

The strength of this book lies in its freshness, exuberance, and sensitivity to the education of the young. Like a good story teller, Jacoby takes one through a variety of socializing agencies—the Soviet school, the Russian family, nursery school, elementary school, and the upper grades, and then discusses, again with sensitivity, the interaction between school and society. In this connection, she considers the dilemma of efficiency and equity in education faced by the Soviet decision makers and the equally thorny problem of how to satisfy the expectations and aspirations of the young while simultaneously striving for the establishment of the classless society. She ends her book with a very refreshing content analysis of two social studies textbooks (one from the United States and the other from the USSR).

M. MOBIN SHORISH

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

DIE PETERSBURGER RELIGIÖS-PHILOSOPHISCHEN VEREINIGUNGEN: DIE ENTWICKLUNG DES RELIGIÖSEN SELBSTVERSTÄNDNISSES IHRER INTELLIGENCIJA-MITGLIEDER (1901–1917). By *Jutta Scherrer*. FORSCHUNGEN ZUR OSTEUROPAÏSCHEN GESCHICHTE, vol. 19. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz in Kommission, 1973. 473 pp. DM 88, paper.

The interest of contemporary Russian writers and thinkers in religion gives added significance to the religious heritage of the Russian intelligentsia. (There is a definite connection between *Problemy idealizma*, a collection of articles which appeared in 1903, and *Iz-pod glyb*, which was published in 1974.) In this volume, Scherrer recounts the intelligentsia's quest for religion and inner experience at the beginning of the twentieth century. The undertaking is very useful for all students of modern Russian history, for although there is no lack of writings by the participants themselves, there is little comprehensive analysis of their thought. Scherrer stresses the discussions within the Religious Philosophical Meetings and the Religious Philosophical Society of St. Petersburg (1901 to 1917), but she also recounts the activities of similar societies in Moscow and in Kiev, as well as related publications, such as *Novyi put'*, *Voprosy zhizni*, and *Pu'*. She draws up handy lists of participants, gives good synopses of the debates, and catalogs both the issues agitating the intelligentsia and the sources in which the debates appeared.

Scherrer constructs her presentation within the context of the intelligentsia. She argues the formation of a new intelligentsia, clustered around "the new religious consciousness." As proof, she repeatedly musters lists of participants in various meetings, groupings, publications, and, on this basis, hypothesizes the existence of a coherent group. Closer study of the people involved, however, will reveal serious differences among them. Although they all met to discuss religion, inner freedom, and overlooked traditions of intellectual life, there was no unity in their understanding of the terms. Thus, when Merezhkovsky and Gippius—who rightly play leading roles in Scherrer's presentation—speak of the church, they do it in a different sense than Evgenii N. Trubetskoi or Pavel I. Novgorodtsev, both of whom were conventional churchgoers.

A serious drawback of the book is Scherrer's own unwillingness to deal with manifestations of the religious quest and its psychological motivation. The towering shadow of Vladimir Solov'ev could easily intimidate any scholar and Scherrer

wisely relegates him, for the most part, to the footnotes. Unfortunately, this creates a false impression of Solov'ev's thought and influence—as something monolithic and constant.

Little attempt is made to assess the significance of the ideas presented, although the discussions, particularly on the functions of the society and the state, are lucidly written. One would have appreciated a fuller treatment of the church, as well as further elaboration of the difficulties with censorship and more on the intriguing bit of information Scherrer offers about the tsar possibly financing a religious society in Kiev.

Since Scherrer apparently limited her research to the obvious influences on the intelligentsia and the literary avant-garde—especially symbolism and the philosophical “turn from Marxism to idealism,” she stumbled into some factual errors. Thus, the Russian public did not have to wait until *Novyi put'* for “its first confrontations with Nietzsche” (p. 115). A decade earlier, in 1892, *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* had carried a series of articles on the “German thinker.” (This journal's circulation was comparable to that of the journals of the intelligentsia, and its sponsor, the Moscow Psychological Society—which Scherrer characterizes as being limited to specialists [p. 208]—performed a much broader function.)

Perhaps no single work can be expected to bring out all the interrelated strands of thought and creativity which characterize this dynamic period of Russian history. Scherrer's book is a welcome stimulant to debate on the subject.

MARTHA BOHACHEVSKY-CHOMIAK
Manhattanville College

HOW COMMUNIST STATES CHANGE THEIR RULERS. By Myron Rush.
Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974. 346 pp. \$15.00.

Succession in Communist states is an important subject, and the “comparative communist” focus of inquiry deserves endorsement. It is therefore regrettable to find the latest book by Myron Rush—whose earlier work included *Political Succession in the USSR*—something of a disappointment. This is not so much the author's fault—his scholarship is impeccable—as it is attributable to the topic. Professor Rush correctly stresses the absence of an institutionalized model for succession in Communist systems and the consequent destabilizing effects. But, as he goes on to show, changes in rulers have not generally resulted in lasting crises, and only few candidates have proved to be woefully inadequate.

In this book the Soviet Union figures only as background or paradigm. China, Albania, and Yugoslavia are discussed although they have had no succession as yet; neither have Cuba or North Korea; Mongolia and Vietnam are in effect ignored. This leaves the Soviet bloc countries of Eastern Europe for more detailed treatment, and the book does give a reliable, factual account of the successions in the six countries concerned.

Rush provides some useful classifications. While some successions have been “natural,” more often they have been politically caused by the ouster of the incumbent. He distinguishes between limited and extended succession struggles, and between those that lead to a single dominant leader and those that do not. The severity of crises, it turns out (not surprisingly), tends to be least in natural, rather than political, successions; when Moscow is in control; when there is no