

In conclusion, one puts down Professor Barratt's book with very mixed feelings. It is nice to have an English translation of excerpts from some Decembrist memoirs. Unfortunately, aside from what passing interest it may have for the very casual reader, the book is of limited value. Still, it is good to see that the Decembrists are again becoming a subject of interest to Western scholars after several decades of neglect.

W. BRUCE LINCOLN  
Northern Illinois University

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF IU. SAMARIN AND BARONESS RAHDEN (1861–1876). Edited by *Loren Calder*. Translated from the Second Edition of D. Samarin, Moscow, 1894, by *Terence Scully* (from the French), *Helen Swediuk-Cheyne* (from the German), and *Loren Calder* (from the Russian). Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1974. 267 pp. \$5.95, cloth. \$3.50, paper.

It is somewhat difficult to understand the necessity for this book or for what audience it is intended. Samarin is, of course, an important figure and a new study of him would be welcome. But a translation of his correspondence with the Baroness Rahden can be of interest only to a relatively small group of specialists on nineteenth-century Russian intellectual and political history, most of whom, I should think, could read these letters in the editions of 1893 or 1894. (To be fair, one should add that only major libraries are likely to have one or another of these earlier volumes, and that it is difficult to read the original letters through without knowing French, German, and Russian.)

The correspondence is not entirely devoid of interest to the reader with a more general knowledge of Russian history. The principal issue between the two was the privileged position of the German minority in the Baltic provinces. Samarin's long hostility to the aristocratic particularism of the Baltic Germans is somewhat softened here by the fact that his correspondent, Edith Rahden, was a member of that alien group, as well as a dear and respected friend. There are also a few interesting observations on other issues of the day—this or that aspect of the reforms of the 1860s—but the correspondence is really no more than a good source for Samarin's biographer.

Nor is the English edition particularly impressive in its execution. Loren Calder's introduction is unsophisticated in its conceptualization of Slavophilism and it is poorly written. Here, for example, is Calder's translation of a remark by Peter Struve: ". . . as distinct from Kireevski and Khomiakov . . . the mind of Samarin was not a philosophical-constructing, but a civil-servant arranging and regulating [one] . . . the mind of Samarin was the mind of a statesman and political thinker" (p. 20). It is also unclear what Calder means when he writes that Samarin's *Borderlands of Russia (Okrainy Rossii)* "was written to combat the autocratic, class character of Russian policy in the 1860's. . ." (p. 20).

Terence Scully's translations from the French are better than Calder's from the Russian, but they are scarcely elegant and on occasion they are quite inaccurate. Small but irritating mistakes ("teaming" instead of "teeming"; "elucubrations" instead of "lucubrations") abound. The volume is indexed, but a much more ambitious set of notes would have helped to guide the general reader through the

maze of minor figures in Russian politics, German philosophy and theology, and so forth. How many readers of this English edition, for example, will know that the "Vinet" discussed on pp. 249–51 is Alexandre Vinet, a Swiss theologian noted particularly for his writings on church-state relations?

ABBOTT GLEASON  
*Brown University*

TRAINING THE NIHILISTS: EDUCATION AND RADICALISM IN TSARIST RUSSIA. By *Daniel R. Brower*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975. 248 pp. \$12.50.

In this book Professor Brower provides a historical interpretation of the sociology of the radical intellectuals in mid-nineteenth-century Russia. He argues, among other things, that, in Russian higher education, a "recruitment" system developed which fed a steady if small stream of committed revolutionaries into the life of the country, and that the radical intelligentsia was drawn from much the same social strata as university students in general. Brower seeks to investigate the details of this recruitment system and to explore the personal motives of active revolutionaries. He accomplishes these objectives rather well, although he is sometimes unduly repetitive.

According to Brower, the roots of radical rebellion lay in the Russian educational experience. More precisely, radicals tended to be formed in the most select institutions of higher learning, particularly the universities of St. Petersburg and Moscow and the Medical-Surgical Academy in St. Petersburg. The university student body in Russia was a very small elite with great expectations for the future, though often with little enough to eat in the present. A sense of solidarity among students, a feeling of apartness from society at large, coupled with the awareness that the larger fraction of the elite would eventually control the state apparatus and the destinies of the Russian empire, justified the smaller fraction's belief that, given the opportunity, it too could chart a course for the entire nation, and impose that course upon the people.

Brower writes that professors at the higher schools generally were not involved in radicalizing their students. They stood for traditional learning, whereas the radical young people demanded—to use a modern catchword—"relevant" knowledge. Indeed, the younger generation defined the very word "learning" to fit its own purposes. As one radical wrote explicitly, "learning" really meant "socialist ideology," founded upon "the ideal of brotherly love and universal equality." And Brower implicitly accepts this definition. When he writes of students in pursuit of learning, he usually has in mind students engaged in political speculation along socialist lines, theorizing about what would or should be, instead of analyzing what had been or was. Since they could not usually obtain such "learning" in the classroom, students formed shifting "circles," a major element of the recruitment system, for discussion. Students also supported the Sunday School movement of the early 1860s, and attempted to provide a model of the new way of life by forming communes. These efforts yielded little in the way of practical results—the students in the Sunday Schools fell away when they faced the drudgery of teaching reading and writing rather than the tenets of their political ideology—but that did not dampen the students' political interests.