

In order to explain Lemke's style and method of work, the author reconstructs step by step his work as collector, commentator, and editor of the first edition in twenty-two volumes of Herzen's collected works in Russian. The attempts of various individuals and political groups to adopt Herzen as the harbinger of their ideals and movements convinced Lemke that only a complete chronological edition of his literary heritage would permit an objective interpretation of Herzen. Although Lemke never stated that Herzen was a liberal and regarded him as an independent and unique figure belonging neither to liberalism nor to revolutionary democracy, the author believes that by stressing the liberal aspects of Herzen's ideology Lemke made him appear to be the representative of left-wing liberalism.

Until 1920 Lemke considered the social and political movements of the 1860s not as a revolutionary movement but as "oppositional," and its leaders as "peaceful" public figures. Chernyshevsky was regarded as a "temporary revolutionary" and more radical than Herzen. However, in Lemke's writings of the early 1920s, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and their followers were presented as revolutionaries and socialists. This new approach, the author argues, was based neither on additional sources nor on the reinterpretation of the old but on Lemke's new political belief. While Lemke's earlier views of Herzen and the people of the sixties showed that he did not comprehend "revolutionism," in the 1920s he "did not understand the essence" of Lenin's writings on the Russian revolutionaries. Although Lemke developed what the author calls his own *faktograficheskii* method (great reliance on sources and extensive commentary on his publication of documents), and his scholarly objectivity carried him ahead of the liberal historiography of his time, Vandalkovskaia contends that he was unable to free himself from the confines of bourgeois methodology and the intellectual climate in which his views were formed and to amend his historical conception in accord with his new political philosophy.

This is a carefully researched and well-written work, which not only expands our knowledge of the historiography of the revolutionary movement but also presents new insights into what it was for a scholar-intelligent to be working in the midst of wars and revolutions. The study might have been even more successful if the author had broadened her analytical perspective beyond the writings of Lenin to include the abundant scholarship on this topic.

PHILIP SHASHKO

*University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*

#### PETER LAVROV AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT.

By *Philip Pomper*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1972. xix, 250 pp. \$7.95.

Rather than put him straight into the river, where she took him for his baths, Peter's nurse filled a tub she brought along and washed him in that. Pomper takes this as a symbol for the rest of Lavrov's life, for, as he portrays him, Lavrov was to remain for the most part safely—though so very guiltily—protected in the tub, distant from the really turbulent revolutionary currents. Although this judgment may not do justice to Lavrov's forty years of political activism or to the sacrifices involved, including a ruined career, exile, and forced emigration, it does catch the essential feature of his life: he was, indeed, the perennial outsider. As he said of himself, he was always either a half-tone too high or too low: a survivor from

the fathers of the forties among the sons of the sixties and grandsons of the eighties and nineties; a respected teacher of mathematics at the Mikhailovsky Artillery School making political speeches, while still in uniform, at radical student meetings; a student of Hegel when everyone else had taken up Vogt, Büchner, and Moleschott; a scholar, who yearned for the leisure and the peace of mind necessary for serious study, entangled somehow in political journalism, at times because, as in his successful editorship of *Vpered!*, he seemed to have been the only luminary around.

Especially significant were Lavrov's efforts to bridge the gap that separated him from revolutionary activism. A dove among the hawks, as Turgenev saw, physically weak and hopelessly incompetent in practical matters, "Hamlet playing Don Quixote," Lavrov idealized and idolized the most daring revolutionaries. From the sixties through the nineties, consequently, he followed a persistently more leftward course, defending along the way rigid *partiimost'* and violence, merging with the Bakuninists (leaving his own Lavrists behind), and ending, in the nineties, as one of the few activists still fervently loyal to the People's Will.

His theories reflected this contradiction no less than his practice. As a sensitive, basically tolerant and conciliatory skeptic, he early adopted a Kantian relativism which left most options open. But the urge to engagement overwhelmed his intellectual uncertainty, and he felt morally driven to a leap of total faith in what he judged to be the most promising revolutionary force, first the intelligentsia, then the masses. As a humanist, who chose poetry as his first vehicle for political expression, he was attuned to the free play of contingency and was convinced of both the inevitability and desirability of subjectivism (his fine insight into the nature of social and historical study). But in need of reliable springboards for unquestioning commitment, he strained mightily toward determinism and what he mistook to be scientific objectivity.

Drawing skillfully on Amsterdam, Hoover, Columbia, and, to a lesser extent, Soviet archives, Pomper richly documents this novel interpretation, at times with quite dramatic quotations, especially regarding Lavrov's Leninist extremism ("No one has the right 'to relax, to forget himself, to doze' if he *believes*." "He belongs entirely to the battle which is going to occur.") and his recurring pessimism ("People are riddles to an unbelievable extent, and the longer one lives, the more one feels contempt and loathing for *almost all of them*. . . . The very greatest miracle in the universe is that this human rubbish creates history.").

Although the book is somewhat fragmentary and disjointed in the early chapters and skirts concentrated study of Lavrov's more scholarly works (leaving at least this reader wondering why the author thinks Lavrov such an "extraordinary" and "encyclopedic" mind), Pomper has given us a fine analysis of the interplay of personality, ideas, and external circumstance. He has also added still another example, although he might not want to draw this conclusion, of the futility, pathos, and danger of the apparently endemic malaise of Russian radicalism: the tendency to mistake poetry for politics, to use thought as a cureall for one's own troubles and shortcomings rather than as an instrument for really trying to understand Russia's problems and for doing something sensible toward solving them.

ARTHUR P. MENDEL  
University of Michigan