

tions in terms of their general political orientation, especially with reference to the foreign policies which they urged upon their governments—or their governments urged on them. Massive documentation seems unnecessary to prove this point. The reader may wonder why Serejski chose to analyze historiography only up to 1914, when recent decades offer such fascinating examples of historical studies that coincide exactly with national policy. In his last paragraph Serejski explains that “European historical opinion” opposed the partitions and therefore favored the re-emergence of an independent Poland after World War I. This point, questionable in view of Serejski’s own evidence, would have been better supported by analyzing the thoughts of European statesmen at the Paris Peace Conference and the views of their experts.

A sixteen-page French summary makes the work accessible to non-Polish readers.

DANIEL STONE
University of Winnipeg

FILOZOFIA A MESJANIZM: STUDIA Z DZIEJÓW FILOZOFII I MYŚLI
SPOŁECZNO-RELIGIJNEJ ROMANTYZMU POLSKIEGO. By *Andrzej
Walicki*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1970. 318 pp. 45 zł.

Walicki’s book consists of four papers on Polish romantic *Weltanschauungen*. In the first two Mickiewicz’s messianism is confronted with the philosophies of August Cieszkowski and Bronisław Trentowski. The third, on Karol Libelt’s “Slavic philosophy,” is a reprint of an introductory essay to a selection of Libelt’s works. The fourth paper was prompted by Herzen’s remark characterizing Mickiewicz as a Polish counterpart of “Khomiakov & Co.” In his detailed and authoritative exposition Walicki (the author of a book on the Russian Slavophiles, *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii*) proves that despite some striking resemblances this was not so.

All the essays, with the exception of the third one, have as their main protagonist Mickiewicz’s Parisian lectures, a work sadly neglected in Polish scholarship until recently. By overemphasizing the contrast between the “sober” Mickiewicz of the initial lectures and the fervid Towiański propagandist of the last ones, scholars have overlooked the basic unity of the whole. Moreover, they have displayed a tendency to isolate passages palatable to them and to disregard the context. Walicki’s approach, like Zofia Stefanowska’s in her fine recent paper “Slavonic Legend in Mickiewicz’s Parisian Lectures” (*Pamiętnik Literacki*, 1968), is “holistic.” This approach is much more fruitful than previous ones, and does some justice to this vast, rich, rambling, and occasionally baffling work.

Two problems especially preoccupy Walicki. He wants to analyze the meaning of Mickiewicz’s messianism in a more precise and unambiguous way than was possible in the past, and by comparing Mickiewicz’s attitudes with those of other thinkers of his time he wants to fix the poet’s place in Polish romantic philosophy. On the way he sheds considerable light on those other thinkers as well. Thus he gives the reader a deeper insight into the spiritual climate of late Polish romanticism, and since he is at home in the French, German, and Russian thought of the period, he is especially good in tracing both the European connections of the Polish romantic thinkers and their original contributions to romantic thought. All in all, this is a highly stimulating and instructive book.

The first paper, on Mickiewicz and Cieszkowski, is by far the most important, the richest in new findings, and the most controversial. It opens our eyes to the hitherto neglected French inspiration of Cieszkowski's philosophy—a philosophy that Walicki characterizes as a kind of watered-down messianism, even though there is no place in it for a charismatic leader, a messiah. At one moment he speaks of Cieszkowski's philosophy as “an impersonal messianism embracing the whole of mankind” (p. 83). In such a context the term “messianism” is self-contradictory. If the whole of mankind becomes its own messiah, then that means it can do without one. Cieszkowski's philosophy—and this was its original feature—was a non-messianic millenarianism. One could also contest Walicki's characterization of Mickiewicz's and Cieszkowski's attitudes toward the Catholic Church as, respectively, “a heterodoxy of a mystic and a prophet” and “a heterodoxy of a rationalistic type” (pp. 84–85). Such an opposition misses the main point. Mickiewicz could utter ideas shocking to orthodox Catholics, but he never considered these ideas incompatible with the teachings of the church, or himself as being outside the pale of the church. If he harshly criticized the “official” church, it was because he found it wanting in the task of assuming the spiritual leadership of the world. Cieszkowski, on the other hand, saw Catholicism as a religion that was becoming antiquated. In the new era—the millennium—he envisioned a new, syncretic religion (reminding one of Toynbee's speculations). No matter what his attitude was in private life, Cieszkowski as a thinker criticized the church—unlike Mickiewicz—from the outside.

The book is provided with a good and fairly detailed French “résumé.”

WIKTOR WEINTRAUB
Harvard University

WSPÓŁCZESNY ANTYKOMUNIZM A NAUKI SPOŁECZNE: ESEJE POLEMICZNE. By *Jerzy J. Wiatr*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1970. 204 pp. 20 zł., paper.

Contemporary Anticommunism and the Social Sciences is a collection of articles previously published in various periodicals (including the ideological monthly of the Polish Communist Party *Nowe Drogi* and the weekly *Polityka*) in the years 1967–69—in other words, in one of the most oppressive periods of Gomułka's rule. Perhaps for that reason these articles abound in clichés of disparagement (“Bourgeois sociology is a perfidious apology of capitalism”) and in ritualistic decreelike pronouncements (“The proletariat is the first class in history which strives for an entirely objective knowledge of society”). The articles are concerned with diverse—if not entirely unrelated—subjects ranging from an analysis of historical materialism to a defense of the stratification studies in Marxist sociology. There is little in them to merit serious study.

The only theme unifying these articles is their common target, “institutionalized anticommunism,” by which we are to understand certain trends (though they are not identified) which are to be found mainly, but not exclusively, in American sociology and “Sovietology” (academic research on the Soviet Union and East European countries). A long chapter reviews some of the important Soviet studies published in the United States in the last twenty years. According to the author Sovietology is an openly partisan undertaking with no claim to academic standards.