

a Madman” is clearly the mere beginning of an essay. Surely these texts would have been greatly enriched if accompanied by Chaadaev’s more personal correspondence, much of which echoes and reinforces the themes of the philosophical letters, even if it is not as yet possible to publish a definitive edition of Chaadaev’s letters. Even those few collected by Gershenzon would have helped. And why does McNally apply as his standard of textual discrimination, as he says he does, what Chaadaev might have chosen around October 1836? Granted, the year 1836, with the publication of the first philosophical letter and the official declaration of insanity, was a crucial one for Chaadaev—but he lived on for another two decades. Why not the *fullest possible* text, with variations indicated? The Gershenzon edition of the “Apology” contains a whole long paragraph which has been eliminated in McNally’s version. There is little enough of Chaadaev as it is.

Richard Pipes’s introduction, while admirably and trenchantly written, makes an extraordinarily imperceptive statement about Chaadaev: “No other major Russian thinker gave the counsel that he did in answer to the perennial question ‘What is to be done?’: create a quiet preserve of inner peace and withdraw from an active life even while outwardly participating in it” (p. xviii). Surely this is a failure to distinguish the particular, personal advice Chaadaev gave Mme Panova, the recipient of the philosophical letters, and the major message of those letters, which is that Christianity means the creation of the Kingdom of God on earth, and that this creation has to be understood *socially*!

While McNally corrects this misconception in his introductory essays and in his notes, these also leave much to be desired. Chaadaev, who cared above all for unity, should not have his life and his ideas treated separately, as is done here. And although sensible and well informed, McNally disposes of too much of the controversy surrounding Chaadaev in too simple and too doctrinaire a manner—as, for example, in the discussion of his “mysticism.” As for the notes, they are far more helpful with substantive references and allusions than they are with the ideational sources of Chaadaev’s thought or with genuine obscurities in the text. In general, the notes are too skimpy, too restricted to the merely factual.

Finally, I miss a whole aspect of Chaadaev that McNally does little more than allude to: his impact on Russian literature, especially by way of Pushkin. In a little known, but brilliant essay on Chaadaev, the poet Mandelstam wrote that Chaadaev was the first Russian educated in Europe who genuinely “came back.” The meaning of that statement is not immediately clear, but I believe its proper elucidation and interpretation would tell us more about the significance of Chaadaev than has yet been done by the historians.

SIDNEY MONAS
University of Texas

BERDIAEV I ROSSIJA (FILOSOFIJA ISTORII ROSSII U N. A. BERDIAEVA). By *N. Poltoratsky*. New York: Obshchestvo Druzei Russkoi Kultury, 1967. vi, 270 pp. Paper.

This book is a welcome addition to the growing literature on Nicholas Berdiaev. It is the only book to deal definitively with Berdiaev’s interpretation of Russian history, set against a background of his conception of universal history. Scholarly and well researched, it should find some resonance not only among those who are interested in Berdiaev himself as a thinker but also among those who have a more general interest in Russian history, particularly Russian cultural history. Berdiaev’s views—

admirably synthesized in this book from a wide variety of his writings—prove challenging and thought-provoking.

The book is divided into two parts: the first summarizes Berdiaev's views on almost every conceivable aspect of Russian history, and the second part is essentially a criticism of these views. It also contains an extensive foreword dealing generally with the problems of a philosophy of history and Berdiaev's particular approach to these problems. Finally, there is a very thorough bibliography of Berdiaev's works and of relevant secondary sources.

Poltoratsky divides Berdiaev's thought into four periods. The first, called the sociological or psychological, extends from the beginning of his writings up to the revolution of 1905; the second, the historical or cosmic phase, runs from 1905 past the First World War and the Russian Revolution of 1917 to the mid-twenties; the third, called the ethical or personalistic period, covers the decade from the mid-twenties to the mid-thirties; and the fourth, or eschatological phase, occupies the time from the mid-thirties until Berdiaev's death in 1948. Given the classifications the author adopts, the second period would appear to be the most interesting from the standpoint of Poltoratsky's subject. However, what the author is attempting to do is to bridge the gap between the Berdiaev of *Sud'ba Rossii* (1918) and the Berdiaev of *Russkaia ideia* (1946), drawing upon a wide variety of sources from all periods in an attempt to present a coherent thematic picture, rather than a chronological account of the development of Berdiaev's historicophilosophical thought. In this he succeeds, I think, remarkably well.

All approaches have their drawbacks, however. In contrast to the first section of this book, the second part—containing the author's critical appraisal of Berdiaev—is not so much an attempt at bridge-building as a demolition job. Poltoratsky is essentially contrasting the earlier and the later Berdiaev, to the definite advantage of the former. In fact, the last part of Poltoratsky's book is more or less a criticism of *Russkaia ideia*.

Poltoratsky's major conclusions are that the "Russian idea" of Berdiaev—which amounts to socialism, anarchism, nihilism, Messianism, and a proneness to eschatological thinking, all somehow connected with the "Kingdom of God"—is nothing more than a summary of Berdiaev's own world view, and that Berdiaev in his later phase was basically antihistorical. Had I the space in this review, I would take exception to both of these conclusions—to the first on the grounds that it is irrelevant to the question whether Berdiaev's views adequately summarize the main themes of Russian thought, and to the second because I do not like the evidence from which he draws the conclusion. The book is marred somewhat by an anti-Soviet animus which seems to be the major reason for Poltoratsky's labeling some of Berdiaev's views as "negative" and some of them as "affirmative," and which draws Poltoratsky into some conclusions which are, to my mind, as unhistorical as any that Berdiaev makes. I have objections as well to a certain tone of the book which is revealed by Poltoratsky's referring to certain of Berdiaev's views as "temptations," "spiritual aberrations," or even "sins" (see pp. 175, 184–85, and elsewhere). Finally, Poltoratsky does not object, as I would, to the notion that there *is* such a thing as the "Russian idea" which is somehow connected to the "Kingdom of God"; he merely chides Berdiaev for having found the wrong content for the kingdom. Nevertheless, these are essentially matters of opinion. Poltoratsky's arguments are for the most part sophisticated and logical, and others may find them more persuasive than I do.

For those who are interested merely in the conclusions of the book (which is a Russian translation of a dissertation in French completed in 1954 at the Sorbonne),

two articles have been published in English which summarize Poltoratsky's position. The first was published in the *Russian Review* (April 1962) and the second in the *Slavonic and East European Review* (January 1967). Both are almost verbatim translations from two separate portions of the second part of *Berdiaev i Rossiia*.

J. C. STORY
Long Island University

THE CONTROVERSY OVER CAPITALISM: STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE RUSSIAN POPULISTS. By *A. Walicki*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969. 197 pp. \$6.25.

Andrzej Walicki's subject is populism as a broadly conceived ideology rather than as any specific movement within that general ideology. He could have stated this simply and briefly at the outset. But the first of the book's three chapters is spent wandering, as through a dark wood, seeking to "avoid terminological confusion." Walicki simultaneously argues with and moderates the argument between Lenin, Richard Pipes, and B. P. Kozmin over the semantic content of the term *narodnichestvo*. The outcome of the argument is ambiguous in the extreme, although Lenin seems to win. But Walicki concludes that we must move on, beyond these entangling disputes, and give emphasis to aspects of populism not dealt with by Lenin at all. At this point the study emerges into the light of day.

The remaining two chapters deal, first, with the ideology of "classical populism" (Lavrov, Bakunin, Tkachev, Mikhailovsky, Vorontsov, and Danielson) and, second, with the close relation between populism and Marxism. On the firmer ground of these last two chapters, Walicki draws a number of important conclusions concerning the meaning and significance of Russian populism: the apparent peculiarities of populism correspond, in fact, to those of a developing rural state, such as Russia, peculiarities which are typical of "all the backward countries in the process of modernization" (p. 129); Populists were the first to postulate the noncapitalist industrial development of a backward agrarian country; in carrying out this historical mission, classical populism "was not only defined, and not merely influenced, but, in a sense, called into being by Marxism" (p. 132); and populism, in turn, influenced Marx and the reception of Marxism both in Russia and, by extension, in the whole developing rural world.

The conclusions are fresh and challenging, but the book is marred by a number of substantive and technical weaknesses. Walicki draws on an unexpectedly wide range of Soviet and Western studies related to his theme. But there are significant omissions—for example, monographs by Theodore Von Laue, Samuel Baron, and B. S. Itenberg. The interrelationship between populism and West European socialism could have been dealt with more fully. The reader is teased by a footnote (p. 173) on the agrarian program of the First International and the *Manifesto to Agricultural Workers* written by J. P. Becker (and issued in the name of a Swiss section, not a German section, of the International). The journal *Vpered!* did not close down with Lavrov's resignation as editor (p. 94); volume 5 appeared in 1877 without him and cannot be called his journal at that point. The system of transliteration from the Russian is curious and inconsistent (e.g., occasionally *c* for *ts*). *Prosvetitel'stvo* is prominently misspelled (p. 14).

The text should have been better edited, and the first chapter could have been left out altogether, but Walicki has offered a noteworthy and convincing reappraisal