects, Vandalkovskaia, as the title of her book indicates, examines only his writings dealing with the revolutionary movement of the 1860s. The author relates the making of the historian to the events of his time and, by using his writings and especially his unpublished diary, has succeeded in presenting a balanced and sympathetic picture of Lemke as a scholar and a representative of the nonrevolutionary intelligentsia. Lemke's intellectual growth and his evolution from liberalism to social democracy and Bolshevism are traced with the intention of showing his inability to remain aloof from the events of his time as well as the pronounced influence of his political beliefs on his scholarship.