

BUREAU SOCIALISTE INTERNATIONAL: COMPTES RENDUS DES RÉUNIONS MANIFESTES ET CIRCULAIRES, vol. 1: 1900–1907. Edited by *Georges Haupt*. École Pratique des Hautes Études, Matériaux pour l'histoire du socialisme international, I^{re} série, Textes et documents, 2. Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1969. 438 pp. 75 F or 54 Dutch guilders, paper.

The fact that eleven years elapsed before the Second International, founded in 1889, created the Bureau Socialiste International (BSI), and the fact that the BSI's role was limited to that of clearing house for information, testified to the influence of Michael Bakunin. Bakunin had been convinced a generation earlier that Karl Marx and the General Council exercised dictatorial control over the First International. This told more about Bakunin's own nature and aspirations than about Marx's real powers, but nevertheless the accusation was widely believed. The canard of the First International as a "general staff without an army" passed, sadly enough, even into respected historical literature.

The Second International, determined not to give the anarchists this issue, renounced any thought of creating a strong central authority; and the International itself became a kind of (to paraphrase a famous line) anarchy tempered by sentimentality. Unlike its predecessor, it wedded the working classes to the bourgeois nation-state; no, it welded them there.

Thus the BSI could only be, as one Russian commentator said of the International as a whole, "nothing but a mailbox." This does not mean that it performed no useful function; mailboxes have their role. The BSI provided a channel for propaganda and pressure on the tsarist regime in Russia. Lenin, Plekhanov, and other revolutionary émigrés valued its participation in the international condemnation which sapped tsarism's confidence in itself and kept it ever on the defensive. Needless to add, ruling circles in London, Paris, Vienna, and Berlin also delighted in this socialist sport.

This volume deals with much more than merely Russia: lynchings in the American South, British concentration camps in South Africa, and the Moroccan Crisis caught the attention of the socialists around the world. But Russia, bulwark of reaction, occupies center stage: two dozen of the seventy-one documents published (carrying the story down to the 1907 Stuttgart Congress) deal directly with Russia and several more with Eastern Europe. The scholarly presentation of this volume by Georges Haupt, who plans three more, merits warm applause and encouragement. The fears Haupt expresses in his preface that some will continue to regard the publication of documents as an evasion of scholarship are groundless; he has performed an extremely valuable service at a very high level of scholarship.

WOODFORD D. MCCLELLAN
University of Virginia

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION: BEFORE AND AFTER. By *E. H. Carr*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969. vi, 178 pp. \$4.95.

IRONIES OF HISTORY: ESSAYS ON CONTEMPORARY COMMUNISM. By *Isaac Deutscher*. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1966. iii, 278 pp. \$5.75.

Both of these books consist of lectures, essays, and reviews written over the past two decades and, for the most part, previously published. Since Mr. Carr and

Mr. Deutscher already have well-established reputations as historians of twentieth-century Russia and as speculators about whatever larger meaning there may be in history, the present volumes do not provide any strikingly new observations. They do provide the reader with anthologies which attest to the continuing preoccupation both men have shared in assessing the significance of the Russian Revolution.

The ten essays comprising *The October Revolution* range widely in time period and subject matter. None focus specifically on the events of October 1917 in Russia, but each is concerned with elaborating the context within which these and subsequent events occurred; as such they touch on the wider significance of the Bolshevik Revolution, which was, in Carr's words, "in part cause, in part result, and in part symptom or symbol" of the changes associated with this century. If ten separate essays can be said to share a common thesis, it is to be found in this emphasis on the Russian Revolution as a product of the distinctive features of the twentieth century. This notion is advanced most clearly in the lead essay—the book's longest and most recently written—in which Carr draws a definite line between the whole nineteenth-century revolutionary tradition, including Marx, and the October Revolution. The Revolution was a new departure not so much because of Russia's special conditions, but because it occurred in a "post-Marxian" world, which for Carr is primarily distinguished by the development of large-scale economic enterprise—with attendant possibilities of planning and conscious control—and the emergence of political elites intent upon using power to reshape society according to conscious purposes. In this connection, Carr argues that Lenin's main significance lay in his creation of such a conscious political elite.

The remaining essays include biographical sketches of Trotsky as "a classical Marxist adrift in a world in which classical Marxism was no longer enough," and Rosa Luxemburg, whose "fundamental humanitarianism" deprived her of the necessary "element of ruthlessness which seems to enter into every revolution in action," as well as somewhat broader essays which argue (against Gerschenkron) that Soviet industrialization represents a more "advanced" model than Britain because it directly embraced twentieth-century industrial organization, and (against Seton-Watson) that the ruling elite of Soviet society is not analogous to nineteenth-century ruling classes but rather "a new phenomenon in history with new merits and new vices." Also included are appraisals of Chernyshevsky's *What Is To Be Done?* and Bukharin's *The ABC of Communism*, an analysis of the decision to collectivize the peasantry, and three reviews of books by Isaac Deutscher. The ten essays are all clearly and skillfully constructed; they contain numerous perceptive insights, though many readers will not accept Carr's unilinear historical scheme, which suggests that each subsequent Soviet leader merely reflected the twentieth century—as if it were somehow independent of their actions.

Ironies of History includes twenty essays which range widely through contemporary politics, history, biography, and literary criticism. These are united less by any pervading sense of irony than by Deutscher's all-pervasive convictions about the direction of history. Deutscher, like Carr but unlike most Western historians, was sympathetic toward the Russian Revolution. Unlike Carr, he interpreted it as part of the nineteenth-century revolutionary tradition and, despite the weight of much of Soviet history, optimistically believed that a pristine Marxism would eventually re-emerge undefiled and intact to complete the Russian Revolution. This theme is more eloquently developed in his published Trevelyan Lectures (*The Unfinished Revolution: Russia 1917–1967*, New York, 1967). The present volume,

composed largely of journalistic articles, many of which seem dated, attests to the consistency with which he has repeated this point of view.

DAVID A. DAVIES
University of Waterloo

VOSPOMINANIA : ZHIZN' I FILOSOFSKII PUT'. By *N. O. Lossky*. Foreword and comments by *B. N. Lossky*. Slavische Propyläen: Texte in neu- und nachdrucken, vol. 43. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1969. 334 pp. DM 28.

This autobiography of the outstanding Russian philosopher Nikolai O. Lossky (1870–1965), edited by his son Boris, was carried to the year 1959 and then briefly completed by the editor. Lossky was born in Belorussia and studied at a gymnasium in Vitebsk. Before completing his course he was expelled for his adherence to socialism and atheism, and since he was not allowed to enter any other school, he escaped from Russia and for a time studied in Switzerland. Suffering extreme destitution, he returned home in 1889 and two years later succeeded in entering St. Petersburg University, where after matriculating in the physicomathematical faculty he changed to the historicophilosophical program. His principal teacher was A. I. Vvedensky, a Kantian, under whom he developed a passion for philosophy. He was particularly attracted to Leibnitz and made the overcoming of the skepticism of Hume and the rationalism of Kant his objective. After finishing his university course he became privatdocent of philosophy, during which time he became acquainted with Vladimir S. Soloviev, who made a deep impression on him. By 1900 he was already on the way to his own philosophical system, which he called “intuitivism,” in which he gave the will the decisive role. In 1903 he published his doctoral dissertation, which was translated into English under the title *The Intuitive Basis of Knowledge* (1919). Later he published many other books. In 1916 he was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of St. Petersburg.

When in 1905 there occurred a religious awakening in which Berdiaev, Bulgakov, Gershenson, Struve, and Frank, among others, participated, Lossky cooperated in the publication of their manifesto, *Vekhi* (1909). Philosophically, he passed from the theory of intuitive knowledge to metaphysics, where he was chiefly influenced by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. He called his view “ideal-realism.”

After the Revolution Lossky, despite his adherence to socialism (Fabian), was regarded with suspicion because of his religious views: he had openly re-entered the Orthodox Church in 1920. For a time he was spared; however, in 1922, along with Berdiaev and several hundred other intellectuals, he was expelled from the Soviet Union. Berdiaev remained in Berlin, but Lossky went on to Prague.

Although he spent the next twenty years in Czechoslovakia, Lossky does not have much to say about it. The government organized a Russian university there at which most of the Russian academic scholars taught. Lossky was in disagreement with some Czech university leaders because of their positivism. Later he was called to teach at the university in Brno, and finally at Bratislava. But when the Soviet army entered that city, Lossky, whose wife had died shortly before, left for the United States, where his youngest son, Andrew, was a graduate student at Yale University. Thenceforth he lived mostly in the United States. When Andrew went to the University of California at Los Angeles to teach history, Lossky also settled