

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.

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